6802. By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Huntington, W. Va., recommending favorable action of Congress on providing adequate and just compensation to the personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, *April 17, 1930*

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, source of our being, goal of our desires, and guide of these our pilgrim days, be with us now as we turn aside from the ceaseless fret of life that we may contemplate its meaning. In the fullness of the times Thou didst gather Thy light into life, that even simple folk might see Thy glory in the face of Jesus Christ.

Grant, therefore, to each one of us that, from His gracious words, the deep compassion of His heart, His friendship for the fallen, the tender grace of His forgiveness, the crown of thorns, the cruel cross, the open shame, we may learn the meaning of Thy love and be persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, April 14, 1930, when, on request of Mr. FESS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

### SENATORIAL EXPENSES IN 1930 CAMPAIGN

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair makes the following announcement:

The Chair appoints the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE] to succeed the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] on the special committee to investigate expenditures of candidates for the United States Senate in the campaign of 1930.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2757) to authorize the United States Shipping Board to sell certain property of the United States situated in the city of Hoboken, N. J., with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7405) to provide for a 5-year construction and maintenance program for the United States Bureau of Fisheries, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### AIRPLANE ACCIDENT AT MENEFEE FIELD, NEW ORLEANS, LA. (S. DOC. NO. 129)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, submitting, in response to Senate Resolution 201, data in relation to the airplane accident of August 23, 1929, wherein one Elliot D. Coleman, jr., a Transoceanic Air Travel Flying School student at Menefee Field, New Orleans, La., was killed when his plane and the plane of another pilot collided, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

### PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of Frederick Reis, of Compton, Calif., praying that the Government render him financial assistance in the matter of completing his invention, being an invention in the nature of a combination airplane and Zeppelin in a monoplane type, which, with the accompanying paper and diagram, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 3466) for the relief of the Searcy Water Co., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 446) thereon.

Mr. FRAZIER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which were referred the following bill and joint resolution, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 5283) to declare valid the title to certain Indian lands (Rept. No. 447); and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 188) authorizing the use of tribal funds belonging to the Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians in South Dakota to pay expenses and compensation of the members of the tribal business committee for services in connection with their pipestone claim (Rept. No. 448).

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3581) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to arrange with States for the education, medical attention, and relief of distress of Indians, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 449) thereon.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3553) for the relief of R. A. Ogee, sr., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 450) thereon.

Mr. PINE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4140) providing for the sale of the remainder of the coal and asphalt deposits in the segregated mineral land in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, Oklahoma, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 455) thereon.

Mr. DALE, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendments and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 10340) granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the White River at or near Calico Rock, Ark. (Rept. No. 451); and

A bill (H. R. 10474) granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the White River at or near Sylamore, Ark. (Rept. No. 452).

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3407) for the relief of Judson Stokes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 454) thereon.

Mr. WATERMAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3527) to authorize credit in the disbursing accounts of certain officers of the Army of the United States for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 456) thereon.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 26) for the acquisition, establishment, and development of the George Washington Memorial Parkway along the Potomac from Mount Vernon and Fort Washington to the Great Falls, and to provide for the acquisition of lands in the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia requisite to the comprehensive park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 458) thereon.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1721) directing the retirement of acting assistant surgeons of the United States Navy at the age of 64 years, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 457) thereon.

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

A bill (S. 1683) for the relief of John Heffron (Rept. No. 453);

A bill (H. R. 5726) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the city of Salem, Mass., and to the Salem Marine Society, of Salem, Mass., the silver service set and bronze clock, respectively, which have been in use on the cruiser *Salem* (Rept. No. 459);

A bill (H. R. 6645) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the president of the Lions Club, of Shelbyville, Tenn., a bell of any naval vessel that is now, or may be, in his custody; and to the president of the Rotary Club, of Shelbyville, Tenn., a steering wheel of any naval vessel that is now, or may be, in his custody (Rept. No. 460);

A bill (H. R. 8973) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Charleston Museum, of Charleston, S. C., the ship's bell, plaque, war record, and silver service of the cruiser *Charleston* that is now, or may be, in his custody (Rept. No. 461); and

A bill (H. R. 10674) authorizing payment of six months' death gratuity to beneficiaries of transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who die while on active duty (Rept. No. 462).

### INVESTIGATION OF SALES OF UNITED STATES SHIPS

Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 129) for the appointment of a special committee to investigate the sales of ships by the United States Shipping Board and Merchant Fleet Corporation, reported it with an amendment.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

EXECUTIVE REPORTS

As in open executive session,

Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Commerce, reported the nomination of Ensign (Temporary) John S. Merriam, jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade) (temporary) in the Coast Guard, which was placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. PHIPPS, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported sundry post-office nominations, which were placed on the Executive Calendar.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on to-day that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 686. An act to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910;

S. 3473. An act to amend the act of Congress approved March 16, 1926, establishing a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes;

S. 3747. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the mouth of Clarks River; and

S. 4027. An act to legalize a bridge across the American Channel of the Detroit River leading from the mainland to Grosse Isle, Mich., and about 16 miles below the city of Detroit, Mich.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. PINE:

A bill (S. 4195) for the relief of Samuel W. Brown; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARAWAY:

A bill (S. 4196) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the St. Francis River in Craighead County, Ark.; to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES—SECOND MORNING HOUR

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 249), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

*Resolved,* That paragraph 3, Rule VII, of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and the same hereby is, amended by adding between the word "Mondays" and the word "the" in said paragraph the words "and Thursdays."

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AT HOBOKEN, N. J.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2757) to authorize the United States Shipping Board to sell certain property of the United States situated in the city of Hoboken, N. J., which were, on page 2, line 25, to strike out "in the case of equal bids," and on page 3, line 6, after the word "sufficient," to insert "Said property shall be sold only to a citizen of the United States, within the meaning of section 2, shipping act, 1916, as amended by section 38, merchant marine act, 1920."

Mr. KEAN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I would like to examine the matter first. I will ask the Senator from New Jersey to call up his motion at a little later time.

Mr. KEAN. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be passed over temporarily.

Mr. McKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago when the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] brought this matter up I objected. I am not sure that I would have approved the bill if I had been present in the Senate when it was considered and passed, but as it has gone this far and as there will probably be an investigation of the Shipping Board and all its transactions, I take it there is no reason for objecting to the passage of this bill. So I shall not do so. If the Senator desires to have the House amendments acted upon, very well.

Mr. KEAN. I renew my motion that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

H. R. 7405. An act to provide for a 5-year construction and maintenance program for the United States Bureau of Fisheries, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

LITERARY DIGEST PROHIBITION POLL

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, a little while ago I called the attention of the Senate to extracts from two or three communications from people in my State indicating a lack of confidence in the prohibition poll being taken by the Literary Digest. I have received several similar letters since. This morning I received a letter with reference to another matter from a gentleman whom I know and who is very reliable; and I read just a brief statement from his letter relating to the subject just mentioned:

> I sure don't think much of the Literary Digest bogus poll. There are four in my immediate family, all voters, and I was the only one to receive a vote.

He is a dry.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. 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:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Allen | Frazier | Kendrick | Smoot |
| Ashurst | George | Keyes | Steck |
| Baird | Gillett | La Follette | Steiwer |
| Barkley | Glass | McCulloch | Stephens |
| Bingham | Glenn | McKellar | Sullivan |
| Black | Goff | McNary | Swanson |
| Blaine | Goldsborough | Metcalf | Thomas, Idaho |
| Blease | Gould | Norbeck | Thomas, Okla. |
| Borah | Greene | Norris | Townsend |
| Brock | Hale | Oddie | Trammell |
| Brookhart | Harris | Overman | Tydings |
| Broussard | Harrison | Patterson | Vandenberg |
| Capper | Hatfield | Phipps | Wagner |
| Caraway | Hawes | Pine | Walcott |
| Connally | Hayden | Ransdell | Walsh, Mass. |
| Copeland | Hebert | Robinson, Ind. | Walsh, Mont. |
| Couzens | Heflin | Robsion, Ky. | Waterman |
| Dale | Howell | Sheppard | Watson |
| Deneen | Johnson | Shipstead | Wheeler |
| Dill | Jones | Shortridge | |
| Fess | Kean | Simmons | |

Mr. FRAZIER. I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is detained in his home by illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is detained on account of the death of his brother. I ask that this announcement may stand for the remainder of the week.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] is unavoidably absent. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are all detained from the Senate by illness.

I further desire to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] are in London attending the naval conference.

Mr. NORBECK. My colleague [Mr. McMASTER] is unavoidably absent from the city. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9546) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4138) to amend the act of March 2, 1929, entitled "An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries," requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RANSLEY, Mr. WURZBACH, and Mr. QUIN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 9546) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

PRESENTATION OF CONFEDERATE FLAG TO SENATOR BLEASE

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a brief article from the State, of Columbia, S. C., relating to the presentation of a Confederate flag by the

United Daughters of the Confederacy to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

[From the State, Columbia, S. C., Sunday morning, April 13, 1930]

UNITED DAUGHTERS OF CONFEDERACY

(Mrs. J. Frost Walker. Union, president; Miss Bertie Smith, Greer, publicity)

Some time ago COLE. L. BLEASE, United States Senator from South Carolina, wrote the division president, Mrs. Walker, asking her where he might secure a medium-size Confederate flag to hang in his office in Washington. Deeply impressed by this inquiry from Senator BLEASE, because he was the first South Carolina Senator who had ever expressed a wish to have a Confederate flag hang in his office, the Daughters of the South Carolina division had one especially made for him, and this was presented to him Thursday, April 3, in the Senate Office Building.

Mrs. Walker was not able to be present and asked Miss Jessica Randolph Smith (daughter of the late Orren Randolph Smith, designer of the Stars and Bars) to make the presentation. The ceremonies attending the presentation were lovely, and everything passed off smoothly and impressively.

John D. Long, secretary to Senator BLEASE, presented General Hawkins, who in turn introduced Maj. A. F. Rose, chaplain, who offered a beautiful prayer. Miss Smith then took the flag and made an impressive talk, stressing the point that South Carolina was the first to secede, fired the first shot of the Confederate War, and that Senator BLEASE, of South Carolina, was the first United States Senator to be presented with the flag of the Confederacy, and to have it placed in his office. Miss Smith then handed the flag to Congressman DOMINICK, who made the presentation speech. He spoke of the loyalty of Senator BLEASE to the veterans. His father was one who wore the gray, and 11 of his people served in the Confederacy, and, said Mr. DOMINICK, "Senator BLEASE has always taken the keenest interest in the welfare of the veteran." Mrs. Walker sent a message which was read by Miss Smith. The following telegram was also read by Miss Smith: "Senator COLE. L. BLEASE: May the Confederate flag that you receive to-day from the South Carolina Daughters of the Confederacy bring you a blessing and benediction in your work for our country."

Congressman DOMINICK closed his presentation speech with these remarks: "Senator BLEASE, it is my pleasure to present this flag. It has only been a short while since there were in the United States Senate and in the House of Representatives a great many representing that grand army of Confederate veterans, but to-day, in the providence of God, there is only one, Major STEDMAN, of North Carolina, and on account of infirmities of age he could not be with us to-day. Take this flag—

"'For though conquered, we adore it,
Love the cold, dead hands that bore it,
Weep for those who fell before it,
Pardon those who trailed and tore it.'"

Senator BLEASE made a beautiful acceptance speech, saying, among other things, that his father's home was often the home of Confederate veterans. Said the Senator, in speaking of the Confederate veterans: "I have said on the floor of the Senate more than once that I come from the State which was the mother of secession, and which has produced some of the bravest men who were ever seen on a battle field. Lee did not surrender—his soldiers were perished, they were overpowered, outnumbered, but they were not cowed. I thank you, Miss Smith, and I thank you all for your attention. When I cease to praise and defend the southern soldiers and this emblem 'this poor, lisping, stammering tongue will lie silent in the grave.'"

"It is quite needless for me to say," said Secretary Long, "that the Senator is deeply appreciative of the high honor which the Daughters of the Confederacy of his native State have thus conferred upon him, and I only wish that you all could see the beautiful flag where it now hangs upon the wall of his reception room in the Senate Office Building, facing the pictures of the immortal Lee and Jackson, who loved it so well, and just under the Palmetto flag and the pictures of Hampton, Gary, and Butler, who followed it with an equal devotion."

Among those present at the presentation were: Maj. A. F. Rose, chaplain in Confederate uniform; General Hawkins and Lieutenant Houchens, both in Confederate uniform; Congressman and Mrs. Fred H. Dominick, of South Carolina; Congressman Butler Hare, of South Carolina; Congressman McMillan, of South Carolina; Congressman J. J. McSwain, of South Carolina; Rear Admiral McGowan, of South Carolina; P. H. McGowan, of South Carolina; James Pruitt, of South Carolina.

One very impressive and touching incident was that, upon the conclusion of Senator BLEASE's speech, Major Rose, one of General Mosby's men, advanced and kissed the flag.

RADIO MERGER

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke regarding the latest merger or combination in the radio industry. I want to say just a few additional words about it this morning, since we have fuller details of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Washington may proceed.

Mr. DILL. The details as given out this morning in the newspapers tell us that under the merger or corporation agreement for the transfer of the patents and manufacturing rights of the General Electric Co. and the Westinghouse Co. to the Radio Corporation those two companies will own 70 per cent of the stock of the Radio Corporation. That means that they are going to dominate entirely the Radio Corporation and through it dominate all the subsidiaries of the Radio Corporation.

I want to call attention to the valuation that has been placed on the properties involved in terms of Radio Corporation stock. The valuation is placed at $540,000,000. What the real valuation is nobody knows at this time, because it has not been carefully computed. But we can get some idea of the probable real valuation if we remember that Mr. Owen D. Young, who was the prime moving figure in the transfer, was the moving figure in the valuation placed upon the Radio Corporation communication properties when they were valued for sale to the International Telegraph & Telephone Co.

We found then that the real valuation was $15,000,000 or $20,000,000, and they were to get property worth $80,000,000 to $100,000,000. At any rate, this enormous valuation placed upon these properties will enable the General Electric Co. and the Westinghouse Co. to control the Radio Corporation and destroy the stock-voting franchise of those who may have invested money in the Radio Corporation stock. This is done not by payment of any money but simply by transfers of properties between affiliated corporations.

This last combination shows what the intent of those in charge has been from the start of this radio organization. If the Department of Justice has needed anything to show what the intent was they certainly have it now. We are told in the press reports that the General Electric is to organize a holding company to take care of its interests in the radio business in a manner similar to the formation of the Electric Bond & Share Co. to hold its interests in the water-power business. Thus one can begin to see what the General Electric Co. is to be. It is to be not only the parent company of the Power Trust and of the electrical manufacturing business, but the parent company of the radio business, with all its ramifications. Thus everything of this kind is to center in the General Electric Co. It is announced that it is to assist them in their communications service; yet they sold their communications service in European countries to the International Telegraph & Telephone Co.

The truth of the matter is that this is a part of Mr. Owen D. Young's plan to have formed a world-wide Radio Trust; there is no question about that. There is just one more step needed. Mr. Young is chairman of the board of the General Electric Co. and chairman of the executive committee of the Radio Corporation. He has been very active in all these world unification movements and primarily in the organization of the international world bank. With the General Electric Co. holding in its hand as parent company the control of the electric power business in this country, of the electric manufacturing business, and the radio business, through the various subsidiaries of the Radio Corporation, he is in a position now to connect it up with the world bank and make special use of the exclusive contracts which the Radio Corporation has made with every great government in the world, except Russia. These exclusive contracts have been made with the Radio Corporation by the various governments, so that all the radio business from those countries must come through the Radio Corporation. So there is just one more step needed to complete the world-wide Radio Trust that Mr. Young is evidently planning.

There has never been anything like it in the history of mankind; and the worst feature of it is that it deals not merely with present radio rights, not merely with present conditions, but these contracts and these arrangements are planned to include all future developments. It is a significant fact that the contracts between the various affiliated companies and between the foreign countries and the Radio Corporation not only give the Radio Corporation rights as to existing patents and existing developments, but propose to transfer to them all future developments that may come in that field of activity. What it will mean and what it will do in the future affairs of humanity nobody knows; but I think that the Department of Justice should act in this matter and act at once to ascertain whether or not under the law to-day these corporations have the right to form an organization leading to a world-wide monopoly of radio development.

I am impressed with the fact that the picture of Mr. Sarnoff is on the front page of a New York newspaper this morning—the

Herald Tribune—and we are told in the newspaper stories that Mr. Sarnoff visited the White House yesterday, conferred with Mr. Hoover, and as soon as he came out gave out the details of this plan. I refuse to believe that President Hoover has approved any such monopoly as is being formed.

Mr. ASHURST. Who is Mr. Sarnoff?

Mr. DILL. Mr. Sarnoff is the president of the Radio Corporation, and I maintain that Mr. Sarnoff did this for the same purpose and in the same manner that General Harbord did when he came down here regarding the International Telegraph & Telephone Co. contract. It will be recalled that General Harbord went to the White House, conferred with President Hoover, and then came out and announced that they were going to make this deal if Congress would repeal the law. Mr. Sarnoff went to the White House yesterday, conferred with Mr. Hoover, came out, and announced the details of this plan. I say I resent the implication that Mr. Hoover, the President of the United States, who has always been an outspoken opponent of radio monopoly, should be put in the position of having indorsed this latest proposal leading to such a world-wide monopoly as is evidently planned. For my part, I shall not believe that he favors it; I shall not believe he indorses it; I shall not believe he is willing that his Department of Justice shall condone it until he himself so states in a public way, because, if this world-wide organization that is being built up is to be allowed to dominate the development of radio, it will dominate the control of public opinion as influenced and developed by radio throughout the world in the years to come.

There is nothing of which the people should be so jealous as the freedom of business in radio development. I am not talking about wave lengths; I am not talking about the use of the air; I am talking about the equipment; I am talking about the sets that are used for receiving purposes; I am talking about the transmitters that are used for broadcasting stations; I am talking about the instruments used for world-wide communication; and the Radio Corporation, through this latest combination with the General Electric Co. and the Westinghouse Co., has prepared the situation, has completed the plan that only needs one more step to make it fully complete as a world-wide organization, because of the exclusive contracts with foreign governments and the international bank, which Mr. Young has been so active in planning.

I do not want to take more time of the Senate, but, recognizing as I do what radio means to the future of mankind, I could not sit silent and see this sort of thing continue without raising my voice in protest and expressing the hope that the Department of Justice will act, and act quickly, so that this world-wide radio monopoly may not be completed as planned.

Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks an article in the New York Times of this morning, which is the most complete of any newspaper account I have seen, beginning on the front page, and also subsequent articles on page 6.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. DILL. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Will not the Senator have the article read by the clerk?

Mr. DILL. It is rather long. I am perfectly willing to have it read, but I put in the RECORD two articles yesterday morning on the same subject.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

Mr. DILL. And I dislike to take the time of the Senate. Of course, if the Senator wants it read, I have no objection to that being done, but I think if the article shall be printed in the RECORD that will be sufficient.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the articles will be printed in the RECORD.

The articles referred to are as follows:

[From the New York Times, Thursday, April 17, 1930]

R. C. A. CONTROL SHIFTS IN $390,000,000 DEAL—GENERAL ELECTRIC AND WESTINGHOUSE TO GET STOCK IN EXCHANGE FOR MANUFACTURING RIGHTS—NEW SHARES TO BE ISSUED—MOVE NOW UP TO STOCKHOLDERS—GOVERNMENT IS SCRUTINIZING THE TRANSACTION

Under a reorganization, announced yesterday, the General Electric Co. and Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co. will control jointly the Radio Corporation of America through ownership of 51.3 per cent of the voting power, following the issuance to them of additional shares by that company, worth $390,000,000 at current market prices, in exchange for exclusive licenses to American radio patents, for factories and equipment employed in the manufacture of radio apparatus, and for other important considerations.

The two electric companies now own only 20.5 per cent of the voting power in R. C. A., and since that company was organized have manufactured all radio apparatus sold by the radio organization. The full reorganization and refunding plan is to be submitted to the stockholders of Radio Corporation at a special meeting on May 6, to follow the annual meeting on that date, and is subject to their approval.

SIX MILLION FIVE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIVE NEW SHARES

The plan provides for the issuance of 6,580,375 shares of common stock of the Radio Corporation, or an amount equal to all of the common stock now outstanding, to the General Electric and Westinghouse companies, the former to receive 3,948,225 shares, or 60 per cent, and the latter 2,632,150 shares, or 40 per cent of the new stock.

These shares are to be issued in payment for the rights and properties to be acquired by Radio Corporation from the electric companies, which are substantially equal in value to the tangible assets of the R. C. A., represented by the common stock now outstanding.

Radio Corporation under the plan will acquire exclusive licenses under all General Electric and Westinghouse American patents to manufacture radio apparatus, real estate, factories, and other manufacturing facilities now employed by the electric companies in the manufacture of radio apparatus. The value of the Radio Corporation shares will include the reimbursement to the electric companies for the $32,000,000 plus interest on cash advances made by them in connection with the Victor Talking Machine Co. acquisition a year ago.

The General Electric and Westinghouse companies will also transfer their holdings in the various radio subsidiary companies to the Radio Corporation, so that it will have 100 per cent ownership of these companies. These are the National Broadcasting Co. (Inc.), the R. C. A. Victor Co. (Inc.), the R. C. A. Radiotron Co. (Inc.), and R. C. A. Photophone (Inc.), in which the Radio Corporation now owns 50 to 60 per cent and the electric companies three-fifths and two-fifths of the balance, respectively.

In addition Radio Corporation will own 49 per cent of the common and preferred stock of General Motors Radio Corporation, whereas it now owns 29.4 per cent, with General Electric holding 11.76 per cent and Westinghouse 7.84 per cent. The transaction also provides for a reduction in the cost to the Radio Corporation of radio transmitting apparatus and radio transmitter tubes, which the electric companies will continue to manufacture for the Radio Corporation.

SARNOFF SEES REDUCED COST

David Sarnoff, president of the Radio Corporation of America, in a statement issued yesterday, said in part:

"The Radio Corporation of America has arranged with the General Electric Co. and the Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Co. to purchase their engineering and manufacturing activities and plants heretofore used in the production of radio receiving sets, tubes, etc., for the Radio Corporation.

"Believing that increased efficiency and economies both in manufacturing and merchandising can thereby be effected and ultimately bring down the cost of radio sets and tubes to the public, the Radio Corporation is asking its stockholders to approve an increase in its capital stock to compensate the General Electric and Westinghouse companies for the radio manufacturing facilities and rights to be acquired from them."

In connection with the plan the stockholders will be asked to approve an increase in the authorized common stock from 7,500,000 to 15,000,000 shares, and in the authorized class B preferred stock from 813,365 to 1,500,000 shares. It is intended to issue a part of the increased class B preferred stock, upon which cumulative dividends of $5 a share are paid annually, to the General Electric and Westinghouse companies to close out current accounts other than the $32,000,000 advances in connection with the Victor purchase.

General Electric now owns about 1,240,530 common and 27,080 "A" preferred shares of the Radio Corporation, and Westinghouse 138,800 common and 50,000 "A" preferred shares. The common shares have 1 vote each and the "A" preferred shares 10 votes each, while the "B" preferred shares do not vote. On the basis of 6,580,375 common and 395,597 preferred shares outstanding, or a total of 10,536,349 votes, General Electric has 14.4 per cent and Westinghouse 6.1 per cent of the total voting strength.

With the additional common shares issued to the electric companies, which will increase the total voting strength to 17,116,724 votes (13,160,750 common and 3,955,984 "A" preferred votes), General Electric will own 32.1 per cent and Westinghouse 19.2 per cent of the voting power, or together 51.3 per cent.

General Electric will hold, upon consummation of the plan, 39 per cent of the common shares to be outstanding, while Westinghouse will have 21 per cent, or 60 per cent of the common stock, between them.

Although no reference is made to the future plans of expansion of Radio Corporation, it is expected to acquire control of the Columbia Graphophone Co., within a few months, through an affiliated English holding company, to add the world-wide distributing facilities of Columbia to the Victor and Radio sales organizations. The Columbia properties in this country will not be merged with the Radio Corporation of America organization, it was reported.

INQUIRY IS UNDER WAY—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE INVESTIGATING RADIO APPLICATION

WASHINGTON, April 16.—A full investigation of the plan of the Radio Corporation of America to take over the radio activities of the General and Westinghouse Electric companies was promised to-day at almost the same time that word of the proposal was made public.

A statement given out at the Justice Department less than an hour after Senator DILL, Democrat, Washington, had called the attention of the Senate to a report that the plans were under way and demand an inquiry by the department, said:

"The Department of Justice announced this afternoon that it was fully advised regarding the proposed affiliation between the Radio Corporation, General Electric Co., and Westinghouse Electric Co. in the manufacture of radios and that it was investigating the application fully and was considerably concerned about it."

Senator DILL brought the matter up in the Senate by reading into the RECORD a newspaper article relating that 6,500,000 shares of stock had been sold by the Radio Corporation, which, he said, would give Westinghouse and General Electric control of the Radio Corporation. "As a result," he said, "these two companies have control of the Radio Corporation of America, which, in turn, has built up subsidiaries controlling the manufacture and distribution of radio sets.

"If the Department of Justice had gone ahead in the prosecution of the Radio Trust, this new trust monopoly would not have been forced. I hope that the Department of Justice will take notice of this enormous organization which is being formed to dominate the entire manufacture and distribution business in the radio world."

SARNOFF SEES PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON, April 16.—David Sarnoff, president of the Radio Corporation of America, called to-day upon President Hoover at the White House, but whether the matter of the reorganization of the Radio Corporation of America was brought up was not disclosed.

Through Oswald Schuette, its executive secretary, the Radio Protective Association issued an attack upon "the newest reorganization of the Radio Trust."

"It is a challenge to the Department of Justice which can be answered only by the immediate prosecution of this $6,000,000,000 monopoly," Mr. Schuette said. "For nine years the Radio Trust has been operating under a grant of immunity from Attorney General Daugherty. It has undertaken to monopolize every line of radio—communications, broadcasting, manufacture, television, and even the talking movies.

"Under the pressure of the United States Senate the Department of Justice is at last investigating this monopoly. There is something peculiarly defiant, therefore, in the newest shuffling of Radio Trust stock. This defiance can be answered only by the immediate enforcement of the law.

"The trust's action is a challenge also to the Federal Radio Commission, because that body is still issuing licenses and renewals for radio channels to the members of the Radio Trust, despite the antimonopoly clauses of the radio law.

"It is also a challenge to Congress which should put antitrust teeth into the Couzens communication bill and push its immediate passage. Only in that way can radio be kept free for the people of the United States.

"The newest stock deal pretends to limit the control of the Radio Trust to the General Electric and Westinghouse companies, but it does not change the status of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. The patent agreement under which the telephone monopoly is the most powerful factor in the Radio Trust remains as firm and as illegal as ever.

"Nor does the new arrangement change the relations of the trust to the General Motors Corporation or to the International Telephone & Telegraph Co.

"If Attorney General Mitchell does not act on the newest challenge of this huge combination, the Senate should follow the precedent of the Teapot Dome case and force a dissolution of the trust by congressional action."

UTILITY PROFIT PUT AT 105 PER CENT—ELECTRIC BOND & SHARE CO. MADE $4,810,000 IN 1927, TRADE BOARD EXPERT SAYS—SERVES 2,820 COMMUNITIES—INTERLOCKING DIRECTORATES ARE HELD TO GIVE IT CONTROL OF "SUPERVISED" CONCERNS

WASHINGTON, April 16.—A profit of at least 105 per cent of expenses was made in 1927 by the Electric Bond & Share Co. on its services to companies which it controls, the Federal Trade Commission has learned, despite the refusal of the company to give the commission access to records bearing on the subject, it was testified to-day before the commission by one of its accountants.

A suit by the commission to obtain access to the records is pending in the Federal District Court for the Southern District of New York. Details of the operations are wanted by the commission, since it is possible that the profits are much larger than those shown by the available figures, according to Judson C. Dickerman, the commission accountant who testified to-day in the investigation of public-utility companies ordered by the Senate.

The Electric Bond & Share Co., according to Mr. Dickerman, holds control of companies throughout the country through a system of interlocking directorates and stock ownership.

From the "supervised" companies, Mr. Dickerman testified, Bond & Share received $9,373,000 for the year 1927 in fees for supervision, engineering, and other special services. The total operating expenses of Bond & Share were $6,613,000, and of this amount $2,050,000 was chargeable definitely to expenses not connected with the services to supervised companies. This left $4,563,000 which might have been chargeable to the services, and showed a profit of at least $4,810,000.

The companies controlled by Electric Bond & Share are chiefly in small communities and in the more sparsely settled States, Mr. Dickerman testified. The system serves 2,820 communities with electricity, he said. Operating revenues of the companies in the system in 1929 were $292,387,000 and the system produced in that year 10,364,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, or 10.6 per cent of the total output of power in the United States.

The commission has been attempting to show large profits made by public utilities through so-called fee systems, "write-ups" of the value of properties against which stock is issued, and manipulation of securities.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Allen | Fess | Kean | Simmons |
| Ashurst | Frazier | Kendrick | Smoot |
| Baird | George | Keyes | Steck |
| Barkley | Gillett | La Follette | Steiwer |
| Bingham | Glass | McCulloch | Stephens |
| Black | Glenn | McKellar | Sullivan |
| Blaine | Goff | McNary | Swanson |
| Blease | Goldsborough | Metcalf | Thomas, Idaho |
| Borah | Gould | Norbeck | Townsend |
| Brock | Greene | Norris | Trammell |
| Brookhart | Hale | Oddie | Tydings |
| Broussard | Harris | Overman | Vandenberg |
| Capper | Harrison | Patterson | Wagner |
| Caraway | Hatfield | Phipps | Walcott |
| Connally | Hawes | Pine | Walsh, Mass. |
| Copeland | Hebert | Ransdell | Walsh, Mont. |
| Couzens | Heflin | Robinson, Ind. | Waterman |
| Dale | Howell | Robsion, Ky. | Watson |
| Deneen | Johnson | Sheppard | Wheeler |
| Dill | Jones | Shipstead | |

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

BOARD OF VISITORS TO PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, there has been on the calendar for a long time a bill providing for the appointment of a board of visitors to the Philippine Islands. The last time it came up the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] objected in view of the absence of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES]. At that time we secured the adoption of the amendments to the bill, one providing for an increase in the number of Senators, and the other striking out the biennial feature, which was the feature chiefly objected to, because it was felt that it made the visitation an indefinite matter, and therefore interfered with the possibility of granting independence.

In view of that amendment—I am glad the Senator from Missouri has now returned to the floor—I hope there will be no objection to taking up the bill at this time.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 17, Senate bill No. 168.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion to take up the bill is not debatable; but if it is taken up, the bill is debatable.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, may we find out just what the bill is?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the title of the bill.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 168) providing for the biennial appointment of a board of visitors to inspect and report upon the government and conditions in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, before this vote is taken I should like to state——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable. If the bill is taken up, it is subject to debate. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GOULD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WATSON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]; and

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRUNDY] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are necessarily detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—25

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Baird | Greene | Keyes | Townsend |
| Bingham | Hale | McNary | Vandenberg |
| Dale | Hebert | Metcalf | Walcott |
| Deneen | Howell | Norbeck | Watson |
| Gillett | Johnson | Oddie | |
| Goff | Jones | Phipps | |
| Goldsborough | Kean | Sullivan | |

NAYS—50

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Couzens | La Follette | Steck |
| Barkley | Dill | McCulloch | Steiwer |
| Black | Fess | McKellar | Stephens |
| Blaine | Frazier | Norris | Swanson |
| Blease | George | Overman | Thomas, Idaho |
| Borah | Glass | Patterson | Trammell |
| Brock | Glenn | Pine | Tydings |
| Brookhart | Harris | Ransdell | Wagner |
| Broussard | Harrison | Robinson, Ind. | Walsh, Mass. |
| Capper | Hatfield | Robsion, Ky. | Walsh, Mont. |
| Caraway | Hawes | Sheppard | Wheeler |
| Connally | Heflin | Shipstead | |
| Copeland | Kendrick | Simmons | |

NOT VOTING—21

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Allen | Hastings | Pittman | Smoot |
| Bratton | Hayden | Reed | Thomas, Okla. |
| Cutting | King | Robinson, Ark. | Waterman |
| Fletcher | McMaster | Schall | |
| Gould | Moses | Shortridge | |
| Grundy | Nye | Smith | |

So the Senate refused to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 168.

ADDRESSES BY SENATOR HAWES AND DOCTOR ALDERMAN ON THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, on the evening of April 14, Doctor Alderman, of the University of Virginia, delivered a most notable address, which was broadcast all over the United States, on Thomas Jefferson. He was very splendidly introduced by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES]. Both of these are very magnificent addresses. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The addresses are as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HARRY B. HAWES, OF MISSOURI, INTRODUCING DR. EDWIN A. ALDERMAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Throughout the United States at least there are men and women who still believe in fundamentals.

There are fundamentals in law, in medicine, in engineering, and in all the affairs of life. Even in the kitchen, in the home, there are certain set rules which must be followed.

Men have appeared in history who occupied great places. When they died, their careers ended.

With Thomas Jefferson it is different. While teaching a theory of government, of self-control, of local expression, of determination in vital matters by the people nearest to the power of Government, he was sufficiently practical during his lifetime not only to have theories but to put those theories into practical operation.

When most men die their history stops. There is a finish to their accomplishments.

This is not true of Thomas Jefferson. He gathered the philosophies of the world in relation to freedom and individual conduct, put them into law, and, for a period, administered them.

But Jefferson is not dead—that is the difference. Other men die and they are gone. Thomas Jefferson is still alive wherever the aspirations of men decide that the theory of individual selection, of freedom, and persuasion, is more powerful than written law. He still has his followers in America and throughout the world.

If he could come back to-night and pick from the long list of men who understand his philosophy and can expound it, I am sure that amongst the list would be found Dr. Edwin A. Alderman. He would certainly be on the list, and I believe he would head the list.

I have heard Doctor Alderman move men in a speech before the joint assembly of the Senate and the House; to hold them; to inspire them, because he has a way of putting things that seems to hold. He uses few adjectives. His statements are facts. He drives home facts reenforced by logic.

As the president of the University of Virginia, founded by Thomas Jefferson within sight of his own home, he has not only absorbed his philosophy but he has absorbed the atmosphere in which that philosophy grew.

It is my privilege and honor to introduce to you an understanding student of Jefferson, a philosopher, an orator, who understands Jefferson and who would not give him credit for one thing which he did not deserve.

Oratory to-day is different from what it was even 25 years ago. It consists in statements of facts from which conclusions are drawn.

I am sure that you, like myself, will feel better and bigger and have nobler resolves after you have heard the distinguished speaker of the evening, Doctor Alderman.

---

ADDRESS ON "THOMAS JEFFERSON" BY DR. EDWIN A. ALDERMAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, FOUNDED BY THOMAS JEFFERSON

My primary purpose in this speech is not to attempt biography, but to set forth briefly some mental and spiritual characteristics of Thomas Jefferson and perhaps to induce a desire among thoughtful men and women everywhere to visit his home and the university which he so dearly loved, as shrines where love of country may be acquired and where democracy learned at the fountain may be handed down from generation to generation.

Thomas Jefferson was born at his father's home, Shadwell, Va., on April 13, 1743, the third in a family of eight children. He died at Monticello, a little hilltop in sight of his birthplace, on July 4, 1826—more than a hundred years ago—in the eighty-third year of his age. At the age of 25 he entered public life as a member of the Virginia House of Burgesses. He retired from the Presidency of the United States, after a service of eight years, in 1809. He thus spent 41 years in the public service of the young Nation, whose basis of independence he had so nobly announced. As legislator, governor, minister to France, Secretary of State in Washington's Cabinet, Vice President, and President of the United States, he ran the gamut of public office and public honor, and, with the exception of George Washington, no man has made a deeper impression on American institutions.

It is said that nearly every man born into the world is born with either an Hebraic conscience or an Hellenic conscience; that is, he looks at things in his life from the standpoint of either the Greek or Hebraic mind and spirit.

I sometimes believe that every man born in America is either a Hamiltonian or a Jeffersonian. I admire the mind and character of Alexander Hamilton. In the field of political genius, and by reason of the lucidity of his thought and the intensity of his purpose he belongs among the great forces of the modern world, but as for me, I was born a Jeffersonian, I had Jeffersonianism thrust upon me, and I trust I have achieved a measure of Jeffersonianism.

Andrew D. White, former president of Cornell University, a scholarly figure in America, was a Hamiltonian of force and power. He once constructed a list of what he called the great founders, builders, and bracers or stimulators of this Nation, and his list was as follows:

The greatest founders, he thought, were Washington, Jefferson, and John Adams; the chief builders were Hamilton, Jefferson, and John Marshall; the chief bracers were Benjamin Franklin, Jefferson, and Edward Channing. One striking thing issues out of that arrangement. Jefferson was in all three of these categories.

Mr. White was a conscientious man as well as a scholar. He did not particularly want to put Jefferson in all three classes. He had to do it.

May I be permitted, too, to say just a word about Monticello? It is a very beautiful spot, seated very grandly among the Piedmont hills. It brings to mind the great Shakespearean touch portraying Duncan's castle. You feel that "it, too, hath a pleasant seat, and that the air blowing about it sweetly and nimbly recommends itself to the gentle senses." It is set upon a mountain top, from which there unrolls on the west a mountain panorama of the Blue Ridge, while to the east an endless plain marches down to the sea. It is the first glorious symbol of the romanticism and classicism of Thomas Jefferson's mind. He was the architect and builder of his own home. In all the Colonies there was not then a single professional architect. At that time there were not two stone masons in Albemarle County, so that this versatile genius drew his own plans, which make the ordinary plans of colonial master builders seem puerile, trained his own workmen, and built his own mansion.

Now, what manner of man was Thomas Jefferson? What is the essence of his varied and versatile and devoted life?

Thomas Jefferson may be described as a world force. His name is on the lips of aspiration everywhere, moving men to gain freedom and teaching men how to keep freedom when they have gained it.

I claim to know something of the spirit and meaning of Thomas Jefferson's life. I have spent 26 years at the University of Virginia, which he founded, and which was his darling objective for the last 20 years of his life. Jefferson is not dead anywhere; but he particularly is not dead around Albemarle County, Va., and the University of Virginia. Men still hate him and love him. He stirs men's passions and he stirs their emotions to this day, as he did in his stormy career.

When I first undertook the management of the University of Virginia I happened to be the first president of that institution, and I seldom inaugurated a new thing that somebody did not come to me and tell me that Mr. Jefferson would not have done that. Well, that stopped me for a while, until I began to know Thomas Jefferson, and to know that he would have slight esteem for me if I allowed myself to be influenced by even his mighty dead hand; that I and my colleagues were put there to use our own judgment, reverently, to be sure, touching the things of the past. You can not speak of Mr. Jefferson around Charlottesville without feeling that he is about to turn the nearest corner. It is a pungent form of immortality that now and then almost gives one a turn.

Jefferson, in my judgment, was the first great intelligent radical to appear in the political history of this country. Some people do not like the word "radical," for it is associated in a menacing way in many minds. We think of it sometimes as meaning one who just tears at the roots of things, regardless of what they are and how they are planted, and what they were planted for, and then throws the precious roots away. But the word is a vigorous word, and means getting at the root of things.

Now, Jefferson was an intelligent radical, and no other sort of radical ought to be allowed to exist. He appeared, at the age of 37, in the House of Delegates in Virginia with four bills in his pocket, and he fought for 10 years to have them all passed. They struck at the very root of the life of the proudest and most conservative Commonwealth in the Nation.

The first was a bill to abolish primogeniture, to free the land for all the people. There should be no leaving of the land to the eldest son, no beginning of an aristocracy in America.

His next bill was the statute of Virginia for religious freedom. Here his thought was to free the soul of man.

The next was a system of free education extending from primary school to university. The mind should be enlightened in a democratic order.

The next was a bill to curb what seemed to him and later proved to be the greatest menace to the Republic—the institution of African slavery.

The whole daring program was designed in a harmonious way to free the corporate and community spirit of a great State and to give it community genius and corporate power. Did any individual in the world ever enter any legislature before with that sort of program in his pocket? They talk about radicals in Washington and elsewhere. They are complacent standpatters to Thomas Jefferson. I believe many of them mean well, and I respect their spirit; but they do not always know precisely where they are going, and he did. He was a glorious, intelligent radical. He never in his life looked at anything, any human institution or human device, from a plowpoint to the moral law, from a copying machine to the Ten Commandments, without asking himself in some way, Is this the best possible thing we can get to advance human welfare? Is this the best thing for the world? Can I do anything in my time and in my life to make things happier for mankind? The man had a modern spirit. He was a modern man in his time, and I believe so greatly in his modernism that if he could drop down on Forty-second Street in New York City to-morrow, and you would give him half an hour for orientation, he probably would be writing to the papers by Wednesday suggesting a better method of handling the traffic, not to mention his views on the naval parley or the League of Nations.

His enthusiasm was for the future, not for the past. He reverenced the past, because every sensible man knows that every present somehow comes out of the tissues of ancient strength. Life was a touching and moving thing to him.

My next claim is that Jefferson was the greatest liberal who has ever appeared in American history. What is liberalism?

The root of the idea is respect for the dignity and worth of the individual. It stands for the pursuit of social good instead of the protection of privileged classes. It stands for the subordinating to the judgment of the individual man all arbitrary claims of external authority, ecclesiastical or constitutional. Practically, liberalism is trust in the people. Its aim is to give the people a chance to make themselves fit to be trusted.

Gladstone once defined liberalism as trust in the people tempered by prudence, and conservatism as distrust in the people tempered by fear. The phrasing is Disraelian, but the idea is Gladstonian. The true test of all liberalism in this world is to persuade men to obey the law rather than to force men to compliance with the law.

The supreme foe of liberalism is intolerance. A scheme of society in which intolerance prevails—and there are some ugly instances of its appearance in American life to-day—a scheme of society in which men can not deliberately seek the truth and then fearlessly and reverently proclaim it to the world is a society branded with the deepest infamy possible to the human spirit and one that brave men should unite to crush.

The deadliest blow ever delivered against intolerance in America was the statute of Virginia for religious freedom. All intelligent men have heard about that statute. I had been talking about it all my life, but not long ago I decided to look it up in its original form. I got out of our library Old Henning's Statutes, printed 120 years ago, and looked at it. I have not had such an intellectual and spiritual thrill in 25 years. I had pictured it as a formal thing, "The House of Delegates of Virginia do enact," so and so; but here is what I saw before my eyes, and it thrilled me then and thrills me to-night: "Whereas Almighty God hath created the mind free; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burthens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy Author of our religion, who being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in His almighty power to do;" and so on for another page of magnificent, eloquent, and glorious defense of the principle of mental liberty, as even more important than physical freedom.

There is an immense ignorance about the religious views of Jefferson. Some of our great-grandmothers and great-grandfathers thought he was a wicked infidel. He was not at all. He was a reverent man. He was a Unitarian. "I never attempted to make a convert nor wished to change another's creed," Jefferson once said. "I have judged of others' religion by their lives, for it is from our lives and not from our words that our religion must be read. By the same test must the world judge me."

My fourth claim is that Thomas Jefferson was the first great American democrat. What is a democrat? No word is so generally used and so little understood. Pasteur's definition suits me best: "Democracy is that order in the state in which every man"—and now he would say "every woman"—"has a chance to make the most of himself or herself, and knows that he has the chance."

Thomas Jefferson never defined it, for he was too busy promoting it. His essential definition of democracy was something like this: "You can trust men if you will train them." He had a certain mystic faith in the ultimate rectitude of human impulse. He was a great philosophical democrat.

I think he did not enjoy individual men as much as John Marshall did, but, like Woodrow Wilson, he would have gone to the stake to insure liberty and freedom to all men. He did not particularly care to stop and talk with Tom Jones, on the roadside; and in that he was mistaken, for Tom is a very interesting fellow. Jesus Christ loved to talk to Tom along the Judean highways; and Socrates spent all day every day talking to him; and John Marshall, though he did not have a bit of faith in Tom's ability to govern himself or anybody else, wanted nothing better than to pitch horseshoes with him, in the tavern yard.

But Jefferson gave a winged soul to democracy, and as a result it has been, with the natural sciences, the one thing that has never stopped growing for a minute since his day until 1914. I think there has been a little eclipse of democracy since then. Men sneer sometimes at the phrase "Making the world safe for democracy." Of course, the man that does it would sneer at relativity if you gave him a chance, because he does not know anything about either one of them. But it is true that democracy is less prowerful, less appealing, than it was 10 years ago. This is the way the human spirit acts after great emotional climaxes, such as the world has passed through since 1914. It tends to get shamefaced before its dreams and ideals.

Now the last point I bring to your attention is that Thomas Jefferson was a man of imagination, and a great poet. I do not mean that he wrote verse. He may have. I do not know it. His epitaph is a great epic poem. When democratic pilgrims come down to Charlottesville they will read it. It is almost the most sentimental and poetic thing in human history. He wrote it himself, and we have the original writing in our archives:

"Here was buried Thomas Jefferson,
Author of the Declaration of American Independence,
of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom,
and Father of the University of Virginia."

Let it be noted that he here omits everything the people did for him and mentions only what he did for the people. Note that he did not say "founder of the university." He had a tenderness for the university as of a father for a child. Let it be remembered, too, that the man who wished to be remembered as the "father of the University of Virginia" was also in more than one sense the father of all the State universities which play such an important part in the education of the American democracy. Jefferson loved beauty. As a child, in a little valley at the foot of the hill upon which Monticello stands, he was wont to look up at the hill and say to his playmate, Dabney Carr, "One day I shall build my home on that hill." And he cherished that hope through all the turbulent years. Jefferson saw beauty as an asset and an ally of democracy, tempering its roughness and its strength. He believed beauty one of the greatest necessities of democ-

racy, and so do I. I never pass the Public Library in New York without looking at that glorious sentence inscribed on its walls:

"Beauty, old yet ever new, eternal voice, and inward word."

Visitors to Monticello will find it beautiful. They will find the University of Virginia beautiful, too. Nature has surrounded it with beauty and art, under his guiding hand, has clothed it with distinction, and it lies there on its green lawn one of the most perfect architectural compositions in all the world. I never go to my office in the morning in any season without a certain thrill as my eyes rest upon the university lawn. In the sober dignity of autumn, in the green freshness of spring, in the witchery of white winter, there it lies, exhibiting something of "the glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome." And I venture to say that all the sons of the university realize that one of the most practical things at work upon their lives at that institution is the antique and everlasting beauty that Thomas Jefferson stamped upon it. I notice the reaction to this vision of beauty of country boys who come there from little villages, little backwaters of the world, who have seen nothing beautiful, and when they walk about those gracious spaces, with all that measured Hellenic beauty lying around them, they suffer a sea change, and something rich and strange appears in their faces and their demeanor.

The most moving and sentimental thing, to my mind, in all American history is the picture of the old octogenarian, disillusioned by age and glory and high station of all the pomps and vanieties of the world, watching the slow rising walls of the university which he was dreaming of building there and later tottering over its lawn with Lafayette, showing him his hope for the new generation, dedicated to the democratic faith. I recently found a letter which he wrote to Madison, an extract from which I believe Americans would care to hear:

"Crippled wrists and fingers," he said, for he had broken his wrist in France, "make writing slow and laborious, but while writing to you I lose the sense of these in the recollections of ancient times when youth made health and happiness out of everything. I forget for a while this hoary winter of old age, when we can think of nothing but how to keep ourselves warm by the fire and how to get rid of our heavy penalties until the friendly hand of death shall rid us of it all at once. Against this 'tedium vitæ,' however, my dear friend, I am now fortunately mounted on a hobby, which, indeed, I mounted some 30 or 40 years ago, but whose amble is still sufficient to give exercise and amusement to an octogenarian writer. This is the establishment of a university for the education of all succeeding generations of youth in this Republic."

Let us not fail in this new civilization, but in this oldest and most stable Government on earth, to do all that ought to be done to protect the fame and teachings of Thomas Jefferson, the great apostle of the liberal faith in America. Thomas Jefferson belongs of right to that great company of immortal liberals of all lands who each in his time contributed to the slow majestic march of man from animalism to spirit, and from mere tribalism to corporate genius and power. He belongs with Benjamin Franklin and John Adams, with Pasteur and Madison, with Gladstone and John Morley, with Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson. Thomas Jefferson is the titular saint of the Democratic Party, but strange to relate he has been the titular saint of the Republican Party as well, at least until the Civil War and the hatreds and passions of the reconstruction era and the problems of a fierce industrialism tended to change its aims and policies; and he is likely to be the titular saint of all parties yet to be born that hark back to individual opportunity and freedom. In the first platform of the Republican Party, in 1855 and again in 1860, the first plank declared faith in the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and the present Republicans of America derived their soundest tradition from the revolutionary republicanism of Thomas Jefferson. In a noteworthy book by Arthur N. Holcombe, of Harvard University, entitled "The Political Parties of To-day," this theory is thus in part lucidly set forth:

"The logical foundation of the Republican Party was laid by Thomas Jefferson just 70 years before its actual appearance. The resolution which he introduced into the Congress of the United States in 1784, for the organization of territorial governments in the great empty regions of the West which the larger States had recently ceded to the Union, was designed to prevent the extension of slavery into any of those regions."

Jefferson's appeal for fame and recognition rests not upon the honors that fell to him but upon the calm authorship of great works for the benefit of posterity and his fellow men. No one can deny that he remains a creative force in American life. As old James Parton once observed (Parton's life still remains the most interesting portrayal of his career): "If Jefferson was wrong, America is wrong. If America is right, Jefferson was right." In the experiment with democracy in the nineteenth century and in this portion of the twentieth century must lie his vindication or his doom. Liberal education, liberal politics, liberal religion; a free press; faith in the simple arts of peace, in science, in material progress, in popular rôle; foreign friendship without foreign alliance; State rights and State responsibilities, this is modern America and this is Jeffersonianism. If the tendency away from legitimate State rights shall be checked, if the tendency toward intolerance shall be halted, if war shall indeed cease to be an instrument of national policy, if faith in the justice and rectitude of enlightened public opinion shall hold sway in this Nation, no greater persuasive force exists than the personal example and political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson.

Abraham Lincoln, that lonely, patient genius of democracy, the present titular saint of the Republican Party, into whose homely face Saint-Gaudens has carved the struggle of the people to higher things, had the habit of quoting Thomas Jefferson more often, perhaps, than any other statesman—it is clear that Jefferson was Lincoln's chief political mentor. Indeed, he said as much in definite terms, and I want to close this speech in the words of Lincoln, set forth in a letter written by him to certain citizens of Massachusetts who had invited him to attend a festival in Boston on April 13, 1859, in honor of the one hundred and sixteenth birthday of Thomas Jefferson:

"All honor to Jefferson, to the man who in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people had the coolness, foresight, and sagacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there, that to-day and in all coming days it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression."

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES in the chair). The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

The next business on the calendar was the bill (S. 1133) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906, as amended.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I say to my genial friend from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] that we are making real progress in the adjustment of the differences between the Agricultural Department and myself, and I hope very soon to be able to report to him and to the Senate. I ask that the bill may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 76) to amend Rule XXXIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to the privilege of the floor was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 551) to regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BROOKHART. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 49) authorizing Committee on Manufactures, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to investigate immediately the working conditions of employees in the textile industry of the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee was announced as next in order.

Mr. METCALF. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 153) granting consent to the city and county of San Francisco to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bay of San Francisco from Rincon Hill to a point near the South Mole of San Antonio Estuary, in the county of Alameda, in said State, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 119) authorizing and directing the Committee on Interstate Commerce to investigate the wreck of the airplane *City of San Francisco* and certain matters pertaining to interstate air commerce was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let that go over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to promote peace and to equalize the burdens and to minimize the profits of war was announced as next in order.

Mr. BLAINE. I ask that the joint resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 206) requesting the Secretary of Commerce to furnish the Senate certain information respecting aircraft accidents since May 20, 1926, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PHIPPS. Let that go over.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to this resolution.

Mr. BINGHAM. What is the number, Mr. President? My attention was diverted for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate resolution 206, Order of Business 151, introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr.

BRATTON] requesting the Secretary of Commerce to furnish the Senate certain information respecting aircraft accidents since May 20, 1926.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask that the resolution may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6) to amend the definition of oleomargarine contained in the act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine," approved August 2, 1886, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. METCALF. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2370) to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan police force and the fire department of the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. PHIPPS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

DISTRICT POLICE FORCE AND FIRE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, what happened to Senate bill 2370?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It went over on objection.

Mr. DILL. I consented to that bill being replaced on the calendar previously, when it came up, on the request of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], with the assurance that he would prepare his amendments, and the bill would not be greatly delayed. I should like to know when we can take up this bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that as soon as we get out of the way the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which we have been considering, I might say, morning, noon, and night, this measure will have my next attention. The consideration of the District appropriation bill, and the hearings on it, have lasted much longer than we had expected, and the trips of inspection we have had to make have occupied our mornings, so that the subcommittee in charge of that bill have been unable to give attention to any of their own personal matters, and the same situation exists now that existed at the time the Senator from Washington so kindly yielded to my request. We hope to have that matter out of the way within the next two or three days.

It is our expectation that the subcommittee will finish its consideration of the bill to-morrow and be able to report it to the Senate on Saturday or Monday. As soon as that is out of the way, I assure the Senator, there will be no desire to delay this matter at all.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, the Senator realizes that the session is passing, and one of these days, when we get the tariff bill out of the way, we are going to adjourn. I am very anxious to get this matter up and consider the Senator's amendment.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Connecticut whether he will be ready within a week to consider the amendments to this police pay bill, so that we may take action?

Mr. BINGHAM. I certainly expect that to be the case. I do not see any reason why it should take even that long.

Mr. COPELAND. Would the Senator be willing, when the calendar comes up on Monday, that we should take up the bill?

Mr. BINGHAM. If the Senator will only give me time to finish with the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill I assure him and the Senator from Washington that the bill in which they are interested will have careful attention immediately following that.

Mr. COPELAND. Then I understand the Senator from Connecticut is willing that within a few days, as soon as the District of Columbia appropriation bill is out of the way, he will prepare his amendments so that we may take up the bill?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is so.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator.

PUBLIC UTILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 3558) to amend section 8 of the 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, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] would like to have this bill returned to the Committee on the District of Columbia. The bill was reported by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE], who is not here now, and I will therefore ask that it be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. GLASS. I understood that the committee itself asked that the bill be returned.

Mr. CAPPER. No; the committee has not made any such request, but I understood that the Senator from Virginia, and possibly some other members of the committee, wanted to have it returned.

Mr. GLASS. It was my understanding that the committee formally requested that the bill be returned.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] reported the bill, and he thought the differences might be worked out on the floor; he knew of no reason why it should be returned to the committee.

Mr. GLASS. My understanding very distinctly was that the committee unanimously agreed to authorize the chairman of the committee to ask for the return of this bill.

Mr. CAPPER. There was no action taken in the committee.

Mr. GLASS. There was this action taken: The chairman of the committee, presiding, said, "If there is no objection, the chairman will ask for the return of the bill for further consideration," and there was no objection; and I understood that to be the order of the committee.

Mr. CAPPER. No; there was no order of the committee; but if the Senator from Virginia wishes to have the bill returned to the committee, I will make the request.

Mr. GLASS. I do.

Mr. CAPPER. I ask that Senate bill 3558 be returned to the committee for further consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PILGRIMAGE OF GOLD-STAR MOTHERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4138) to amend the act of March 2, 1929, entitled "An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries," and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments disagreed to by the House, agree to the request of the House for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. SHEPPARD conferees on the part of the Senate.

AIRPORT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 3901) to establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, on page 2, line 3, to strike out the words "fee simple title to which lands and the improvements thereon shall be acquired, in the name of the United States, by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "the use of which lands shall be acquired by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, on such terms as may be most favorable to the Government: *Provided*, That for any land and improvements acquired in fee simple the title shall be in the United States," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That a commercial airport for the District of Columbia shall be developed and maintained by and under the jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia upon the following site:

(1) The lands embracing the properties known as Washington Airport and Hoover Field and any other lands within the area situated adjacent to the right of way of the Washington & Virginia Railway on the south and east, the Boundary Channel on the north, and the United States agricultural experimental farm and the right of way of the Rosslyn branch of the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad on the west, the use of which lands shall be acquired by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, on such terms as may be most favorable to the Government: *Provided*, That for any land and improvements acquired in fee simple the title shall be in the United States;

(2) The lands comprising that portion of the public highway known as Military Road (running from the southern terminus of the Highway Bridge to the Arlington Cemetery) which is contiguous to Washington Airport;

(3) So much of the lands situated east of the right of way of the Rosslyn branch of the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad, north of Military Road, and west of Hoover Field, comprising part of the lands known as the United States agricultural experimental farm lands, set apart by the act of April 18, 1900, as amended, as the Com-

missioners of the District of Columbia may designate as necessary for the purposes of this act;

(4) So much of the lands known as Columbia Island situated east of Hoover Field and not included in the Arlington Memorial Bridge project or in the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway project, as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may designate as necessary for the purposes of this act; and

(5) The lands comprising the bed of that portion of Boundary Channel which lies between and separates Hoover Field and the southeasterly end of Columbia Island. The commissioners are hereby authorized to fill said portion of Boundary Channel, notwithstanding the provisions of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1899, as amended.

Whenever it becomes necessary to acquire by condemnation proceedings any lands referred to in paragraph (1) such acquisition shall be under and in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize condemnation of land for sites of public buildings, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1888, as amended. No payment shall be made for any such lands until the title thereto in the United States shall be satisfactory to the Attorney General of the United States.

SEC. 2. Jurisdiction and control of the lands referred to in paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 1 is hereby transferred to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and jurisdiction and control of the lands referred to in paragraph (1) of section 1 shall be transferred to said commissioners at such time as the United States shall acquire title to such lands. The commissioners shall develop all such lands for use as a commercial airport, and shall maintain the lands in such condition, and provide for the furnishing of such facilities, service, fuel, and other supplies as are necessary to make the lands available for public use as an airport of such rating as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the authority vested in him by the air commerce act of 1926, as amended. The commissioners shall make reasonable regulations, to take effect upon approval by the Secretary of Commerce, to govern the use of such airport, but all departments and agencies of the United States operating aircraft shall have free and unrestricted use of the airport, and, subject to the consent and approval of the commissioners, may erect and install thereon such structures and improvements as the heads of such departments and agencies deem advisable, including facilities for maintaining supplies of fuel, oil, and other materials for operating aircraft. Whenever the President may deem it necessary for military purposes in time of war, the Secretary of War may assume full control of such airport.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, title to such lands in the vicinity of the airport established by this act as may be necessary in order to reroute the whole or any part of Military Road, and to construct and maintain a roadway thereon, if, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, the public interest and convenience require such rerouting.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the general funds in the Treasury, the sum of $2,500,000 to carry out the purposes of this act. All sums expended during any fiscal year from appropriations pursuant to such authorization shall be repaid without interest to the United States, from any funds in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia, in 10 annual equal installments commencing the next following fiscal year.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I do not want to object to the consideration of the bill—I did object to it before—but I wish the Senator from Connecticut would explain a little bit about it.

Mr. BINGHAM. I shall be very glad to. Will the Senator indicate any particular part of the bill he desires to have explained? I want to get the bill through as rapidly as possible, because it is holding up parts of two other projects—the Memorial Highway to Mount Vernon and the Memorial Bridge—which are both involved with that part of the Virginia shore that would be affected by this bill.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, the real objection that has been made to me is that the bill proposes to locate this field directly in front of the Arlington Cemetery. I want to ask whether there is any other location within reasonable distance from the center of the city where the field could be located without putting it directly in front of the Arlington Cemetery?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the nearest location next to the one recommended by the joint commission is the so-called Gravelly Point site, which is about half a mile farther away from the cemetery than this is.

May I say to the Senator that the site selected by the joint commission is the site now occupied by two airports, one called the Washington Airport and the other called Hoover Field, from which in the last calendar year more than 75,000 tourists were flown into the air to see Washington from the air, and, so far as I was able to observe—and I have been pretty careful in observing the motion of aircraft there—very few of those planes actually fly over the cemetery, because the winds are usually up and down stream, and therefore it is not necessary for planes taking off from that field to pass over the cemetery.

Of course, it is true that to-day planes repeatedly fly, at a considerable elevation, over the cemetery, and there is a certain amount of objection to that feature, but I do not believe it can be prevented, even if we do not have this site for the municipal airport.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, how close will this be to the scenic highway from Washington to Mount Vernon which is to be built within the next few years?

Mr. BINGHAM. The Memorial Highway, from the end of the Memorial Bridge to Mount Vernon, will pass along the river bank. There is an island, which has recently in the last few years been constructed by dredging operations, called Columbia Island, part of which is intended to be used in connection with the present privately owned airports as part of the municipal airport.

The highway about which the Senator inquires is to go along the river bank, as a margin to the field; in other words, the field adjoins the highway.

Mr. McKELLAR. For what distance; half or three-quarters of a mile?

Mr. BINGHAM. Not as much as that. My recollection is that it is about a third of a mile.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am wondering what effect it will have on the highway itself for the airport to be so close to the highway.

Mr. BINGHAM. It is our expectation that the municipal airport will be an attractive looking park, with attractive buildings, and will be an addition to the highway; in fact, that it will improve the entire neighborhood.

The Senator knows that at the present time there is a pawn shop owned there just at the end of the bridge, which is unsightly, an eyesore. This bill contemplates the condemnation of that property and throwing it into the airport. We believe it will improve the view from the roadway and will not interfere with the bridge or the highway in the slightest particular.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, what is the status of this legislation in the House?

Mr. BINGHAM. A similar bill has been introduced in the House and referred to one of the House committees. I was told by the Representative who, as a member of the joint commission, introduced the bill in the House, that as this bill was on the Senate calendar, the House committee would prefer to consider our bill in such form as the Senate might amend it and send it over.

Mr. DILL. I notice the bill authorizes an appropriation of two and a half million dollars. Is that expected to cover all the cost of acquiring the land and improving the land?

Mr. BINGHAM. It is so hoped. It is hoped that the cost of the land which will have to be bought will not amount to more than $1,500,000.

Mr. DILL. What about the maintenance of it? Who is to pay for that?

Mr. BINGHAM. That will have to be worked out by the commission. The experience of other municipal airports, notably that of the airport at Oakland, Calif., is that under proper regulations in regard to charges, the cost of maintaining the airport is met by the charges to the companies which use it and the planes which land there and take off from it.

Mr. DILL. Do I understand that Government planes may use it also in time of peace?

Mr. BINGHAM. The Government planes may land there without paying any charge. There will be no necessity for the War Department or the Navy Department to use it, and there is room for the flying activities of the Commerce Department on the new field to be acquired by the War Department. In time of war it may be taken by the Government.

If the commissioners choose to grant permission to any Government department to erect a building there, that may be done, but only in case the commissioners so decide.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, how much of this land is owned by the Government?

Mr. BINGHAM. About half of it.

Mr. HEFLIN. How many acres in all will be devoted to this project?

Mr. BINGHAM. The project as designed by the engineers, approved by the joint commission, contemplates about 280 acres, which is just large enough to come under a 1-A rating of the Department of Commerce for airports.

Mr. HEFLIN. It appears that we are going to pay a very magnificent price for the land over there which does not belong to the Government.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the commission did not act upon this until the representatives of the owners of the two airports now in operation there came before us and assured us of their willingness to submit their books to the audit of officials of the government of the District of Columbia, or of the Park and Planning Commission, and to give us the land for what it had cost them, with improvements, plus 10 per cent; so that there will be no extravagant gain on anybody's part in connection with it.

Mr. HEFLIN. If the Government is not going to use this airport, if the Army and the Navy are not going to use it, who is going to use it?

Mr. BINGHAM. It is to be used just as any municipal airport is used, by visitors coming to the city, and by the business men of the city. There are at the present time in construction or finished in the United States over 3,000 municipal airports, in addition to and quite apart from any Army and Navy airports or air fields.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I said a few moments ago that the two fields there now were used by over 75,000 persons last year in merely taking flying trips over Washington.

Mr. McKELLAR. What proportion of the expenses is to be borne by the city of Washington?

Mr. BINGHAM. According to the provisions of the bill, the District will bear the total expense of the purchase of the land and the construction of the buildings, to be paid in 10 annual installments following the expenditure of the money, which will be loaned to them by the Federal Government without interest, the Federal Government contributing the part of the land which it now owns.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is that provided for in the bill? I have not had time to look it over.

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; it is provided for in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish the Senator would let the bill go over and let us examine it.

Mr. BINGHAM. It has been on the calendar for some time. The joint commission gave it very careful consideration and study over a period of a great many months. There is need for present consideration of the bill, because if the Senate or the Congress is not going to take this action it will make a considerable difference in the plans for the Memorial Bridge and the Memorial Highway. If we are going to do it, these plans ought to be altered accordingly. In view of the importance of the two memorial projects there is need for promptness in putting the matter through.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the bill have the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. BINGHAM. The bill was unanimously reported by the joint commission composed of five Senators and five Representatives.

Mr. McKELLAR. What about the Committee on the District of Columbia? Is it a unanimous report from that committee?

Mr. BINGHAM. I understand so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired under the rule.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think the question of the Senator from Tennessee goes to a very important phase of the matter. First, the Airport Commission, which consisted of five Senators and five Representatives, the five Senators being the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], the Senator from Michigan, myself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], joining with five Congressmen, put in a year's study of the problem and came to the unanimous conclusion, after a survey of every possible, conceivable suggestion for a municipal airport in the city of Washington, that this is the best and most economical plan for the purpose of producing an A-1 airport with the least possible delay. The report of the commission was submitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia and that committee unanimously reported it to the Senate. Really I know of no piece of legislation which has had a more varied, a more general, a more conscientious, and a more complete survey than this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the facts stated by the Senator from Michigan I shall not interpose an objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no further amendment to the bill as in Committee of the Whole, it will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

PATENTS FOR DISCOVERIES IN PLANTS

The bill (S. 4015) to provide for plant patents was announced as next in order.

Mr. BLACK. Over.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. BLACK. Very well.

Mr. COPELAND. The other day when the bill was called I joined in interposing an objection. Since then I have made a study of the bill and also of correspondence which I have had regarding it, somewhat voluminous in character. If my opinion is worth anything, I would like to say to the Senator from Alabama that I have come to the belief that this is a very worthy measure.

For instance, the Stark Delicious apple, to my mind, is one of the most delicious apples I have ever tasted. It is well named. It required years of effort in Missouri before the apple was developed. They now sell it under a bond that no one who has the trees may sell or give away any of the grafts. I have 100 of them on my farm. I think it is such a remarkable product that I feel extremely thankful that somebody had the energy to work out the development of the plant.

Undoubtedly a similar thing has happened many times. It happened in the experience of Mr. Burbank, of California. It does give incentive to horticulturists and those developing plant culture to find ways of developing fine fruits. For my part, I am very happy to join in support of the bill.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say that I have some misgivings about the bill, and especially about the provision of the bill allowing the regular patentee to go back for two years.

Mr. JOHNSON. Regular order!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is demanded, and the bill will go over.

Mr. COPELAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with the debate this morning on plant patents, some telegrams which bear on the importance of the measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The telegrams referred to are as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 16, 1930.*

Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

We feel that patent plant bill very important to horticultural industry. The industry has long needed this very proper protection. We also feel that it would provide a great stimulus to American industry. We earnestly request your support.

STUMPP & WALTER CO.

---

WESTBURY, LONG ISLAND, N. Y., *April 16, 1930.*

United States Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND:

The Townsend-Purnell plant patent bill is of great importance to everyone interested in horticulture. It will provide protection and an incentive for those who produce worth-while plants. We hope you will give it your support.

HICKS NURSERIES.

---

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 16, 1930.*

Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND,
*United States Senate Chamber:*

The entire agricultural and fruit interests in New York State are vitally interested in the Townsend plant bill which gives encouragement and protection in new developments of new fruits and plants. Every botanist in America will have an added reason for developing the wonderful products of field and orchard under the protection of this bill. Your support will be greatly appreciated.

FRUITMAN'S GUIDE.
J. P. STEWART, *Editor.*

---

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 16, 1930.*

Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Townsend bill on plants is of deep interest to the fruit industry of this State, and will help agriculture and is a splendid opportunity to improve the farmers' position and will increase employment on the farm.

JOSEPH SICKER,
*Chairman of the International Appleship Association.*

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *April 16, 1930.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
*United States Senate:*

We believe that the Townsend-Purnell plant patent bill will benefit the nursery and other agricultural interests, and think this the general sentiment among nurserymen. The bill provides encouragement for their financial returns from research and production of new and valuable varieties of plants. We ask your support.

CHASE BROSE CO.

---

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 16, 1930.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
*United States Senate:*

In view of the fact that the Townsend plant Patent Office bill now pending is of great importance to the agricultural and fruit interests and gives encouragement and protection to breeders of new improved plants in the same manner as the patent system protects mechanical inventors, we respectfully request your support for this bill, as it will provide an opportunity for the development of better varieties, which will mean much to the prosperity of agriculture of our State.

NEW YORK FRUIT EXCHANGE.

---

NEWARK, N. J., *April 16, 1930.*

Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND,
*Senate Chamber:*

Proposed Townsend-Purnell plant patent legislation very important to agricultural and horticultural interests of our country. Would lend far-reaching encouragement to agriculture and benefit general public, providing wonderful stimulus to American horticulture. Your support is urgently requested.

JACKSON & PERKINS CO., *Nurserymen.*

---

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 16, 1930.*

Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND:

We understand that the Townsend plant bill is now before Senate, and in view of the fact that this bill is of vital interest to the agricultural industry in this State as well as the fruit and vegetable industry, the passing of this bill will make it an object on the part of the horticulturists to create new wonderful products and permit them to get the benefit of their labor the agricultural and fruit interests strongly ask that you support this bill.

PRODUCE NEWS,
H. R. PRESTON, *Editor.*

BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3059) to provide for the advance planning and regulated construction of certain public works, for the stabilization of industry, and for the prevention of unemployment during periods of business depression, and the bill (S. 3061) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor," approved March 4, 1913, were announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those bills, being a special order, will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 227) to amend the Senate rules so as to abolish proceedings in Committee of the Whole on bills, joint resolutions, and treaties was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

QUOTA PREFERENCES IN IMMIGRATION

The bill (S. 1455) to amend the immigration act of 1924 in respect of quota preferences was announced as next in order.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Over.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the objection for a moment?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Very well.

Mr. COPELAND. This bill was given long and very serious attention and there were several hearings before the Committee on Immigration. Representatives of the department appeared and various amendments were suggested. The bill came forth as a result of those deliberations. It means that within the quota of any country two persons may be brought in or be given preference for admission to the United States for permanent residence here. They must be persons who have peculiar training in executive, administrative, or supervisory work. An example which was used several times before the committee is the rayon industry, which was developed abroad, and it was necessary, in order that it might be brought here and given effective activity in our country, to bring some experts from abroad. Sometimes they have been brought in by subterfuge or otherwise.

The bill permits only two and within the quota. It does not increase the quota. It means simply that of the number permitted under the quota two persons who have peculiar qualities making them valuable to the development of industry in the United States may be brought in after the Secretary of Labor has thoroughly investigated to find whether there are persons in our own country who have those qualifications.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I did not quite understand the bill. I appreciate the statement of the Senator and withdraw my objection.

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 Immigration with amendments, on page 2, line 5, to strike out "being trained and skilled in a particular art, craft, technique, business, or science, or in agriculture"; in line 7, after the words "engage in," to insert the words "executive, administrative, or supervisory"; in line 8, to strike out the words "so trained and skilled"; in line 15, to strike out the words "claiming to be so trained and skilled"; in line 19, to strike out the words "so trained and skilled" and insert "in executive, administrative, or supervisory work"; in line 23, after the words "United States," to insert "and such preference shall not be given to more than two such persons exclusive of their wives and dependent minor children in each instance"; on page 3, lines 5, 6, and 7, to strike out "Such determination by the Secretary of Labor shall constitute an exemption of the alien from the contract labor provisions of the immigration laws" and to insert in lieu thereof "The provisions of this act shall not be construed to modify, in any manner, the provisions of existing law relating to the importation into the United States of alien contract laborers," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of section 6 of the immigration act of 1924, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Fifty per cent of the quota of each nationality for such year shall be made available in such year for the issuance of immigration visas to the following classes of immigrants, without priority of preference as between such classes: (A) Quota immigrants who are the fathers or the mothers, or the husbands by marriage occurring after May 31, 1928, of citizens of the United States who are 21 years of age or over; (B) in the case of any nationality the quota of which is 300 or more, quota immigrants who are needed by bona fide employers to engage in executive, administrative, or supervisory work to perform which persons can not be found unemployed in the United States, or who are needed to engage in such work independently or as an employer in the United States, and the wives, and the dependent children under the age of 21 years, of such immigrants if accompanying or following to join them. Preference under clause (B) of this paragraph shall not be given to any alien unless the Secretary of Labor, upon application of any person interested and after full hearing and investigation of the facts in the case, determines that a bona fide employer needs persons in executive, administrative, or supervisory work and that such persons can not be found unemployed in the United States, or that it is desirable that such alien be admitted to work independently or as an employer in the United States, and such preference shall not be given to more than two such persons exclusive of their wives and dependent minor children in each instance. The Secretary of Labor shall inform the Secretary of State of such determination, and the Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer with whom the application for the immigration visa has been filed to grant the preference. The provisions of this act shall not be construed to modify, in any manner, the provisions of existing law relating to the importation into the United States of alien contract laborers."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of this act shall take effect July 1, 1929, except that the determinations thereunder by the Secretary of Labor may be made at any time after the enactment of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 255) for the promotion of the health and welfare of mothers and infants, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], who is absent from the Chamber, I shall object to the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3060) to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. At the request of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], who is detained from the Chamber, I ask that the bill may be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

SISSETON AND WAHPETON BANDS OF SIOUX INDIANS

The bill (S. 1372) authorizing an appropriation for payment of claims of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians was considered as in Committee of the Whole. The bill had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment to strike out the preamble and, on page 4, line 12, to add a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That an appropriation of $300,000 be, and the same is hereby, authorized to be paid, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the same to be paid and disbursed to said Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior with allowance for attorneys' fees in such amount as, in the discretion of the Secretary, shall to him seem just for services rendered in the prosecution of said claim, not exceeding 10 per cent of the amount hereby appropriated: *Provided*, That if the Secretary of the Interior shall find that any authorized attorney or attorneys, or any authorized agent or agents, of said bands of Indians rendered any services in the case of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians against the United States prior to the judgment of the Court of Claims rendered therein on April 23, 1923, the Secretary of the Interior shall fix the compensation for such prior services on such quantum meruit basis as to him shall seem reasonable, the same to be paid out of the appropriation herein authorized, at the same time that he shall pay the compensation he shall find to be payable to the authorized attorney or attorneys now representing said bands of Indians. The total amount of all attorneys' or agents' fees to be paid out of this appropriation shall in no event exceed the limitation herein provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

The committee reported in favor of striking out the preamble, and it was stricken out.

Mr. WALSH of Montana subsequently said: Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. WHEELER] is interested in the bill (S. 1372) authorizing an appropriation for payment of claims of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians, which was passed just a few moments ago, and has some views with respect to the matter which he desires to submit to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the action of the Senate whereby the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed may be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, I hope that action will not be taken. There has never been a bill before the Senate on which there has been such unanimous agreement with reference to the merits of the bill. I do not blame the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] at all for his objection. I understand the circumstances; but I hope the request of the Senator from Montana will not be granted.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I want to say to the Senator from South Dakota that I know nothing myself about the merits of the bill, but my colleague is unavoidably absent this morning; he is engaged in important work, and he should have an opportunity at least to present whatever views he desires to present regarding the bill.

Mr. NORBECK. Let me say in answer to the Senator from Montana that his colleague has been here on two or three different occasions when this bill has come up, and he has had a chance to express himself.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator objects, I shall be obliged to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. NORBECK. If the Senator feels that deeply about it, I shall not object, but will let the bill go back to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the votes whereby the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed are reconsidered, and the bill will be returned to the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3619) to reorganize the Federal Power Commission was announced as next in order.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMELIA ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE RESERVATION, FLA.

The bill (S. 3404) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of a portion of the Amelia Island Lighthouse Reservation, Fla., was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to convey to the city of Fernandina, Fla., that portion of the Amelia Island Lighthouse Reservation, Fla., consisting of all that portion of section 12, township 3 north, range 29 east, Tallahassee meridian, lying north of the shell road running east from the city of Fernandina across section 12, consisting of 115.25 acres.

SEC. 2. The city of Fernandina, Fla., shall pay to the United States for the above-described property the sum of $5,762.50, or at the rate of $50 per acre.

SEC. 3. The Lighthouse Service shall retain a perpetual easement for beams of light from the Amelia Island Lighthouse, including the right to trim any trees and to limit the height of any structures erected on said property that may obstruct the rays of such light.

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

COMMISSIONED PERSONNEL OF COAST GUARD

The bill (H. R. 8293) to amend an act entitled "An act to readjust the commissioned personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1929, was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the second proviso of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to readjust the commissioned personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1929, is hereby amended by striking out the words "total service" in said proviso and substituting therefor the words "total commissioned service."

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

RANK AND PAY OF COAST GUARD COMMANDANT

The bill (H. R. 8637) to fix the rank and pay of the Commandant of the Coast Guard was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That hereafter the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall, while so serving, have corresponding rank and shall receive the same pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be prescribed by or in pursuance of law for chiefs of bureaus of the Navy Department.

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

ST. CROIX RIVER BRIDGE, MINNESOTA

The bill (H. R. 9671) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free highway bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Stillwater, Minn., was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across the St. Croix River, at or near Stillwater, Minn., authorized to be built by the State of Minnesota and the State of Wisconsin, by act of Congress approved February 13, 1929, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from February 13, 1930.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE, HASTINGS, MINN.

The bill (H. R. 9672) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Hastings, Minn., was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across the Mississippi River, at or near Hastings, Minn., authorized to be built by the State of Minnesota, by the act of Congress approved January 14, 1929, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from January 14, 1930.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE, CLEARWATER, MINN.

The bill (H. R. 9901) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, Minn., was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by an act of Congress approved March 4, 1925, extended by acts of Congress approved February 26, 1926, February 16, 1928, and March 2, 1929, to be built by the State of Minnesota and the counties of Sherburne and Wright across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, in the county of Wright, in the State of Minnesota, are hereby further extended one and three years, respectively, from February 16, 1930.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

SCHUYLKILL RIVER BRIDGE, READING, PA.

The bill (H. R. 9931) granting the consent of Congress to Berks County, State of Pennsylvania, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Schuylkill River at or near Reading, Pa., was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the commissioners of Berks County, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Schuylkill River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the westerly end of Buttonwood Street in the city of Reading, Pa., and connecting at or near the easterly end of Valley Street in the borough of West Reading, in Berks County, Pa., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

YUMA AUXILIARY PROJECT, ARIZONA

The bill (S. 261) amending the act of January 25, 1917 (39 Stat. L. 868), and other acts relating to the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the lands in the Mesa division, Yuma auxiliary project, constructed and operated pursuant to the act of January 25, 1917 (39 Stat. L. 868), and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, shall hereafter be subject to sale in tracts of 10 to 160 acres at a price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior and the estimated cost of constructing and providing the necessary works for the irrigation of said lands.

SEC. 2. That the purchase price of land and water right hereafter sold shall be paid to the United States in 40 equal annual installments, the first of which shall be due and payable at the date of purchase and the remaining installments annually thereafter until paid. No interest shall be payable on the amount represented by the first 10 installments, but interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum shall be payable annually on the indebtedness represented by installments 12 to 40, inclusive, after the end of the tenth year from the date of sale. All installments unpaid when due shall bear interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from the date of default until paid. Contracts of six months or more in default on any installments or interest payment shall be subject to cancellation and the forfeiture of all payments made thereon: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized at any time within one year from the date this act becomes effective to amend any existing uncompleted contracts for the purchase of land and water rights purchased pursuant to the act of February 21, 1925 (43 Stat. L. 962), so that the aggregate amount of the principal and interest remaining unpaid under such contract may be paid in 40 equal annual installments in accordance with the conditions of this act, beginning with the date of the amendatory contract.

SEC. 3. All acts and parts of acts in conflict with the provisions hereof are hereby repealed.

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

APPORTIONMENT OF WATERS OF NORTH PLATTE RIVER

The bill (S. 2863) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the North Platte River and other streams in which such States are jointly interested was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into compacts or agreements providing for an equitable division and apportionment between such States of the water supply of the North Platte River and of the streams tributary thereto and of other streams in which such Sates are jointly interested.

SEC. 2. Such consent is given upon condition that a representative of the United States, to be appointed by the President, shall participate in the negotiations and shall make report to Congress of the proceedings and of any compact or agreement entered into.

SEC. 3. No such compact or agreement shall be binding or obligatory upon either of such States unless and until it has been approved by the legislature of each of such States and by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is herewith expressly reserved.

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

ERECTION AND MAINTENANCE OF OUTDOOR SIGNS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 4022) to regulate the erection, hanging, placing, painting, display, and maintenance of outdoor signs and other forms of exterior advertising within the District of Columbia was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered to make and enforce such regulations as they may deem advisable to govern the erection, hanging, placing, painting, display, and maintenance of all outdoor signs and other forms of exterior advertising within the District of Columbia, and such regulations as may be promulgated hereunder shall have the force and effect of law.

SEC. 2. No person, persons, firm, or corporation shall engage in the business of erecting, hanging, placing, painting, or displaying any sign for outdoor display within the District of Columbia without first having obtained a license therefor from the superintendent of licenses of the District of Columbia, which license shall bear an identification number: *Provided,* That no license shall issue without the prepayment of $5 to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia and an annual fee of $5 thereafter for each succeeding year. For good cause shown the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have the power to reject any application for a license hereunder, or, where license has been issued, to revoke it.

SEC. 3. That paragraph 39 of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. L., pt. 1, pp. 627–628), relating to billposters and signs, and the act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. L., pt. 1, p. 974), relating to the erection of real-estate signs in the District of Columbia, be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

SEC. 4. Any person, persons, firm, or corporation, whether as principal, agent, or employee, violating this act or any of the regulations promulgated pursuant to said act shall, upon conviction thereof in the police court of the District of Columbia, be fined not less than $5 nor more than $100 for each and every offense, and a like fine shall be imposed for each and every day thereafter that such violation of law shall continue: *Provided,* That the regulations promulgated hereunder shall be printed in one of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia, and no penalty prescribed for the violation of said regulations shall be enforced until 30 days after the publication of such regulations.

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

CONTROL OF WATERS OF YAQUINA BAY AND RIVER, OREG.

The bill (S. 3898) granting the consent of Congress to the Mill Four Drainage District in Lincoln County, Oreg., to construct, maintain, and operate dams and dikes to prevent the flow of waters of Yaquina Bay and River into Nutes Slough, Boones Slough, and sloughs connected therewith was considered as in Committee of the Whole. The bill had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments, on page 2, line 5, to strike out the word "and" and insert the word "are," and in line 12 to strike out the word "passing" and insert the word "approval," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is granted to Mill Four Drainage District, organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, to construct, maintain, and operate at points suitable to the interests of navigation dams and dikes for preventing the flow of waters of Yaquina Bay and River into Nutes Slough, Boones Slough, and sloughs connected therewith.

Work shall not be commenced on such dams or dikes until the plans therefor, including plans for all accessory works are submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, who may impose such conditions and stipulations as they may deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2. The authority granted by this act shall terminate if the actual construction of the dams and dikes hereby authorized is not commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date of approval of this act.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

AMENDMENT OF IRRIGATION ACT

The bill (H. R. 4291) to amend section 43 of the act of May 25, 1926, entitled "An act to adjust water-right charges, to

grant certain other relief on the Federal irrigation projects, and for other purposes," was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 43 of the act of May 25, 1926, entitled "An act to adjust water-right charges, to grant certain other relief on the Federal irrigation projects, and for other purposes" (44 Stat. 636), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 43. The payment of all construction charges against said areas temporarily unproductive shall remain suspended until the Secretary of the Interior shall declare them to be possessed of sufficient productive power properly to be placed in a paying class, whereupon payment of construction charges against such areas shall be resumed or shall begin, as the case may be. Any payments made on such areas shall be credited to the unpaid balance of the construction charge on the productive area of each unit. Such credit shall be applied on and after the passage and approval of this act, which shall not be construed to require revision of accounts heretofore adjusted under the provisions of this section as originally enacted. While said lands are so classified as temporarily unproductive and the construction charges against them are suspended, water for irrigation purposes may be furnished upon payment of the usual operation and maintenance charges, or such other charges as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, the advance payment of which may be required, in the discretion of the said Secretary. Should said lands temporarily classed as unproductive, or any of them, in the future be found by the Secretary of the Interior to be permanently unproductive, the charges against them shall be charged off as a permanent loss to the reclamation fund and they shall thereupon be treated in the same manner as other permanently unproductive lands as provided in this act, except that no refund shall be made of the construction charges paid on such unproductive areas and applied as a credit on productive areas as herein authorized."

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

RECOMMITMENT OF BILL

The bill (H. R. 8296) to amend the act of May 25, 1926, entitled "An act to adjust water-right charges, to grant certain other relief on the Federal irrigation projects, and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I am under obligation to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation for making a favorable report on this bill. I was unable to attend the meeting of the committee at which it was considered, by reason of an engagement with another committee on important work there. There are, however, certain important considerations which I desire to present in connection with the bill which have not been presented, and accordingly I ask that the bill be recommitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMERICAN FOREIGN TRADE CORPORATION

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7356) for the relief of the American Foreign Trade Corporation and Fils d'Aslan Fresco, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on line 7, after the word "of," to strike out "$54,810" and insert "$24,160," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the American Foreign Trade Corporation and Fils d'Aslan Fresco the sum of $24,160, in full compensation for losses sustained by consequences resulting from acts of the Government of the United States in the requisitioning of the ship *Navahoe*, under United States registry, at Odessa, Russia, on February 5, 1920.

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.

BANDMASTERS IN THE ARMY

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1011) to amend the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, in section 6a, on page 2, line 4, after the word "major," to strike out "fourth pay period"; in line 5, after the word "shall," to insert "under the direction of the Secretary of War"; and in line 7, after the word "bands," to insert "and schools," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 6a. Chief bandmaster: A chief bandmaster shall be selected from among experienced Army bandmasters of the service by the Secretary of War, and shall have the assimilated rank, pay, and allowances of a major while so serving. He shall, under the direction of the Secretary of War, be charged with the duty for the uniform administration of all authorized Army bands and schools, and shall advise The Adjutant General on all matters relating to the musical organizations in the Army.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 6b, page 2, line 15, after the word "year," to strike out "first pay period"; in line 16, after the word "year," to strike out "second pay period"; in line 17, after the word "year," to strike out "third pay period"; at the beginning of line 19 to insert "as chief musician, master sergeant, warrant officers"; in line 21, after the word "the," to strike out "pay period" and insert "rank"; and on page 3, line 5, after the word "That," to strike out "band leaders now in the service who fail to pass the prescribed physical examination because of physical disability incident to the service and sufficient to prevent them from the performance of duty valuable to the Government shall be placed upon the retired list of the Army with 75 per cent of the pay to which they would have been entitled if appointed bandmasters as hereinbefore prescribed" and insert "no band leader shall suffer the loss of pay by reason of the provisions of this act," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 6b. Bandmasters: Bandmasters hereafter commissioned under the above section shall be entitled to the same benefits in respect to pay, allowances, and retirements as are applicable to commissioned officers of the various grades to which they are assimilated with, as follows: Less than 3 years, to rank with second lieutenants; 3 to 10 years, to rank with first lieutenants; over 10 years, to rank with captains. All prior active band-leader service as chief musician, master sergeant, warrant officers, commissioned and enlisted, shall be credited toward computing the rank present band leaders shall receive on first appointment. There shall be one bandmaster for each authorized band of the Army. Appointment as bandmasters shall be made, first, from band leaders now in the service who are found to be physically qualified; second, subject to such examination as the President may prescribe from noncommissioned officers and other enlisted musicians who have had at least 10 years' service in Army bands, with preference to such appointments to qualified graduates of the Army Music School: *Provided*, That no band leader shall suffer the loss of pay by reason of the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DEWITT & SHOBE

The bill (S. 2972) for the relief of DeWitt & Shobe was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to DeWitt & Shobe, of Glasgow, Mo., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $8,296 in full settlement for extra work performed under contract dated May 15, 1912, for revetment work at Providence Bend, Missouri River, for which work the Government has received the benefit but for which no payment has been made, the facts in this claim being identical with the facts in the case of Fox & Bristol, allowed and paid by the Comptroller General (vol. 21, Compt. Gen. Dec., p. 750).

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

CREW OF TRANSPORT "ANTILLES"

The bill (S. 1963) for the relief of members of the crew of the transport *Antilles* was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to examine and settle the claims of the crew of the transport *Antilles*, which was sunk in October, 1917, on the high seas by an enemy torpedo, for the value of private property lost by the sinking of said vessel, and to allow reimbursement of the value of said private property not exceeding the sum of $100 in any one case, and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, sufficient sums, not exceeding in the aggregate $3,000, for the payment of such of these claims as may be allowed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

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

HAROLD L. LYTLE

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1756) granting the sum of $5,000 to reimburse the family of the late Harold L. Lytle for hospital and medical expenses and loss of salary due to an injury received in a collision with a Government truck in Portsmouth, N. H., May 10, 1927, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the family of the late Harold L. Lytle, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,500, in full settlement of all claims against the Government for hospital and medical expenses and loss of salary due to an injury he received in a collision with a Government truck in Portsmouth, N. H., on May 10, 1927.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

E. M. DAVIS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 671) for the relief of E. M. Davis, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the accounts of E. M. Davis, former postmaster at Cut Bank, Mont., in the sum of $174.33, representing the amount of postal funds lost by reason of the failure of the First National Bank of Cut Bank on January 1, 1921, and shown on final audit of his accounts as postmaster to be due the United States.

SEC. 2. That the surety on the bond of such E. M. Davis as postmaster is relieved of any liability on account of such loss.

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

WARREN J. CLEAR

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1979) for the relief of Warren J. Clear, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Warren J. Clear, captain, Infantry, United States Army, the sum of $737 in reimbursement for the loss by earthquake and fire of personal property in Tokyo, Japan, on or about September 1, 1923, while he was serving as an attaché, American Embassy, Tokyo, Japan.

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

GEORGE W. BURGESS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1702) for the relief of George W. Burgess, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, in line 6, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$255,231.86" and insert "$254,272.11," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the account of George W. Burgess, postmaster at Pawtucket, R. I., in the sum of $254,272.11, the value of postage-stamp stock lost in the burglary of the post office at Pawtucket, R. I., February 1, 1926.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 10288) to regulate the transportation of persons in interstate and foreign commerce by motor carriers operating on the public highways was announced as next in order.

Mr. BLEASE. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 9592) to amend section 407 of the merchant marine act, 1928, was announced as next in order.

Mr. COPELAND. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

CUSTER NATIONAL FOREST

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6130) to exempt the Custer National Forest from the operation of the forest homestead law, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the numerals "287)," to insert the following proviso: "*Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, list limited tracts when in his opinion such action will be in the public interest and will not be injurious to other settlers or users of the national forest," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That from and after the passage of this act no applications may be accepted by the Secretary of Agriculture for the classification and listing of any land in the Custer National Forest for homestead entry under the provisions of the act of June 11, 1906 (34 Stat. 233; U. S. C., title 16, sec. 506), nor shall any lands be so classified for entry under the provisions of the act of August 10, 1912 (37 Stat. 269–287): *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, list limited tracts when in his opinion such action will be in the public interest and will not be injurious to other settlers or users of the national forest.

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.

HELENA NATIONAL FOREST, MONT.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4810) to add certain lands to the Helena National Forest in the State of Montana, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the following-described lands be, and the same are hereby, added to and made a part of the Helena National Forest, in the State of Montana, and are hereafter to be administered subject to the laws and regulations relating to the national forests: North half and south half southwest quarter section 14, and north half and south half southwest quarter section 22, all in township 14 north, range 6 west, Montana meridian.

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

WESLEY A. HOWARD

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 413) authorizing the issuance to Wesley A. Howard of a patent for certain lands, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Wesley A. Howard, as transferee of Frank Bastien, patent for the lands covered by homestead entry No. Great Falls 054646, upon payment by such Wesley A. Howard, within 60 days from the date of the approval of this act, of the balance due upon such lands.

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

MONUMENT TO MARTIN CHARGER AND OTHER INDIANS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3051) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument to commemorate the heroic sacrifice and the service of Martin Charger and 10 other Indians in the rescue of white women and children held as captives by an unfriendly Indian tribe, which had been reported from the Committee on the Library with amendments, on page 1, line 3, before the word "That," to insert "Sec. 1," and on page 2, after line 4, to insert:

SEC. 2. No funds shall be disbursed for this purpose until satisfactory assurances have been received by the Secretary of the Interior pledging the construction and maintenance of the necessary highway between the location of this monument and the nearest State highway.

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*—

SECTION 1. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to erect a memorial monument, the cost of which shall not exceed $5,000, to commemorate the extraordinary sacrifices and services of Martin Charger and 10 other Indians, commonly known as the fool soldiers, in rescuing Shetak captives on November 20, 1862. The sum of $5,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to defray the expenses of constructing such monument: *Provided*, That such memorial shall be erected upon the site where such rescue was effected.

SEC. 2. No funds shall be disbursed for this purpose until satisfactory assurances have been received by the Secretary of the Interior pledging the construction and maintenance of the necessary highway between the location of this monument and the nearest State highway.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

UNION SHIPPING & TRADING CO. (LTD.)

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 193) for the relief of the Union Shipping & Trading Co. (Ltd.), which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the claim of the Union Shipping & Trading Co. (Ltd.) against the United States of America for damages alleged to have been caused by a collision on April 25, 1918, near Pauillac, in the Gironde River, France, between the Spanish steamship *Consuelo* (at the time of the collision the British steamship *Reims*) and the American steamship *Berwind*, then in the transport service of the United States War Department, may be sued for by the said Union Shipping & Trading Co. (Ltd.) in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, sitting as a court of admiralty and acting under the rules governing such court, and said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such suit (in accordance with the principles of libels in rem and/or in personam), and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of such damages (including interest) and costs, if any, as shall be found to be due against the United States in favor of the said Union Shipping & Trading Co. (Ltd.) or against the said Union Shipping & Trading Co. (Ltd.) in favor of the United States upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases in admiralty between private parties and with the same rights of appeal: *Provided*, That at the trial of said suit the written report or reports concerning said collision made by the pilot, master, any officer or member of the crew of the steamship *Berwind*, who is not available to testify because he is dead or can not be found, may be admitted in evidence: *Provided further*, That such notice of the said suit shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by order of the said court, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause the United States attorney in such district to appear and defend for the United States: *Provided further*, That said suit shall be brought and commenced within four months of the date of the passage of this act.

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

OWNERS OF CARGO ON STEAMSHIP "BOXLEY"

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3641) for the relief of owners of cargo aboard the steamship *Boxley*, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the claim of W. R. Grace & Co., owner of various shipments of merchandise which were laden on board of the steamship *Boxley*, at the time hereinafter mentioned, against the United States of America for damages alleged to have been caused by the unseaworthiness and negligence of the said steamship *Boxley* on her voyage from Iquique, Chile, to New Orleans, La., between the dates of January 5, 1920, and February 14, 1920, inclusive, may be sued for by the said owners of cargo in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, sitting as a court of admiralty, and acting under the rules governing such court, and said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such suit and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of such damages and costs, if any, as shall be found to be due against the United States in favor of the owners of said cargo, or against the owners of said cargo in favor of the United States, upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases in admiralty between private parties, and with the same rights of appeal: *Provided*, That such notice of the suit shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by order of the said court, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause the United States attorney in such district to appear and defend for the United States: *Provided further*, That said suit shall be brought and commenced within four months of the date of the passage of this act.

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

OWNER OF AMERICAN STEAM TUG "CHARLES RUNYON"

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3726) for the relief of the owner of the American steam tug *Charles Runyon*, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the claim of the Crew Transportation Corporation, owner of the American steam tug *Charles Runyon*, and/or the receiver and/or trustee of the said corporation against the United States of America for damages alleged to have been caused by collision between said vessel and the U. S. S. *Traffic* on or about the 6th day of May, 1919, at or near Pier C, navy yard, Brooklyn, N. Y., may be sued for by the said owner and/or receiver and/or trustee in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, sitting as a court of admiralty and acting under the rules governing such court; and said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such suit and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of such damages and costs, if any, as shall be found to be due against the United States in favor of the owner of the said American steam tug *Charles Runyon* and/or receiver and/or trustee of aforesaid, or against the owner of the said American steam tug *Charles Runyon* and/or the receiver and/or trustee of said corporation, in favor of the United States, upon the same principles and same measures of liability as in like cases in admiralty between private parties and with the same rights of appeal: *Provided*, That such notice of the suit shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by order of the said court, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause the United States attorney in such district to appear and defend for the United States: *Provided further*, That said suit shall be brought and commenced within four months of the date of the passage of this act.

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

OWNERS OF CARGO ON U. S. TRANSPORT "FLORENCE LUCKENBACH"

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3727) for the relief of the owners of cargo laden aboard the United States transport *Florence Luckenbach* on or about December 27, 1918, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the claims of all owners of various shipments of merchandise which were laden on board the U. S. transport *Florence Luckenbach*, at the time hereinafter mentioned, against the United States of America for damages alleged to have been caused by fire and by water used to extinguish fire on or about the 27th day of December, 1918, at Locust Point, Baltimore, Md., may be sued for by the said owners of cargo in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, sitting as a court of admiralty and acting under the rules governing such court; and said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such suits and to enter judgments or decrees for the amounts of such damages, including costs, if any, as shall be found to be due against the United States in favor of the owners of said cargo, or against the owners of said cargo in favor of the United States, upon the same principles and same measures of liability as in like cases in admiralty between private parties, and with the same rights of appeal: *Provided*, That such notices of the suits shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by orders of the said court, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause the United States attorney in such district to appear and defend for the United States: *Provided further*, That said suits shall be brought and commenced within four months of the date of the passage of this act.

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

OWNER OF BARGE "CONSOLIDATION COASTWISE NO. 10"

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3728) for the relief of the owner of barge *Consolidation Coastwise No. 10*, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the claim of the owner of barge *Consolidation Coastwise No. 10* against the United States of America for damages and loss alleged to have been caused by collision between the said barge and barge *Consolidation Coastwise No. 2½* when said *No. 10* was in tow of the United States Navy steam tug *Mohawk*, in or near Hampton Roads, Va., on or about the 24th day of October, 1918, may be sued for by the said owner of barge *Consolidation Coastwise No. 10* in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, sitting as a court of admiralty and acting under the rules governing such court, and said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such suit and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of such damages and costs, if any, as shall be found to be due against the United States in favor of the owner of barge *Consolidation Coastwise No. 10*, or against the owner of barge *Consolidation Coastwise No. 10* in favor of the United States, with the same powers as if said suit was brought in accordance with the provisions of the suits in admiralty act of March 9, 1920, and said decree or judgment shall be paid as provided in said act: *Provided*, That such notice of the suit shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by order of the said court, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause the United States attorney in such district to appear and defend for the United States: *Provided further*, That said suit shall be brought and commenced within four months of the date of the passage of this act.

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

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT AS AMENDED

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3141) to amend paragraph (11) of section

20 of the interstate commerce act, as amended, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That paragraph (11) of section 20 of the interstate commerce act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(11) That any common carrier, railroad, or transportation company subject to the provisions of this act receiving property for transportation from a point in one State or Territory or the District of Columbia to a point in another State, Territory, District of Columbia, or from any point in the United States to a point in an adjacent foreign country shall issue a receipt or bill of lading therefor, and shall be liable to the lawful holder thereof for any loss, damage, or injury to such property caused by it or by any common carrier, railroad, or transportation company to which such property may be delivered or over whose line or lines such property may pass within the United States or within an adjacent foreign country when transported on a through bill of lading, and no contract, receipt, rule, regulation, or other limitation of any character whatsoever shall exempt such common carrier, railroad, or transportation company from the liability hereby imposed; and any such common carrier, railroad, or transportation company so receiving property for transportation from a point in one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to a point in another State or Territory, or from a point in a State or Territory to a point in the District of Columbia, or from any point in the United States to a point in an adjacent foreign country, or for transportation wholly within a Territory, or any common carrier, railroad, or transportation company delivering said property so received and transported shall be liable to the lawful holder of said receipt or bill of lading or to any party entitled to recover thereon, whether such receipt or bill of lading has been issued or not, for the full actual loss, damage, or injury to such property caused by it or by any such common carrier, railroad, or transportation company to which such property may be delivered or over whose line or lines such property may pass within the United States or within an adjacent foreign country when transported on a through bill of lading, notwithstanding any limitation of liability or limitation of the amount of recovery or representation or agreement as to value in any such receipt or bill of lading, or in any contract, rule, regulation, or in any tariff filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission; and any such limitation, without respect to the manner or form in which it is sought to be made is hereby declared to be unlawful and void: *Provided*, That if the loss, damage, or injury occurs while the property is in the custody of a carrier by water the liability of such carrier shall be determined by and under the laws and regulations applicable to transportation by water, and the liability of the initial or delivering carrier shall be the same as that of such carrier by water: *Provided, however*, That the provisions hereof respecting liability for full actual loss, damage, or injury, notwithstanding any limitation of liability or recovery or representation or agreement or release as to value, and declaring any such limitation to be unlawful and void, shall not apply, first, to baggage carried on passenger trains or boats, or trains or boats carrying passengers; second, to property, except ordinary livestock, received for transportation concerning which the carrier shall have been or shall hereafter be expressly authorized or required by order of the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish and maintain rates dependent upon the value declared in writing by the shipper or agreed upon in writing as the released value of the property, in which case such declaration or agreement shall have no other effect than to limit liability and recovery to an amount not exceeding the value so declared or released, and shall not, so far as relates to values, be held to be a violation of section 10 of this act to regulate commerce, as amended; and any tariff schedule which may be filed with the commission pursuant to such order shall contain specific reference thereto and may establish rates varying with the value so declared and agreed upon; and the commission is hereby empowered to make such order in cases where rates dependent upon and varying with declared or agreed values would, in its opinion, be just and reasonable under the circumstances and conditions surrounding the transportation. The term 'ordinary livestock' shall include all cattle, swine, sheep, goats, horses, and mules, except such as are chiefly valuable for breeding, racing, show purposes, or other special uses: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall deprive any holder of such receipt or bill of lading of any remedy or right of action which he has under the existing law: *Provided further*, That all actions brought under and by virtue of this paragraph against the delivering carrier shall be brought, and may be maintained, if in a district court of the United States, only in a district, and if in a State court, only in a State through or into which the defendant carrier operates a line of railroad: *Provided further*, That it shall be unlawful for any such receiving or delivering common carrier to provide by rule, contract, regulation, or otherwise a shorter period for the filing of claims than nine months, and for the institution of suits than two years, such period for institution of suits to be computed from the day when notice in writing is given by the carrier to the claimant that the carrier has disallowed the claim or any part or parts thereof specified in the notice: *And provided further*, That for the purposes of this paragraph and of paragraph (12) the delivering carrier shall be construed to be the carrier performing the line-haul service nearest to the point of destination and not a carrier performing merely a switching service at the point of destination: *And provided further*, That the liability imposed by this paragraph shall also apply in the case of property reconsigned or diverted in accordance with the applicable tariffs filed as in this act provided."

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

KREMER & HOG

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1254) for the relief of Kremer & Hog, a partnership, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to adjust and settle the claim of Kremer & Hog, a partnership, for reimbursement of the sum of $146.14 on account of additional expenses incurred in placing a culvert under the tracks of the Chicago & North Western Railway Co. due to delay by the United States in furnishing corrugated pipe for said culvert under contract of January 10, 1928, for the construction of drains on the Belle Fourche Federal irrigation project, South Dakota, and to allow not to exceed $146.14 in full and final settlement of any and all claims arising under or growing out of said contract. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $146.14, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for payment of the claim.

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

GULF REFINING CO.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1255) for the relief of the Gulf Refining Co., which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to adjust and settle the claim of the Gulf Refining Co. for refund of rent erroneously paid on premises known as 401 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., after claimant had vacated said premises on or before April 15, 1928, and to allow said claim in the sum of not to exceed $200. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $200 for payment of said claim.

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

FEDERATION BANK & TRUST CO., NEW YORK, N. Y.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1256) for the relief of the Federation Bank & Trust Co., New York, N. Y., which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to settle and allow the claim of the Federation Bank & Trust Co., New York, N. Y., in a sum not to exceed $2,710 on account of loans made under the World War adjusted compensation act of May 19, 1924, by the Federation Bank & Trust Co. to 29 World War veterans on their adjusted-compensation certificates, as shown in report dated April 30, 1929, of the Comptroller General of the United States to the Congress, and "The adjusted service certificate fund" created by section 505 of the act of May 19, 1924 (43 Stat. L. 128), is hereby made available to the extent of $2,710, to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to make payment of the claims when settled and allowed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided*, That the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau shall charge the respective loans to the respective adjusted service certificates in accordance with section 502 of the act of May 19, 1924 (43 Stat. L. 126).

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

BEAVER VALLEY MILLING CO.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1257) for the relief of the Beaver Valley Milling Co., which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to settle and allow the claim of the Beaver Valley Milling Co., Des Moines, Iowa, in a sum not to exceed $418.10, as loss resulting from an error made in stating the estimated quantity of flour required for use at Camp Dodge, Iowa, during the period from August 1 to 26, 1928. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum not to exceed $418.10 for payment of the claim.

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

JOHN WILCOX, JR.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3577) for the relief of John Wilcox, jr., which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $50 to John Wilcox, jr., a forest ranger employed on the Flathead National Forest, State of Montana, in payment for an automobile, which was destroyed by a forest fire in said national forest.

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

JAMES R. SHEFFIELD

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3623) for reimbursement of James R. Sheffield, formerly American ambassador to Mexico City, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,876.23 to reimburse James R. Sheffield, formerly American ambassador at Mexico City, for expenses personally incurred by him in the fiscal years 1925 and 1926 for the completion, remodeling, and furnishing of the Government-owned embassy building in Mexico City.

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

SALARIES OF INSPECTORS OF BOILERS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3845) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911, as amended March 4, 1915, June 26, 1918, and June 7, 1924, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with an amendment, in section 4, page 2, line 9, after the word "be," to strike out "$4,200" and insert "$4,000," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911, as amended March 4, 1915, June 26, 1918, and June 7, 1924, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That section 3 of said act is hereby amended so as to provide that the salary of the chief inspector shall be $7,500 per year, and the salary of each assistant chief inspector shall be $6,000 per year.

"SEC. 4. That section 4 of said act is hereby amended so as to provide that the salary of each district inspector appointed under said act shall be $4,000 per year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

INSOLVENCY OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

The bill (H. R. 6604) to amend sections 6 and 9 of the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 6 of the act of December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 288), be amended and reenacted to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. If any member bank shall be declared insolvent and a receiver appointed therefor, the stock held by it in said Federal reserve bank shall be canceled, without impairment of its liability, and all cash-paid subscriptions on said stock, with one-half of 1 per cent per month from the period of last dividend, if earned, not to exceed the book value thereof, shall be first applied to all debts of the insolvent member bank to the Federal reserve bank, and the balance, if any, shall be paid to the receiver of the insolvent bank.

"If any national bank which has not gone into liquidation as provided in section 5220 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 181) and for which a receiver has not already been appointed for other lawful cause, shall discontinue its banking operations for a period of 60 days the Comptroller of the Currency may, if he deems it advisable, appoint a receiver for such bank. The stock held by the said national bank in the Federal reserve bank of its district shall thereupon be canceled and said national bank shall receive in payment therefor, under regulations to be prescribed by the Federal Reserve Board, a sum equal to its cash-paid subscriptions on the shares canceled and one-half of 1 per cent a month from the period of the last dividend, if earned, not to exceed the book value thereof, less any liability of such national bank to the Federal reserve bank.

"Whenever the capital stock of a Federal reserve bank is reduced either on account of a reduction in capital stock of any member bank or of the liquidation or insolvency of such bank or on account of the appointment of a receiver for a national bank following discontinuance of its banking operations as provided in this section, the board of directors shall cause to be executed a certificate to the Comptroller of the Currency showing such reduction of capital stock and the amount repaid to such bank."

SEC. 2. That the eighth paragraph of section 9 of the Federal reserve act as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 327), be amended and reenacted to read as follows:

"If at any time it shall appear to the Federal Reserve Board that a member bank has failed to comply with the provisions of this section or the regulations of the Federal Reserve Board made pursuant thereto, or has ceased to exercise banking functions without a receiver or liquidating agent having been appointed therefor, it shall be within the power of the board after hearing to require such bank to surrender its stock in the Federal reserve bank and to forfeit all rights and privileges of membership. The Federal Reserve Board may restore membership upon due proof of compliance with the conditions imposed by this section."

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

BATTLES OF KING'S MOUNTAIN AND COWPENS

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) authorizing the printing of House Document No. 328 was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That 3,000 additional copies of House Document No. 328, Seventieth Congress, first session, entitled "Historical Statements Concerning the Battle of King's Mountain and the Battle of Cowpens in South Carolina," by Lieut. Col. H. L. Landers, be printed with illustrations and bound for the use of the Committee on Printing of the House of Representatives.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 4104) authorizing an appropriation for expenses of delegates to attend the International Conference on Load Lines at London, England, was announced as next in order.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

MARGARET DIEDERICH

The bill (S. 917) for the relief of Margaret Diederich was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Margaret Diederich, widow of the late Henry W. Diederich, late Foreign Service officer of the United States, retired, and formerly American consul at Leipzig, Germany; Magdeburg, Germany; Bremen, Germany; consul general at Antwerp, Belgium; and consul at Sarnia, Ontario, Canada, the sum of $3,000, being one year's salary of her deceased husband.

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

NATURALIZATION AND CITIZENSHIP OF MARRIED WOMEN

The bill (S. 3691) to amend an act entitled "An act relative to naturalization and citizenship of married women," approved September 22, 1922, was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act entitled "An act relative to the naturalization and citizenship of married women," approved September 22, 1922, is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"SEC. 8. That any woman eligible by race to citizenship who has married a citizen of the United States before the passage of this amendment whose husband shall have been a native-born citizen and a member of the military or naval forces of the United States during the World War and separated therefrom under honorable conditions, if otherwise admissible, shall not be excluded from admission into the United States under section 3 of the immigration act of 1917, unless she be excluded under the provisions of that section relating to—

"(a) Persons afflicted with a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease, except tuberculosis in any form;

"(b) Polygamy;

"(c) Prostitutes, procurers, or other like immoral persons;

"(d) Persons convicted of crime: *Provided*, That no such wife shall be excluded because of offenses committed during legal infancy, while a

minor under the age of 21 years, and for which the sentences imposed were less than three months, and which were committed more than five years previous to the date of the passage of this amendment;

"(e) Persons previously deported;

"(f) Contract laborers.

"That after admission to the United States she shall be subject to all other provisions of this act."

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

CERTIFICATES OF ADMISSION TO ALIENS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1278) to authorize the issuance of certificates of admission to aliens, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration with an amendment, on page 2, section 3, line 23, after the word "effect," to strike out "January" and insert "July," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That an alien who has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence and who has continued to reside therein since such admission shall, upon his application to the Commissioner General of Immigration, in a manner to be by regulation prescribed, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, be furnished with a certificate made from the official record of such admission. Such certificate shall be signed by the Commissioner General of Immigration and shall contain the following information concerning such alien: Full name under which admitted; country of birth; date of birth; nationality; color of eyes; port at which admitted; name of steamship, if any; and date of admission. Such certificate shall also contain the full name by which the alien is then known, his signature, and his address. A photograph of the alien shall be securely attached to the certificate, which shall bear an impression of the seal of the Department of Labor.

SEC. 2. Such certificate shall be prima facie evidence of the lawful admission of such alien. A fee of $3 shall be paid by such alien to the Commissioner General of Immigration for each such certificate. The money so received by the Commissioner General of Immigration shall be paid over to the disbursing clerk of the Department of Labor, who shall thereupon deposit it in the Treasury of the United States, rendering an account therefor quarterly to the General Accounting Office, and the said disbursing clerk shall be held responsible under his bond for such fees.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect July 1, 1930.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

Mr. COPELAND subsequently said: Mr. President, my attention was diverted this morning when we came to Calendar No. 442, and I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which it was passed may be reconsidered and that it may be returned to the calendar. I have no doubt that the bill will pass ultimately, but I have some remarks, which may or may not be important, which I desire to make on this bill before it is placed upon its passage.

Mr. McNARY. I did not hear the Senator's request.

Mr. COPELAND. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which Senate bill 1278, to authorize the issuance of certificates of admission to aliens, and for other purposes, was ordered to a third reading and passed, be reconsidered, and that the bill be returned to the calendar.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, of course I shall not object, but the Senator was in his seat when the bill was called, and I looked to see him object, and as he did not, I presumed he had waived his objection; and the bill passed. Of course, if he asks for reconsideration, I shall not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed is reconsidered, and the bill will be restored to the calendar.

BUFORD E. ELLIS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1971) for the relief of Buford E. Ellis, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "sum," to strike out "$496.15" and insert "$495.15," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and in full settlement against the Government, the sum of $495.15 to Buford E. Ellis, BM-2c, United States Navy, of Calhoun City, Miss., on account of expenses incurred by him for civilian medical treatment while suffering from cellulitis contracted May 1, 1929, while on leave of absence from the United States ship Mississippi, with orders to report at Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D. C.

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

REPLACEMENT AND CONSERVATION OF WILD ANIMAL LIFE

The resolution (S. Res. 246) submitted by Mr. HAWES and Mr. WALCOTT on April 11, 1930, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved,* That a special committee of five Senators, to be composed of three members from the majority political party and two members from the minority political party, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed (1) to investigate all matters pertaining to the replacement and conservation of wild animal life (including aquatic and bird life) with a view to determining the most appropriate methods for carrying out such purposes; and (2) to report to the Senate as soon as practicable, but not later than the beginning of the first regular session of the Seventy-second Congress, the results of its investigations, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Senate in the Seventy-first Congress until the final report is submitted; to employ such clerical and other assistants; to require by subpœna or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; and to take such testimony and make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $20,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the terms of Senate Resolution 246, for the appointment of a special committee to investigate matters pertaining to the replacement and conservation of wild animal life, agreed to to-day, the Chair appoints the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES].

Mr. McNARY subsequently said: Mr. President, I am requested to state that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT] was selected as chairman and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES] as vice chairman of the select committee appointed under the provisions of Senate Resolution 246, agreed to to-day, for the purpose of creating a commission to study wildlife conservation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2757. An act to authorize the United States Shipping Board to sell certain property of the United States situated in the city of Hoboken, N. J.;

S. 3425. An act to amend the act of Congress approved March 1, 1929, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a children's tuberculosis sanatorium";

S. 3440. An act authorizing the exchange of 663 square feet of property acquired for the park system for 2,436 square feet of neighboring property, all in the Klingle Ford Valley, for addition to the park system of the National Capital; and

H. R. 6343. An act to provide for the extension of the boundary limits of the proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the establishment of which is authorized by the act approved May 22, 1926 (44 Stat., p. 616).

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wonder if it would be agreeable to the Senator from Oregon to have laid before the Senate now the immigration bill and to proceed with its consideration?

Mr. McNARY. I am glad to cooperate with the Senator in asking that the Chair lay before the Senate at this time the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 51) to subject certain immigrants born in countries of the Western Hemisphere to the quota under the immigration laws.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I do not care to make any argument on this bill. I think it has been thoroughly explained and gone over. I merely wish to call attention to some extracts

from the hearings before the Committee on Immigration of the Senate on Tuesday, February 28, 1928. I will refer first to page 66. At that time there was on the stand a man by the name of C. B. Moore, representing the vegetable growers of the Imperial Valley of California. I asked him this question:

Do you think that it would be possible to have an arrangement of this kind?

The arrangement to which I referred was this, that those who wanted Mexicans to come into the United States for a certain purpose should be allowed to have them come over, provided Americans could not be found who would do the work, on condition that they file an application with the Secretary of Labor or the Commissioner of Immigration, as the case might be, stating how many laborers they wanted, and let the Secretary of Labor or other official pass on the question. Then, if a certain number were admitted to come into the United States; for instance, 100 or 500, that the individual or corporation which had asked for the admission of such Mexican laborers should furnish a list of the names and the number and that the department should retain a copy of that list, and also that those desiring to bring such laborers into the United States should be put under bond so that when the work was finished which the laborers were brought over here to perform they should be responsible for seeing that they went back across the line, and thus save the Government from any trouble, or if the Government be put to any expense in having them returned that these bondsmen be made to pay all such expenses and save the Government harmless.

It was alleged that there was some work which Americans would not do. That is stated in the hearings. I will not take the time to go into it, but there is a certain class of labor which American laborers will not perform, it seems, and so it is almost necessary in certain industries that Mexican laborers be brought over here, so it is claimed. However, when they get over here, they do not go back. Numbers of them are brought over here, say, 500 or 1,000, to work in the fields performing a particular class of work, but when they get through that work there is nobody to see that they go back across the line, and the result is that, having been brought here, they remain here.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BLEASE. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. As the Senator knows, such laborers are brought in by the trainload.

Mr. BLEASE. Oh, yes.

Mr. HARRIS. And when once brought in they have to get out the best way they can.

Mr. BLEASE. That is what I am trying to show, and I thank the Senator for his suggestion. I asked the gentleman to whom I have referred this question:

Do you think it would be possible to have an arrangement of this kind that would be satisfactory—to let the men like yourself, who are responsible for those people coming over here, make a requisition for so many hands, file it, and keep an account of them, and guarantee that when the temporary work is over they will return?

I thought he was rather impudent in his reply and in his conduct. He is one man I have seen before a Senate committee who, I thought, had very little respect or regard for the laws of this country or for the committee. He replied:

Mr. MOORE. No, sir. You would be doing a thing with a law of that sort that is absolutely against the fundamental principles of this Government, and that is slavery or peonage, and you can not control Mexican labor unless you are empowered in some way to restrain their movements by force.

Senator BLEASE. That is why I am in favor of keeping them out, temporarily or otherwise.

Mr. MOORE. We feel differently about that.

Senator BLEASE. I hope we will be able to make it different, too, so far as I am concerned.

The late Senator Warren of Wyoming appeared before the committee. We all loved him and we all remember him with affectionate regard. His testimony will be found on page 68 of this report. I shall not read it, but call it to the attention of the Senate, so that any Senator who would like to ascertain Senator Warren's views along this line will be able to do so.

The present senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], who is so well and favorably known by all the Senators, likewise appeared before the committee. On page 71 he said:

I can readily understand the attitude of this committee, and I think perhaps we shall have to face the situation as suggested by Senator BLEASE of arrangements for seasonal labor. But I ask the committee in framing such legislation not to make a hard and arbitrary arrangement, because we who live in the neighborhood where these men are employed are not finding them a drawback, and I do not believe any of my friends among the laboring people of my section would object to a seasonal arrangement for this labor.

Further along he said:

In finishing my statement may I say that I am not averse to some restriction.

I merely call attention to these short extracts from the hearing in order to show, Mr. President, that the late Senator Warren and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] and other gentlemen who are very much interested in this matter and who, of course, love their country and have its best interests at heart are not so much opposed to the bill of the Senator from Georgia, provided some arrangement may be made whereby seasonal labor from Mexico may be obtained.

My position, of course, is well known. It is needless for me to repeat it. I am opposed to all foreign labor. I think there are too many foreigners in this country now. If the Federal and State departments would turn out every foreigner that is working in them, and have Government and State work done by home people, and send these foreigners back home, we would have very little unemployment.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BLEASE. I do.

Mr. HEFLIN. I think the Senator is right about that. If we should deport the aliens now in the United States, I do not believe we would have a single American citizen out of employment. I believe that there are 5,000,000 aliens in the United States to-day, and four-fifths of them came here in violation of the immigration law.

Mr. BLEASE. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Just one other thought, Mr. President. There is another way in which we can get rid of this unemployment. There are families in the city of Washington to-day that have four or five members working in the Government service. If we restrict that it will go a long way toward doing away with this unemployment. If a husband is working for the Government and getting a handsome salary, a sufficient salary to support his family, I can not see why his wife should be given a position, and as each child comes along and gets old enough why they should be given positions. I believe in dividing the employment.

For instance, you may find a family here to-day that are in need. They are struggling for a livelihood. If we would let out some of the members of these families that are overburdened with jobs, sitting in Government departments and not doing a thing—some of them smoking cigarettes with their feet cocked up on the desks, as I see them as I go around these departments—and give those jobs to some persons who are out of work, who are just as competent, just as faithful in the performance of their duties, and just as good American citizens—if we would restrict this family monopoly and divide that employment around among people who are in need, I believe that these two things would absolutely settle this question of unemployment.

As I say, I shall not take up the time of the Senate, but I do hope the Senate will pass the bill introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], and give this country some relief from this foreign population that is not worth a cent to it. They do not produce anything. All they do is to consume; and we need producers sometimes, at least.

Give Americans jobs first, and if we have any vacancies after all Americans are employed, then give the aliens the vacant places, or if the Americans refuse to do certain work, give that to the aliens.

Let us feed and clothe those who pay taxes and fight for us in preference to those who get our money and return to their own country and then fight us.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, there are two amendments at the desk that I have offered. One is on line 9, page 2, to change "April" to "June," because the bill will not get through in time for the word "April" to remain.

I ask that that amendment be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 9, after the word "before," strike out "April" and insert "June."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. The other amendment is purely administrative. It does not relate to the quota or anything of the kind. It is offered so that if the bill takes effect on July 1, 1930, it will enable the issuance of visas, and they will not be counted until after July 1.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert in lieu of section 3, on page 2, reported to be stricken out by the committee:

SEC. 3. (a) Section 1 of this act shall take effect July 1, 1930; but (1) for the purposes of the determination, report, and proclamation under section 2, it shall be deemed in effect as of the date of the enactment of this act, and (2) immigration visas may be issued prior to July 1, 1930, to quota immigrants of any nationality hereby made subject to the quota, which visas shall not be valid for admission to the United States before July 1, 1930. In the case of quota immigrants of any such nationality, the number of immigration visas to be issued prior to July 1, 1930, shall not be in excess of 10 per cent of the quota for such nationality, and the number of immigration visas so issued shall be deducted from the number which may be issued during the month of July, 1930. In the case of such immigration visas issued before July 1, 1930, the 4-month period referred to in subdivision (c) of section 2 of the immigration act of 1924 shall begin to run on July 1, 1930, instead of at the time of the issuance of the immigration visa.

(b) The remainder of this act shall take effect on the date of its enactment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The disposal of the two amendments offered by the Senator from Georgia brings to the consideration of the Senate the substitute offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD], does it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that there are two or three other amendments on the table.

Mr. McNARY. 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:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Allen | Frazier | Kendrick | Smoot |
| Ashurst | George | Keyes | Steck |
| Baird | Gillett | La Follette | Steiwer |
| Barkley | Glass | McCulloch | Stephens |
| Bingham | Glenn | McKellar | Sullivan |
| Black | Goff | McNary | Swanson |
| Blaine | Goldsborough | Metcalf | Thomas, Idaho |
| Blease | Gould | Norbeck | Thomas, Okla. |
| Borah | Greene | Norris | Townsend |
| Brock | Hale | Oddie | Trammell |
| Brookhart | Harris | Overman | Tydings |
| Broussard | Harrison | Patterson | Vandenberg |
| Capper | Hatfield | Phipps | Wagner |
| Caraway | Hawes | Pine | Walcott |
| Connally | Hayden | Ransdell | Walsh, Mass. |
| Copeland | Hebert | Robinson, Ind. | Walsh, Mont. |
| Couzens | Heflin | Robsion, Ky. | Waterman |
| Dale | Howell | Sheppard | Watson |
| Deneen | Johnson | Shipstead | Wheeler |
| Dill | Jones | Shortridge | |
| Fess | Kean | Simmons | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The bill is in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. Amendments to the text are in order.

Mr. BLACK obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was going to suggest that I think that under the rule perhaps the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from South Dakota would have priority over other amendments. Does the Senator at this time desire to present his amendment?

Mr. BLACK. I was going to state that I was perfectly willing to present it now or present it later, under the rule.

Mr. McNARY. I think it would be very well if the Senator would present it at this time.

Mr. BLACK. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama proposes an amendment, which will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Alabama proposes to add the following additional sections to the bill:

SEC. 4. Providing that for the period of five years beginning January 1, 1931, the immigration of aliens into the United States is prohibited. This provision shall not apply to aliens of the following classes:

(a) Aliens excepted from the class of immigrants by section 3 of the immigration act of 1924, as amended; and (b) aliens included in subdivisions (a), (b), (d), (e), and (f) of section 4 of such act, as amended, except that no alien in any of such classes shall be admitted to the United States (1) if not otherwise admissible under the immigration laws as in force at the time of application for admission, nor (2) except in the manner and subject to the restrictions now provided by law for admission of persons of such classes.

SEC. 5. The Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall prescribe rules and regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. The provisions of this act are in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of the immigration laws, and shall be enforced as a part of such laws; and all the penal or other provisions of such laws, not inapplicable, shall apply to and be enforced in connection with the provisions of this act. An alien, although admissible under the provisions of this act, shall not be admitted to the United States if he is excluded by any provision of the immigration laws other than this act; and an alien, although admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than this act, shall not be admitted to the United States if he is excluded by any provision of this act.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, it is my understanding that this amendment is acceptable to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I will be very glad to vote for the amendment, as it is in line with views I have expressed heretofore.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I did not understand what the Senator from Georgia said. Does the Senator from Georgia accept the amendment of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Georgia said he would be glad to vote for the amendment, because it is in line with the views he has heretofore expressed.

Mr. JOHNSON. And this is the amendment by which all immigration would be prohibited for the next five years?

Mr. BLACK. That is correct. I do not care to consume much of the time of the Senate, but I want briefly to explain what the amendment is, and its object and purpose. Of course, the Senator from Georgia, as he has stated, does not accept the amendment, because that is a question for the Senate to determine.

Mr. HARRIS. It is entirely for the Senate.

Mr. BLACK. But the Senator states that he will vote for the amendment.

The amendment provides that there shall be no immigration into this country for the next five years, except as noted in section 4, the first section of the amendment. The exceptions are intended to permit the entrance of certain relatives, as provided in the original immigration act, and to permit certain other exceptions as provided in the act, but the amendment generally would prohibit immigration into the country, as a broad policy, for the next five years.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. JONES. Will the Senator kindly point out the exceptions? I do not remember what they are.

Mr. BLACK. I would have to get the law. I will ask that the law be obtained for me while I make a few remarks in connection with the amendment. There are very few exceptions.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. President, I have not studied the Senator's amendment, and do not know that I understand it. May I inquire whether his amendment would affect the two bills which were passed by the Senate this morning, covering very exceptional cases? I do not think those bills ought to be interfered with by this legislation.

Mr. BLACK. This provides for an exception of all aliens included in section 4 of the act as amended, so, of course, "as amended" would refer to any law which had previously gone into effect.

Mr. STEPHENS. I had not heard the reading of the Senator's amendment; therefore the inquiry.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I want to call attention first to this significant statement which I put into the RECORD some months ago, and it is the basis upon which I ask for the passage of this measure. I placed the statement in the RECORD on April 30, 1929. This is a statement which came in a news item from Houston, Tex., as follows:

"UNORGANIZABLE LABOR" OFFERED BY TEXAS

HOUSTON, TEX.—"Unorganizable Mexican labor in inexhaustible numbers can be secured in Texas for new textile mills," says a bulletin which the local chamber of commerce has just mailed to every New England textile manufacturer in an attempt to bring new mills to Houston. "Houston also has available for textile mills over 7,000 native female workers, ranging in age from 18 to 44, who retain enough of the democracy of the 'great open country' to give a day's work for a day's pay," according to the bulletin. Operators in the 12 Texas textile mills receive an average wage of $14.41 for a 55-hour week.

Not only have the textile mills been filled with foreign labor, but foreign labor is at work on the railroads. Foreigners are working on the southern farms in competition with the farmers of the South and of the West. They have penetrated up into the mills of Pennsylvania; they have gone all over this country.

According to the census, there are about fourteen and one-half million aliens in this country to-day, people of alien birth or immediate foreign descent. We owe to them an obligation while they are here, just as we owe one to our citizens. We owe them the duty of protecting them from competition which is unfair and unjust.

It is not necessary for me at this time to make any remarks about unemployment. While there are varying ideas about

the number of unemployed, there is no question but that there are many people walking the streets of practically every city in the United States to-day hungry and in want, and who desire jobs. I was told only yesterday of a man walking the streets of Washington with a sign on his back, a healthy, vigorous-looking man, and the sign said this:

I want a job—anywhere, any kind, any salary.

That is a symptom of the general condition which exists in this country to-day, with millions of men out of employment. There have been several bills offered here—one or two by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]; some by other Senators—but what is the use spending Government money to obtain statistics, to work on the problem, and to raise new revenues from the people, if we are not willing to protect the citizens who are already here, both those who were born here and those who have come from abroad, from competition with further cheap immigrant labor at this time?

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. May I ask the Senator, for my own information, about the second paragraph on the first page? Will he refresh my mind as to what aliens are included in the subdivisions (a), (b), (d), (e), and (f), of whom he speaks?

Mr. BLACK. Suppose I let the Senator have the copy of the law passed in 1924, which has just been handed me. That does not include the amendments. I wanted to make my remarks brief, if possible, and I will ask the Senator to look at this.

I will state this, that if that does not include all the exceptions which are necessary from a humane standpoint, with reference to the coming into this country of a man's wife or his immediate relatives, or something of that kind, I shall not be averse to having it do so. That is what this is intended to do.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator will permit me, I wanted to be sure exactly what the Senator had in mind. I take it that he would not object to the admission of the hearthstone friends, the immediate family?

Mr. BLACK. The immediate family, the minor children, a minor daughter——

Mr. COPELAND. Fathers and mothers?

Mr. BLACK. Those who are immediately next to those now in the country, dependent on them, and recognized in the law to-day as having a preferential right.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator think he has, by the wording of his amendment, excluded them?

Mr. BLACK. It was my intention to do so.

Mr. COPELAND. I will be glad to look over the law and see if I agree with the Senator that he has done so.

Mr. BLACK. Very well.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator one question?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Take the case of the man who works in Detroit, and who, under the existing system, has been permitted to make his home in Windsor, Canada, across the river, and who commutes from day to day; would this summarily exclude him from the country?

Mr. BLACK. A man who is a resident and a citizen of Canada?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. It is my understanding that it would. I would like to state to the Senator that while that raises a very interesting question, I have had a number of letters from Detroit making very serious complaint about that very situation. The writers of these letters claim that the citizens in Detroit are in a bread line, that they are supported, in the main, by the city, thousands, I believe a man has written me, while thousands of people who are not citizens of this country are drawing salaries.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will yield, I think there is no question but that that situation exists, and furthermore, I think there is no question but that it should be corrected. I am wondering about summary dispossession of seven or eight thousand people who have been encouraged to proceed in this fashion in the ordering of their lives.

Mr. BLACK. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that this law would not go into effect immediately. It says "beginning January 1, 1931."

I desire to call the Senator's attention very briefly to the fact that there is nothing novel in this kind of legislation except in the United States. Such laws are in effect in Europe, and the very countries some of whose citizens in this land have objected to the passage of our immigration laws, prohibit an American citizen from holding a job so long as a citizen of their own land is out of employment.

Conceding the fact, which everyone knows to be a fact, that there are many millions of people hungry to-day, walking the streets and thoroughfares of this Nation, what excuse can we give for not adopting the same method to protect the jobs of our citizens which the countries of Europe adopt?

I call the Senator's attention to these striking statements. Germany fixes every year beforehand the number of immigrant land workers to be admitted into that country, and all alien workers must hold a permit from the Government.

Denmark does not admit alien workers unless the national immigration committees, on which labor is represented, find that no native labor is available for the work. Finland compels foreigners to obtain a residence permit from the police if staying longer than three months, and the authorities may dictate the place of residence. Hungary prohibits the entry of alien workers unless they hold a permit from the minister of the interior, and this permit is valid only for work at a specified place and for a specified time; the alien worker may not accept employment elsewhere. Deportation is also provided by the Government of Hungary in the economic interests of the country.

Rumania authorizes the Minister of Labor to prohibit or restrict the entry of alien workers of certain occupations. Rumania also prohibits the employment of a foreign worker unless his employer agrees to take a Rumanian instead if the employment exchange can find him one. In other words, if an American citizen should go to Rumania to-day and should succeed in finding employment, his employer must cancel that contract if a native Rumanian is found to be out of employment who will accept the position. With millions of men in America to-day out of employment, what excuse can we give to the people of the United States if we do not adopt at least a part of the same protective measure that the Governments of Rumania, Hungary, Germany, and other European countries have adopted for the protection of their citizens?

Switzerland prohibits the entry of immigrants to fill jobs until these posts have been advertised in the Federal employment office. In other words, in Switzerland no American can obtain a position until the employment agencies of the Government have first advertised for native citizens and failed to obtain applicants for the position. Alien land workers and domestic servants are admitted for two years only in Switzerland. Yugoslavia has adopted regulations providing that foreign workers who have entered the country since 1922 must hold permits from Government inspectors, and these must only be granted if the workers are really needed. Even South Africa permits its authorities to prohibit any immigrants unsuited to the requirements of the Union on economic grounds.

Some one suggested the other day—I think the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM]—something about Brazil, and stated that we had had no trouble with immigrants from Brazil. Brazil suspends immigration in times of economic depression by ordering her consuls not to issue passports. It is also interesting to note that Arabs, Syrians, Armenians, Turks, and Hindus are excluded from Costa Rica, Panama, Haiti, Natal, and Canada. In other words, other governments adopt legislation to protect their citizens in the employment that gives to them and their children their daily bread.

What is the situation that confonts us? There is an unemployment situation which that man is an optimist who believes will be thoroughly cured by any legislation which has been offered in this body. Machines have driven the laboring men of the country to the wall. With one machine to-day frequently taking the place of 50 laboring men of 10 years ago, with the Nation bowing down at the shrine of efficiency, adopting every conceivable plan to oust some man from employment, we are confronted with a situation which must bring about a change in the policy of our Government.

One State only recently has enacted its old-age pension law. We are on the eve of vast legislative changes with reference to social activity and economic legislation. We do not know how long it may be until a general unemployment insurance will be in effect. But why dig down into the pockets of the people to pay for old-age insurance, for unemployment insurance, and for other kinds of protection to the people who need jobs in the country, so long as we do not adopt the very plan adopted by other governments to protect the vast body of laborers dependent upon the people?

I call upon those who are going to vote upon this matter to bear in mind their constituents. The people of the Nation are opposed to any further foreign immigration in these days of unemployment. The difficulty is not limited to those who were born in this country. I have talked to many men born across the water who have had their jobs taken away from them frequently, after they have been here and demanded fair wages

according to American standards, by newer immigrants imported here for the special purpose of taking their jobs.

I want to say that the legislative representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation does not represent the idea of the farmers of Alabama when he comes before a committee of Congress and opposes legislation at this session intended to put Mexico on a restricted immigration basis. He is not representing the views of the farmers of the Nation when he says that the farmer must have cheap labor. The men in this country on the farms who need protection are the little farmers. Some of them are occupying the farms as tenants. There are others who have bought small farms, with an acreage of 60 or 80 or 100 acres. They are not attempting to import Mexicans to work at a wage which is not a living wage in this country. What we need is not more hands. If we are going to have immigration, we ought to have more citizens.

When it is attempted to put the idea of foreign immigration on the basis of how many hands we can have to work on the plan, we are descending to a level that the American people do not approve. I deny that the people of this land will not perform any duty or any labor for which they can be employed if they are paid sufficient wages There is the trouble. When anyone talks to me about the American not working in the sugar-beet fields, I know immediately that they mean the American will not work there unless he is paid an adequate wage so that he can live in surroundings like decent American citizens demand he shall have. That is the only trouble with the American sugar-beet people. If they are willing to pay the price they can get the employees. That is true of every kind of employment in the country. The American people will work anywhere in any honorable employment if the employer is willing to pay them the price.

My own idea is that the foreign immigration has been utilized by the big business interests of the country as a direct weapon to break down the price of wages of the people of the land. No truer statement was ever made than that the condition of the working people of the country is to be determined by the amount of wages they receive and the amount of necessary commodities those wages will buy. Wages constitute the criterion of the comfort, of the convenience, and of the pleasure of the average citizen of any government. The citizens of this country will work at any honorable employment if they are paid a sufficient wage.

We do not want a caste system in our country. We do not want one class of people to have to live down on a lowly order of intelligence like serfs and peons, with insufficient wages and salaries, while we have at the same time a great aristocratic class in order to uphold the traditions of aristocracy and wealth and power. What this country needs is a class of citizens with intellect, moral character, and the background which comes from a living wage enabling them to live as people are entitled to live in a democracy such as this.

I give Senators the opportunity now to vote for a measure which, at a time of universal unemployment in America, says that no foreign immigration shall come into this country to break down the price of American labor for the next five years. I call attention to the fact that in offering the amendment I am not offering anything novel. Similar provisions have been adopted by Germany, by Hungary, by Rumania, by Switzerland, and by practically all of the European countries. I call on those who have been telling the people of this country that they are opposed to permitting cheap foreign labor to take the places of American labor, and that they are opposed to permitting the big business interests of the country to use foreign laborers to break down the price of American labor, to express themselves on this amendment of mine on the yea and nay vote which I hope to have. That is the proposition.

Do Senators favor keeping the jobs in this country at the present time for those who are here, do they favor keeping those jobs for the 14,500,000 foreigners actually born in foreign lands or of immediate foreign descent who are in this country, do they favor keeping those jobs for those who are born in this land, 100,000,000 or more, or do they favor continuing to let the gates remain down because somebody says we have to have cheap labor from abroad to work on the farm, in the factory, on the railroad, or in the mine? So far as I am concerned, I favor for the next five years closing the gates and keeping this country just as the countries of Europe are attempting to do—for those people who are here in want of jobs, whose children are hungry, whose families are in need; and it can be accomplished if my amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I demand the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I want to invite the attention of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] to his amendment. As I understand it, the amendment is offered to the bill presented by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS]. That bill, as proposed by the Senator from Georgia, permits the admission of persons born in the Dominion of Canada or Newfoundland. They may come in, as I understand it.

Mr. HARRIS. It puts all countries under the quota except Newfoundland and Canada. Personally, I am willing to include them.

Mr. COPELAND. Did the Senator say he was willing to include them?

Mr. HARRIS. I am willing to include them. I will vote for an amendment to that effect.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] has offered an amendment which prohibits for five years the admission of anybody from abroad except from Canada and Newfoundland, with those exceptions. Am I not right?

Mr. BLACK. No; I have not intended to have any exceptions at all.

Mr. COPELAND. This is offered as an amendment to the measure proposed by the Senator from Georgia, and he exempts, from the operation of his exclusion provisions, Canada and Newfoundland.

Mr. BLACK. But I call the Senator's attention to the fact that I have a provision that for the period of five years, beginning January 1, 1931, the immigration of all aliens into the United States is prohibited.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; but it is very significant that in the further wording of the amendment the Senator does not include subdivision (c) of the existing law, which makes an exemption for an immigrant born in Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Mexico, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the Canal Zone, or any of the independent countries of Central or South America. The Senator, however, by presenting the amendment permits the Canadians and citizens of Newfoundland to come in, because he is offering it as an amendment.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is mistaken about that. Section 4 speaks for itself. It says, wholly distinct from the amendment of the Senator from Georgia:

> *Provided*, That for the period of five years beginning January 1, 1931, the immigration of all aliens into the United States is prohibited.

That does not except anyone from Canada and it does not except anyone from Newfoundland.

Mr. COPELAND. Then, the Senator is offering it really as a substitute?

Mr. BLACK. I am not. I am offering it as an amendment to the bill of the Senator from Georgia. It suspends the operation of the quota, even as amended by the Senator from Georgia, for a period of five years. That is the total effect of it.

Mr. COPELAND. And the exemptions would be "an immigrant who was the unmarried child under 18 years of age or the wife of a citizen," "an immigrant who had previously lawfully been in the United States," "an immigrant who continuously for at least two years immediately preceding the filing of his application seeks to enter the United States for the purpose of carrying on the vocation of minister or professor," and so forth, and "an immigrant who is a bona fide student." Those would be exempted from the provisions of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BLACK. That is correct.

Mr. COPELAND. His purpose is to exclude everybody else.

Mr. BLACK. My purpose is to exclude from any country in the world everybody else from coming to America for the next five years to become either citizens or residents.

Mr. COPELAND. That would mean, Mr. President, that if every member of a family save one—and that one might be a young woman 22 years of age—was in this country the one individual could not be admitted for five years.

Mr. BLACK. No; because I can not see but what she would take somebody else's job, just as though she were not related to some one already here. I am offering this as a measure to protect this country from competition, and it does not make any difference to whom she is kin, she can take the job of somebody else.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well; then, let me go a little further. Suppose all the members of a family of the second generation have come to the United States, but the old father and mother are left on the other side; that the family here in America has prospered, and in order that the family here may share its prosperity with the father and mother now on the other side it desires them to come; the Senator would say, "No; you can not come in"?

Mr. BLACK. No; they could come in as visitors.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; for six months.

Mr. BLACK. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. But not as permanent residents?

Mr. BLACK. No. If the Senator thinks we should admit such persons he can offer an amendment to that effect. Of course, if the Senator is against the whole idea there would be no need to try to perfect the amendment according to his idea, but, if he is really in sympathy with and in favor of restricting immigration for five years, then, perhaps, it might be that he could perfect the amendment.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator desires to have the humanities observed and these "fireside" friends received, why does he himself not offer such an amendment to the bill?

Mr. BLACK. As I have said to the Senator, I think there are enough exceptions in the amendment. The exceptions which are provided are those which heretofore have been recognized in the law. Whatever exceptions have been recognized in the law heretofore I am perfectly willing to have included in this measure; but does the Senator favor the idea of preventing everybody else from coming in for five years? I am asking the question merely to secure information so it may be known whether we are trying to get an agreement or whether the Senator is offering these criticisms because he opposes the whole idea?

Mr. COPELAND. I should want to see the bill corrected before I would pass judgment upon whether I could be for it or not. I certainly would oppose it if it means that relatives such as those to whom I have referred would not be permitted to come in for a period of five years.

Mr. BLACK. May I ask the Senator does he think cousins should come in?

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator has excluded cousins.

Mr. BLACK. Does the Senator think I should amend it so as to include cousins?

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator wishes to know whether I favor his proposal or not, I will say no; I do not. That is frank enough, is it not?

Mr. BLACK. That is frank.

Mr. COPELAND. I am anxious to have the bill perfected so that if, by any mischance, it should become a law, at least we will not be doing an inhumane thing to families now here. I see numerous instances of hardship in the working of the law. The Senator does not see them because he has no foreign population in his State, but if he could witness the tears which are shed at my office he might have a different opinion.

Mr. BLACK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is mistaken when he says we have no foreign population in Alabama. I may say to the Senator that the first resolution passed by the American Legion in Alabama for the further restriction of immigration was adopted on the motion of a man who was born in a European country, and he made a very strong appeal for it.

Mr. COPELAND. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment, which I have no doubt the Senator will accept. On page 1, line 8, after the word "amended," I move to insert the words "fathers or the mothers, or the husbands by marriage occurring after May 31, 1928, of citizens of the United States who are 21 years of age or over." Will the Senator accept that?

Mr. BLACK. I will not accept it. It would be up to the Senate to vote for any amendment the Senator may have to offer.

Mr. COPELAND. Then the Senator is not willing to make this a humane measure, but is willing only to exempt the very limited number which he suggests in his amendment. However, if it is in order—and I am not sure whether the amendment is in the third degree—I offer the amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRAZIER in the chair). The Chair will rule the amendment to be in order.

Mr. COPELAND. I offer as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama the language which I have suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to have the amendment to the amendment stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 8, in the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama, after the word "amended" and the comma, it is proposed to insert "fathers or the mothers, or the husbands by marriage occurring after May 31, 1928, of citizens of the United States who are 21 years of age or over."

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, is the amendment of the Senator from New York an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. COPELAND. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON. So that the amendment of the Senator from Alabama will subsequently come up for determination by the Senate.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes. I say frankly that I am opposed to the amendment even as amended, but if we are to pass judgment upon the proposal of the Senator from Alabama I am asking that we preserve the fireside and include fathers and mothers and foreign-born husbands of American citizens.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I have no idea how many people that would include; there has been no investigation made as to that, but I think, so far as the husband feature of the amendment of the Senator from New York is concerned, it will open the door for numerous frauds. There have been frauds in similar cases in the past, according to my information.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the amendment of the Senator from New York would admit as many people as are coming in under the quota and the national-origins plan.

Mr. BLACK. It would probably let in more, according to my view of it, and that is the reason I say I would not want to accept the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, while we are discussing the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, may I suggest to him that the problem that is sought to be solved by the bill of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] is one relating primarily to Mexican immigration. To endeavor now to adopt an entirely new and drastic plan respecting immigration in general will probably render it impossible for the bill of the Senator from Georgia, or any bill having a like purpose which may be adopted by the Senate, ever to become a law. The policy which is sought to be established by the Senator from Alabama is one that is entirely new in character, one that departs radically from the policy that is now in vogue, and one that should have separate consideration upon its merits alone, rather than as an amendment to a bill such as that proposed by the Senator from Georgia. It is because it is a new policy in immigration and because it proposes an entirely different and even more drastic plan than exists at the present time that I do not feel——

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there to let me suggest that a quorum be called?

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, no; I do not yield for that purpose. It is for those reasons, first and primarily, that I can not be at this time, if ever I would be, for the policy suggested by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, in response to the suggestion of the Senator from California I will state that I have had my amendment in the form of a bill pending before the Immigration Committee for three years, but the Immigration Committee have not acted upon it; they have taken no steps of any kind whatever to act upon it. It is my belief that the bill will meet with a hearty response from the citizenship of America. I believe it represents the settled views of the people of this country; I believe that if the people of America could vote upon this question they would vote for it overwhelmingly. I think it is the proper policy. We are getting no particular benefit, so far as I can see, from the admission of 150,000 immigrants a year. It gets down to where it is a question of whether we will have 150,000 or 5,000 or 10,000. What I propose is not in conflict with the bill of the Senator from Georgia; it can not possibly kill his bill, because, if this amendment shall be adopted, it will not prevent the passage of his bill as it is now; and if my amendment shall be defeated by the Senate it will not injure the bill of the Senator from Georgia. My amendment merely proposes to suspend the law for five years. I appreciate fully that the Senator from California is not in favor of the proposed legislation, at least, as he said, at this time, but I can not agree that it will at all affect the legislation proposed by the Senator from Georgia. It certainly can not defeat it, because if there are sufficient votes to adopt this amendment there will be sufficient votes to pass the bill of the Senator from Georgia, and if there are not sufficient votes to adopt this amendment the Senate could still vote for the bill offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, in response to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] I might say, in the language of a distinguished journalist of the West, "All of which is partly true"; but the fact is that we have been dealing here with a specific immigration problem, not with the general immigration problem. We are dealing alone, in reality, with the problem of immigration from Mexico, and when it is sought to adopt an entirely different plan from that which exists as the general

policy of the Nation to-day, of necessity it is going to make more difficult the solution of the Mexican problem that is now being handled by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS].

You can take an instance like my own. I want to aid in the passage of some remedial legislation here. I am not entirely clear as to just what form that remedial legislation in respect to immigration from Mexico should take. I am not entirely clear whether it should take the form of the bill that is presented by the Senator from Georgia, whether the substitute that is presented by the Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD], or whether we should rewrite this bill so that it touches alone the problem of Mexican immigration.

Which of these courses should be adopted I am not entirely clear, but I am perfectly clear that if we seek by this measure to tack on another that is a drastic immigration policy, by which the entire policy that the United States now has adopted shall be changed, and changed in a fashion which will be obnoxious, I am sure, to many Members of the Senate and many Members of the House, we shall simply retard the possibility of the remedial legislation that the Senator from Georgia presents.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, for 10 years I have advocated the policy presented by my colleague [Mr. BLACK]. There are so many conflicting reports about how many people are coming into the United States that something ought to be done to find out definitely just what the situation is in the United States.

If we shall adopt his amendment and shut out all immigrants for five years, there will be no excuse for anybody to come over and say, "I came in under the quota plan." There will not be any quota plan, as far as that goes, for at least five years, if this amendment goes into effect. Then we can keep out everybody. But when some now come over on the ships and land in New York and at other ports, they bring in with them aliens who have no right to come; and I believe that New York is the worst place on the earth for smuggling them in. I believe more come in through that port than all the others combined; and I think that a lot come, and that certain officers who are there to see that they do not land pass them in, and no account is ever taken of them. Thousands come in that way, and to-day we have a miserable situation all around the country with foreigners.

There is a condition in California where the Mexicans are quarreling because the Filipinos are coming down there and interfering with their means of livelihood; so the Filipino question is becoming an acute question in the Senator's great State, and he has my sympathy and best wishes for a right solution of all these questions. The Mexicans are there; they are quarreling with the Filipinos; the Filipinos are quarreling with the Mexicans about jobs, about work that ought to be given to American citizens. Adopt the amendment of my colleague and shut them all out for five years, and let us take stock and see "who is who" in America.

We have had arguments presented here by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the effect that 1,700 Mexicans are coming over in a year. I brought out certain facts in the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I want to read them to the Senate:

> Senator HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wilson suggested that there are 1,700 Mexicans coming into this country annually. I want to read some statistics furnished by this Government and by the Mexican Government showing there have been many more than that. This shows, according to the Mexican migration service, that in 1929 22,643 Mexicans entered the United States.

That is according to the Mexican Government's figures. Now, listen:

> According to the figures of our own Government, in 1929 there were 38,980 Mexicans who entered the United States.

These are the facts; and yet there are a dozen different Senators here who have a dozen different views as to how many are really coming into the United States.

Mr. President, they present a serious problem to America. It has been disclosed in this debate that two and a half million Mexicans have come over and are now in the United States. My God! When will we stop this? In the interest of the American people, I ask again, when are we going to commence protecting our own American stock against an influx of foreigners?

We have our problem of unemployment. We have Americans, natives, with their wives and children, hungry to-day, in distress, because aliens have their jobs and are doing the work at half price. We have Mexicans flowing over the Texas border, the Arizona border, the New Mexico border, and California. They are coming in by the thousands, the tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands. What did Mr. Wilson, the witness from California, say before our committee? Why, he said: "We bring them over, but the railroads come and get them and take them out into the other States."

So, Mr. President, therein lies grave danger to our country. They come to do seasonal work, and, according to Mr. Wilson's testimony, they are taken up by railroads and carried into other States. They are spreading through the Union. They are in all the States to-day but six. It is a serious problem that we have.

Mr. President, when I hear Senators stand here and say that if we pursue this policy we will offend Mexico, we will offend Argentina, we will offend the other South American countries, I am amazed to think that any Senator would be controlled by such argument. I have no patience with it. This country has a right to do whatever it wants to do to protect itself. This country must have immigration laws looking to the good of this country without consulting any other country.

I am going to repeat what I said here the other day: If ever we abandon the idea, if ever we surrender the position that we have the absolute right to do whatever we feel we ought to do on the question, we are undone as a nation; we are lost.

I think Senators ought to consider this question from the standpoint of the good of the American citizen, for the perpetuity of this great Government. But some now talk about some fellow who can produce a peck of prunes out in California or some other place needing seasonal labor, and it is said that he can not get Americans to gather prunes; that Americans can not be induced to go into the vineyards and gather the grapes; that Americans can not be found who will gather the fruit, who will can this fruit, and who will market this stuff. It is not so. They bring this cheap labor over here because it is cheap. They are bringing it here and putting it in competition with American labor. It ought to stop. It must stop.

Mr. President, I want the people back home to watch the votes of the Members of this body. Let us see who votes here for the interest of the big concerns who want cheap labor, and who votes for the interest of the people of the United States who need this protection and who are asking for this legislation. Let us see which side Senators are on.

It has been suggested here, as one of the solutions of some of the problems of the big cities, that as these distressed farmers are driven to the wall in the South and in the West, are having their mortgages foreclosed and are driven from their homes and farms empty handed, these mighty rich are going out and buying up this land by the thousands of acres and the millions of acres for the purpose of bringing over Filipinos and Mexicans who will work for little or nothing and produce food supplies in abundance to be sent into the big cities. These are to be placed in competition with the American farmers of every kind. I am opposed to it, Mr. President. I want to protect my country. I want to see this Government reach out its strong arms and put them around the distressed farmers of the United States. Give these millions of men who are unemployed a chance to get this work, and they will do it.

You say that a few years ago you brought over these aliens and they would not do anything but pick cotton out in Texas. What are they doing now? They are helping to make the crop and to pick the crop; and now they are not only helping to gin the cotton but they are now working in some cotton factories. You have driven the white boy and girl from these cotton factories to make room for Mexicans. What else are you doing? Taking them over to help gather the fruit in California. Is that all they are doing? No; they are helping to make the crop. And what else? They are out building railroads now. They are driving the white men from that kind of employment. And what else are they doing? They have gone into the mines, and the white man must give up his place there. They are working in various things. Why, they are constructing a dam up there somewhere in the Northwest. It cost $6,000,000. It is a nice job for many good men. Mexicans were called in there to do work on that project.

How long will it be before they will be in every avenue and every field of endeavor in America? Let us put a stop to it now. You have the opportunity. Let those who stand for America and the Americans vote right here to-day. If you adopt my colleague's amendment you will go a long way toward solving this problem; and then let us have five years in which to decide what we will do for the future, for the protection of our children and our children's children.

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Allen | Bingham | Borah | Capper |
| Ashurst | Black | Brock | Caraway |
| Baird | Blaine | Brookhart | Connally |
| Barkley | Blease | Broussard | Copeland |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Couzens | Hatfield | Norris | Sullivan |
| Dale | Hawes | Oddie | Swanson |
| Deneen | Hayden | Overman | Thomas, Idaho |
| Dill | Hebert | Patterson | Thomas, Okla. |
| Fess | Heflin | Phipps | Townsend |
| Frazier | Howell | Pine | Trammell |
| George | Johnson | Ransdell | Tydings |
| Gillett | Jones | Robinson, Ind. | Vandenberg |
| Glass | Kean | Robsion, Ky. | Wagner |
| Glenn | Kendrick | Sheppard | Walcott |
| Goff | Keyes | Shipstead | Walsh, Mass. |
| Goldsborough | La Follette | Shortridge | Walsh, Mont. |
| Gould | McCulloch | Simmons | Waterman |
| Greene | McKellar | Smoot | Watson |
| Hale | McNary | Steck | Wheeler |
| Harris | Metcalf | Steiwer | |
| Harrison | Norbeck | Stephens | |

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

Mr. GOULD. Mr. President, there has been long discussion of this immigration matter. I have been a member of the Committee on Immigration since I have been in the Senate, and I am very much interested in the subject of immigration.

I believe that every one of the many amendments which have been offered has some good in it. I believe that all of the immigration measures we have undertaken to pass in the last three years have had some merit in them. But hardly any immigration laws have been enacted. If we have reported a measure from the committee, it has been killed either in the Senate or in the House, as a general thing.

It might be said that the national origins bill was the only one that amounted to anything that went through. That I voted for, but it was only for the reason that I thought it was better than anything else we had had. That was not perfect, to my way of thinking.

Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] introduced a very good bill, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration. It was discussed there and thoroughly considered. I thought it was a very good bill and contained a great many fine provisions. There was not quite enough to it to suit me, but we reported the bill to the Senate.

A little later a bill was sent over from the House called the Johnson bill, which I thought and still think, after hearing all the discussion in the Senate in the last week, is the best immigration bill that has ever been offered since I have been in the Senate. It would not shut out immigration from Mexico, it would not shut out immigration from the Western Hemisphere, entirely; it would allow a reasonable amount of immigration from all countries. It would curtail some of the European and Asiatic elements, but, on the whole, it seems to me that bill is more reasonable than anything else that has been offered, and I have offered it as an amendment to the Harris bill, in the nature of a substitute.

There has been talk of shutting off immigration entirely, but I do not think that will do. First, I do not think it is right, and, next, I know it will not get by the House, so what is the use of putting up something here to be knocked down by Members of the House?

The Johnson bill has gone through the Immigration Committee in the House, it is agreeable to friends of the Box bill, and, so far as I know, there is no opposition to it whatever in the House. It is a good bill, to start with. It would cut down immigration from Mexico from the good many thousands we have been told about in different speeches which have been made, to about 11,000 the first year, and about 7,000 the next year. Then we would go back to the national-origins provision. Two years from now we may have a better understanding as to how many Mexicans are needed in the United States for seasonal labor.

The whole matter has been pretty well aired. I do not believe there is anybody who has not made up his mind as to what he wants to do on this immigration question.

If it is in order, I want to move that we take a vote on my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That motion is not in order at this time. The parliamentary situation is such that amendments to the text of the bill are first to be voted on. After they are disposed of, then the vote would come on the Senator's amendment, or amendments thereto.

The question now is upon the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, it seems to me we should vote first on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Kansas, if the Senator from Alabama will withdraw his amendment temporarily, and then we might vote on the national-origins amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state, first, that, as the Chair understands it, the amendment of the Senator from Kansas is an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Maine. That being so, that amendment will not be voted on until the votes on the amendments to the text of the bill are first taken.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I apologize for taking any time of the Senate in this discussion at this moment, and very briefly will I occupy the Senate.

It is an amazing thing to me that, dealing with a major policy of the United States Government, we can not get a corporal's guard to listen to what is transpiring, and it is with the utmost difficulty, after two or three calls, that we are able to obtain a quorum. Yet I recall to Senators that we are now endeavoring to legislate upon a major policy of the United States Government.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I have noticed that, but I think the reason is obvious. The mind of every Senator is made up on this subject, and has been made up for many, many months, if not years, and that accounts for the paucity of attendance here to-day.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I should be very glad to accept that explanation if I thought the Senate had an adequate conception of the propositions which are presented upon this problem now. Let me recall what is here.

First there is the bill of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS]. The bill was designed originally and is designed at present to deal with Mexican immigration. It deals with it by taking the quota that is now existing and within that quota of 150,000 or thereabouts placing Mexican immigration and giving then to the Republic of Mexico a part of that quota. If I am in error in any particular I ask correction from the Senator from Georgia. But I venture the assertion there is not a Member of the Senate who could tell me how many Mexicans that means can be admitted into the United States nor the basis upon which the computation is made for the admission of those Mexicans.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The Department of Labor estimates that between 1,200 and 1,500 will come into this country if the bill is passed.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator from Georgia says 1,200 to 1,500 will come in from Mexico under the provisions of the bill. Upon what basis is that calculation made?

Mr. HARRIS. It is made on the same basis of calculation that is made for other countries by which we get the 150,000 under the national origins act.

Mr. JOHNSON. But that is made upon the basis of how many Mexicans are here now; of what percentage of those Mexicans; and how is the computation mathematically arrived at?

Mr. HARRIS. I am not familiar with the method of arriving at the computation.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is exactly what I want the Senate to understand. Nobody knows and nobody will tell the Senate. I am willing to accept the dictum of the Senator from Georgia that it means 1,200 or 1,500 Mexicans that will come in here, but upon a subject of this importance I would like to know just how that 1,200 or 1,500 may be computed and how it is that that computation is made by which we arrived finally at the quotient of 1,200 or 1,500. Nobody knows and nobody has told us.

That is the first proposition presented. The next proposition presented is the House bill. It is not a bill that has come to us nor one that has been passed by the House. It is a bill of which Congressman ALBERT JOHNSON, of Washington, is the author, which the House Committee on Immigration has favorably reported to the House, upon which the House has not yet acted, and for which the Immigration Committee of the House has been unable to obtain a rule or a hearing before the House of Representatives. That measure is offered as a substitute for the pending measure of the Senator from Georgia. It has one virtue, I think. It fixes in absolute terms the number of Mexicans who are to come here hereafter. It fixes for the present as a definite quota 2,900 who shall be permitted to come in; and then, very rightly, I think, and very justly, it gives a period of readjustment for 1930 and 1931, so that those industries and those railroads and those activities which are crying against the restriction of Mexican immigration may have the opportunity to adjust themselves to the new conditions.

Let us see how those figures are arrived at, because I have been at some pains to endeavor to get detailed information concerning them. I investigated how the figure "2,900" was arrived at. I find that it is arrived at by giving to Mexico at the ratio of 4 to 1 the number 2,900, the 4 to 1 being arrived

at by taking one departing American to Mexico and saying, "We will give for each American departing to Mexico four Mexican immigrants to the United States," a wholly arbitrary figure, of course. The method of reaching it by a ratio of 4 to 1 creates at once some perplexity—and I see upon the countenances of some of my brother Senators a smile—but at any rate it does arrive at a figure, 2,900. The method of computation is one for which, of course, there is no justification, except the fact that it does enable one to reach a definite figure.

The method of arriving at the conclusion is a bit more exact. Congressman JOHNSON, in order to arrive at what he calls his bonus for the year 1930, takes one-half of those to whom visas have been granted for the last six months of last year. He adds, therefore, for 1930, one-half of those to whom visas were granted to four times as many Mexicans as there are Americans departing to Mexico. For 1930, therefore, he reaches his total number as shown by his bill submitted in the House. For the following year, 1931, he halves the half that he granted for 1930 and adds to 2,900 one-half of one-half of those to whom visas have been granted for the last six months of last year.

That is the mode by which we are arriving at our quotas. I do not know how better we can arrive at them, either by the method employed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] or the method that has been employed by Congressman JOHNSON, of the State of Washington. It must be apparent, because of the fact that Mexicans come across the border in such numbers that no real count is kept of them, that we must take an absolute and arbitrary figure in arriving at any conclusion we draw. But I do not think that until now we have had any explanation upon the floor of the Senate of how these figures were arrived at, and I wanted an understanding upon the part of Senators here before they reach any conclusion and reach any vote upon either the substitute or the bill itself.

In the one instance we have in the House bill a perfectly arbitrary figure with a ratio of 4 to 1, with one-half of those who have visas in the last six months of last year added to that ratio of 4 to 1, as the number which then would be given us for 1930; and for 1931 we had four times as many as there are departing Americans in Mexico for Mexicans in the United States, with one-half of one-half of the visas that were granted during the last six months of last year; and in the other instance we have an undisclosed formula which mathematically can not be worked out and has not been worked out here, resting alone upon a statement of somebody connected with some department that it will give us 1,200 or 1,500 Mexicans coming here in the next year. That is the situation in which this important legislation is presented to us.

I would prefer, could I do it, and I am unable, I confess, mathematically to work out some plan by which we deal with the one point of immigration that is the point which is to-day hazardous to our people and the one that should be remedied—that is, the immigration from Mexico. But I am unable because we do not know the number who are coming here or the number who may come here—I am unable mathematically to work it out with any degree of exactness, and our legislation of necessity, I fear, is dependent upon uncertainty and upon mere estimates such as I have indicated have been made concerning the two measures.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, several Senators have suggested to me that they would prefer that I withdraw my amendment temporarily in order that the vote might first be taken upon the national origins amendment and the substitute dealing with the bill of Congressman JOHNSON of Washington. It is said that it would be more logical to do that, and therefore I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment temporarily for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would state that if an amendment in the nature of a substitute is agreed to, no further amendment could be offered to the text of the pending bill as in Committee of the Whole, but the amendment could be offered when the bill is in the Senate.

Mr. BLACK. That is all right. I ask permission now to withdraw my amendment in order that I may meet the desires of several Senators who prefer to take up the other matters first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has the right to withdraw his amendment. The amendment of the Senator from Alabama is withdrawn.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be reported.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 19, insert the following as an additional section at end of the bill:

SEC. —. That with respect to quotas after June 30, 1930, for any nationality other than those within section 4 (c) of the immigration act of 1924 (43 Stat. L. 153), such provisions of that act, or any act amendatory thereof, as relate to quotas based on national origins (as referred to in subdivision (b) of section 11 of such act) are hereby repealed; subdivision (a) of section 11 of the immigration act of 1924 (which provides for quotas based on the United States Census of 1890) is amended by striking out the figure "2" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "1½"; and the quotas for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1930, and for each fiscal year thereafter shall be determined and proclaimed (including any annual revision thereof, if necessary) in the same manner as such act prescribed for quotas for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1924, and shall be final and conclusive for every purpose.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, in explanation of the amendment, it proposes certain changes in the present immigration law. It deals only with the quotas from the Eastern Hemisphere. The amendment is carefully drawn, it has been submitted to the Solicitor of the Department of Labor, and it fits into the law.

It proposes two things: First, to get away from that system which gives us a large immigration from the non-self-governing countries. In other words, it gives a larger quota to northern Europe, or rather it goes back to the same basis upon which we were proceeding prior to July 1, with one exception. A horizontal cut of 25 per cent is proposed. In other words, our ratio will be 1½ per cent instead of 2 per cent. That is all that is proposed.

With that explanation I will rest except to say that it was hoped by the advocates of the national-origins theory that we would have some certain results following the taking effect of the law on July 1 last. However, we have been disappointed. I think everyone in the Senate agreed that the best immigrants from the British Isles were highly desirable and the idea was to give them a larger quota. Two things are very apparent: First, that they are not going to use all of their quota; and, second, as the Senator from Kansas [Mr. ALLEN] said, they have such shifting processes over there and such opportunities in their own dominion that protects them, Canada and Australia having been added. The Senator from Kansas well said that the shifting interests over there would give the United States the culls of the immigration from that country.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. NORBECK. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. What countries are affected by the Senator's amendment?

Mr. NORBECK. It will reduce the Italian immigration and it will reduce the German immigration. It will increase the Scandinavian quota. For instance, Denmark had a quota of 3,000 up to July 1, and we cut that down to 1,000. This amendment will allow them 2,000. It takes that number away from other countries to the south. It will reduce the British quota somewhat, but still leave them as much as they evidently want to use. It will absolutely prevent the Jamaican negro from coming in here under the English quota as an Englishman, because it will cut down that quota so that the opportunity is not there. It will get away from some of the abuses possible under the present law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK].

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am not just clear about what is accomplished by the Senator's amendment. I take it to mean that the national-origins plan is repealed?

Mr. NORBECK. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. And that then the quota, instead of being 2 per cent, is reduced to 1½ per cent. Is that correct?

Mr. NORBECK. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. So we would go back to the law of 1924?

Mr. NORBECK. We would go back to the only restrictive immigration law that was ever enforced, namely, the one which was in force up to July 1 of last year.

Mr. COPELAND. And the significance of it is that the national origins law is repealed?

Mr. NORBECK. Yes; and there is substituted therefor a plan under which the percentage of the nationals of a given nation in this country at a certain time shall be the guide.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator make any reference to the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. NORBECK. None whatever.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, my time has been so occupied with other legislative matters, particularly with appropriation

bills, that I have not had the opportunity I should have liked to go more deeply into the question of immigration, but I feel that I should make a short statement with reference to the situation in the Rocky Mountain region.

My home State, Colorado, and the neighboring State of New Mexico, have large populations of Mexicans. Many of them have been there for years; in fact, some of the families have been there for generations. They are a law-abiding, frugal, hard-working class of people, who make good farmers, good herdsmen, and are really the backbone of the farming and stock-raising element of those two States, at least.

The class of Mexicans that come into that region for seasonal labor is about the same as those who have been long-time residents of that section; in other words, undesirables do not wish to come in and do not seek to come into what is known as the sugar-beet region for the purpose of finding employment. But those who are desirous of working in the sugar-beet fields and to a certain extent on the railways do find employment. However, they are not adapted to the performance of mechanical labor, and they do not enter into competition with skilled labor to any extent; in fact, very rarely, unless the cultivation of sugar beets may be called skilled labor. In many respects, sugar-beet cultivation is skilled labor, because very few people who follow it learn how to do the work properly. The Mexicans will work in the beet fields, and they do so successfully, to the satisfaction of their employers; and, as I have indicated, cause no trouble in the communities in which they are temporarily located.

The sugar-beet industry is a large and growing one in the western tier of States. It is expected that it will develop even more largely. Where are those who are interested in that industry to find labor in the event the laborers who have been coming and are now coming to those States from Mexico shall be shut out is very much of a problem.

When our sugar-beet farmers have been short of Mexican labor they have attempted to get it from the Southern States. They have tried out colored labor, but while the rates of pay are much higher in the sugar-beet fields than in the Southern States, colored men do not care to cultivate or pull or top sugar beets. At the same time we find that the people in the Southern States who are employers of colored labor have very serious objections to allowing such labor to go away from them. In fact, there have been instances when groups of colored workers have been gotten together and even the trains have been arranged for their transportation, the citizens of the community where those workers had gathered have risen practically in arms and prevented the departure of the railway trains that had been chartered to carry those colored laborers to the sugar-beet fields.

Mr. President, the Mexicans do not, in one way, intermingle with the American citizens or with white families. It is rare, indeed, for a Mexican to marry a white girl, though occasionally white men marry Mexican girls. As I have stated, the State of Colorado has experienced no trouble from the standpoint of keeping law and order among the Mexicans who are residents, or among the Mexicans who come to our State for seasonal labor. Undoubtedly undesirables may congregate in some of the larger cities, such as Los Angeles or San Antonio, and perhaps, even in St. Louis and Chicago, where it is said some have penetrated. I am quite sure, however, they do not centralize in Denver. They have found employment and they take it when they come there.

It has been said that the Mexicans who work in the beet fields are practically in a state of slavery; that is to say, they are not paid enough, that their families work, that the women and the children also work. Mr. President, I can say from observation, extending over a period of nearly 30 years, that the Mexicans who come to Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming for seasonal labor live much better than they do in Mexico. They live in the way they do because they do not want to incur any greater expenditure, but they earn enough so that with six or eight months of seasonal labor they can go back to their own country and, without working, support themselves and live on what they have earned in the United States for a period of a year or two.

The Mexican labor in the West is higher paid than is labor in the Southern States. It is true that in many instances when the sugar-beet harvest is over the Mexican laborers return to Oklahoma or to Texas, stopping there during the period of the cotton harvesting, when their labor is very much needed and has been used to very great advantage.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President——

Mr. PHIPPS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. KENDRICK. Does the Senator from Colorado consider Mexican labor, when employed in the cultivation of sugar beets, to be cheap labor?

Mr. PHIPPS. I do not, as the per diem rate, which is paid, is high.

Mr. KENDRICK. I desire to ask the Senator another question. Does the Senator know of any instances in which Mexican labor employed in the cultivation of sugar beets has competed with white labor in that kind of employment?

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, on the contrary, it is practically impossible to find any white labor or any white men who will engage in the business of cultivating sugar beets. When I say "cultivating sugar beets" I refer to the planting, the thinning, the pulling, the topping, and the loading of the beets, which is all hard, manual labor. It may be that the farmer owning the ground will do the plowing for the planting, that he will do the harrowing of the ground, and when the harvest is ready that he will use cultivators to loosen up the earth around the beets or perhaps an up-to-date machine which will actually plow under the beet and throw it to the top of the ground so that it may be picked up without the old-time labor of pulling. But that all means work requiring stooping and bending over; it has to be carried along very steadily, so that it is really very arduous. It is, however, highly paid labor. As compared to the wages received by ordinary laborers working on the roads, on a ditch, or on a railway, laborers in the sugar-beet fields are paid much more than those employed as gang workers on any railway, and yet our western railways need some of that kind of labor. I have here a telegram from the president of the Denver & Rio Grande Railway in which he states it "would be disastrous to railroad, agricultural, and industrial interests in Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico" if congressional action restricted this labor.

Mr. President, without reading the entire telegram, I ask that it may be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., *October 3, 1929.*

Hon. LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,
*United States Senator from Colorado, Washington, D. C.:*

Understand movement on foot to restrict by congressional action immigration of Mexican laborers. This would be disastrous to railroad, agricultural, and industrial interests in Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico section men. Extra gang laborers, sugar-beet, and other farm laborers, herdsmen, and common laborers in other industries drawn very largely from this source and can not possibly be recruited from other sources. Mexicans skillful in these branches in which other nationalities will not engage. Shortage of labor in this class bound to result in serious curtailment in production and in transportation earnings and would constitute grave menace to the industrial progress of these States. Earnestly hope you will use your influence in opposition to such legislation.

J. S. PYEATT,
*President Denver & Rio Grande Western Railway.*

Mr. PHIPPS. In that connection I also have a letter from Mr. Carl R. Gray, who is the president of the Union Pacific system. His letter is at more length, but it is along similar lines. Both of these railway presidents point out that if the use of Mexican labor shall be restricted it will be cut down the cultivation of beets and the production of sugar, and will also cut down railway freight. Of course, in connection with the production of sugar beets not only is there involved the transportation of the beets and the resultant sugar but also fuel, coal, lime, rock, and other things that are essential in the manufacture of the sugar itself, must be transported. I ask that the letter from Mr. Gray may be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION PACIFIC SYSTEM,
*Omaha, Nebr., October 8, 1929.*

Hon. LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,
*United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR PHIPPS: I feel it a duty to call to your attention a very serious situation with respect to the common-labor supply in the West and Southwest. Advices from the Imperial Valley in California indicate that the recent fruit crop was very seriously affected by this shortage, and that the growers will be compelled, unless relief is afforded, to materially restrict their acreage next year, and it seems probable at this time that a considerable portion of the cotton crop in the Yuma, Ariz., and Imperial Valley sections will not be gathered.

Our reports are that in Utah and Idaho extreme difficulty is being encountered in securing labor for the harvesting of sugar beets and potatoes, both fundamental crops in those States. And in central California there is a labor shortage which is affecting the harvesting of grapes and deciduous fruits notwithstanding a material reduction in such crops through unfavorable weather conditions, and will undoubtedly affect in all these territories the harvesting of vegetables next season, which form a considerable part of the food supply of the Nation.

The railroads are also experiencing the same shortage, and during this fall have found it impracticable to hold up their usual programs of maintenance.

While it is our information, and observation of our people who are closely in touch with the situation, that there is an actual and permanent shortage of native American labor throughout the West, where the demand for construction, road-improvement work, and the like, is currently absorbing the supply, the primary reason for the shortage lies in the restrictions which have been placed upon the immigration of Mexican labor, which has heretofore been the backlog of these seasonal operations in the highly perishable products. While the shortage has not yet seriously affected the central West, it has already done so to an extent indicating that the labor supply in these sections also will be greatly reduced, and it is without exaggeration a very serious matter.

I am informed that legislation with respect to the importation of Mexican labor is contemplated, and I venture to bring the matter to your attention and to express the earnest wish that you will, in the interests not only of these localities, but of the Nation at large, give personal consideration to the postponement of any further legislation until all of the facts can be secured. The western division of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at a meeting in Ogden on October 1, memorialized the President and advocated the appointment of a committee to ascertain the facts prior to the enactment of any legislation.

Very truly yours,

CARL R. GRAY.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, the telegrams and letters which I am presenting have been selected from numerous communications I have received from time to time. I have a communication from the Holly Sugar Corporation, whose headquarters are at Colorado Springs, Colo., in which they state that the passage of the Harris bill or a substitute will result in materially increasing the cost of growing sugar beets, by which I think they mean that they will have by some means to find other labor and pay higher prices for it than they are to-day paying or have been paying for Mexican labor. I should like also to have that telegram included in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *April 8, 1930.*

Senator LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,

*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Unquestionably the passage of Harris bill or substitute will result in materially increasing cost of growing beets to the beet farmers in Colorado. We urge you give serious consideration to the effect that passage of this bill would have on a large number of the citizens of your State.

HOLLY SUGAR CORPORATION.

Mr. PHIPPS. I have before me a letter from the president of the Nevada-California Electric Corporation, which was sent to me last fall, relating to the trouble that was caused by putting into operation the amendment to the immigration law of March 4, 1929. It seems in consequence of the passage of that act that the labor authorities practically threw a scare into Mexicans who had become bona fide residents of the United States, although they had not as yet taken out citizenship papers. Many of them, fearing that they would first be thrown into jail for illegal entry into the United States and then deported, packed up their possessions and skipped across the border back into Mexico, although in so doing they were violating the laws of Mexico and taking a risk in that connection.

The attention of the Labor Department was called to this matter, and I believe that trouble has been straightened out, but I feel that this correspondence is worth while, and I ask that it may be included in the RECORD.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE NEVADA-CALIFORNIA ELECTRIC CORPORATION,
*Denver, Colo., September 19, 1929.*

Hon. L. C. PHIPPS,

*Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I herewith inclose two clippings from the Calexico Chronicle dealing with the labor shortage in Imperial Valley resulting from the enforcement of the new immigration law passed March 4, 1929.

While I question whether there is anything that you could do in the matter, yet I feel you should know something of the situation that exists. Due to the climatic condition that prevails in Imperial Valley during the summer months, it is very difficult to find white labor, and as a result the valley is dependent to a very large degree upon Mexican labor. Formerly there were many Hindus and Japanese in the valley. Immigration laws, as well as other restrictive measures, have resulted in driving from the valley the latter races, so that the valley is to-day almost entirely dependent for common labor on Mexicans. You can readily see the serious situation now confronting the valley resulting from the cutting off of the Mexican supply.

Sincerely yours,

A. B. WEST, *President.*

[From the Calexico Chronicle, September 12, 1929]

DISTRICT IN APPEAL TO UNCLE SAM—LABOR SHORTAGE IN VALLEY DUE TO STRINGENT BORDER METHODS

The Imperial irrigation district to-day advised the United States immigration authorities in Washington of the need for immediate consideration of Mexican immigration question in order to relieve valley labor shortage.

Arthur Williams, superintendent of the Calipatria division of the district, says he is seriously handicapped in the operation of his division because of labor shortages, which, he told the board, are becoming more and more acute as the immigration men continue to search Mexican labor camps and deport Mexicans who are unable to produce evidence of legal entry into the United States.

"Some of my oldest men are being taken from field gangs by the authorities. The worst feature of the situation is that other Mexicans are frightened off the job for fear that they will be deported," Williams said.

CALIPATRIA SUFFERS

The north end superintendent declared that he has only 20 men on his pay roll at present, which is about half the number required for field labor. He asked that the directors give attention to the matter of effecting a remedy. Superintendent Hartzog, of the Holtville division, is similarly handicapped, according to Director Mark Rose.

The irony of the labor dilemma appeared in a statement made before the board by Director C. W. Brockman, of Calexico, who states that across the boundary line in Mexico there is an oversupply of labor. "The situation in Lower California is just the reverse of ours on this side," Brockman said. "In Mexicali there are bread lines formed every day, and through Governor Rodriguez's orders hundreds of Mexicans are given food without charge. These men are all anxious to work, but they can't get over the line. Several have attempted that and have been deported."

RUGULATIONS TOO STRICT

Another serious angle of the problem was indicated by Director Ira Aten and W. O. Blair, who told of instances in which either the man or his wife had been deported while a large family of children were left in the United States to become dependent.

Director Rose made a motion calling for a resolution addressed to United States immigration authorities in Washington, as well as to Senator HIRAM JOHNSON and Congressman PHIL SWING, and setting forth the situation and asking for relief.

"Unless there is some effective action taken shortly, Imperial Valley, heavily dependent upon Mexican labor for harvesting its vegetable crops, will suffer seriously this winter," Rose declared.

[From the Calexico Chronicle, September 13, 1929]

VALLEY LABOR SHORTAGE IS DUE TO LAW—RISK OF PROSECUTION FOR ILLEGAL ENTRY STOPS HUNDREDS—HADLEY EXPLAINS LAW—ERRONEOUS INTERPRETATION CAUSES MANY MEXICANS TO GO SOUTH

An explanation of the immigration activities regarding which the Imperial irrigation district directors have sent a request to Washington was this morning made to the Chronicle by Maj. Herbert Hadley, in charge of the Calexico immigration office.

"The present shortage of labor in Imperial Valley," said Inspector Hadley, "is due primarily to the new law which was passed March 4, 1929, and which went into effect on July 1. That law made illegal entry into the United States subject to prosecution. Heretofore it was subject only to deportation.

"To-day any alien illegally crossing the boundary line must be placed in jail, given a hearing, and if he has crossed illegally he is subject to a fine or imprisonment and deportation. This deportation under prosecution means that he may not again apply for admission into the United States and he is not again eligible to a crossing card."

PROSECUTION THROWS SCARE

Mr. Hadley also explained that before this law went into effect the local immigration force was not large enough to permit close scrutiny of line crossings, but the force has been increased by the department on account of the new law. Now, men and their families who formerly gained entrance through crossing cards on the supposition they were entering Calexico to go shopping and then spent a season working in the vegetable fields of the valley are not running the risk of being caught making illegal entry and stand prosecution and jail confinement, and are not coming over as they formerly did.

It appears also that, through misunderstanding of the new law, many Mexican families who have lived in the valley on the American side for years are becoming frightened, fearing that if caught on this side they will be subject to prosecution in addition to deportation.

This is not a fact, however, according to the law which applies only to those found making illegal entry. If the families have illegally entered and are then found on this side, they are subject to deportation and not to prosecution.

SMUGGLE TO MEXICO

The above misunderstanding is believed by Inspector Hadley to be causing many Mexican families to actually smuggle themselves back into Mexico. They fear being found on this side. They are now laying themselves liable to Mexican arrest through making illegal entry into their own country.

Major Hadley believes the directors of the Imperial irrigation district may have mistaken the activity of the Immigration Department for an unwarranted activity by immigration men and hastens to explain a condition in justice to his men and to the Immigration Department. Although the terms of the new law have been published variously erroneous rumors originating in the valley have misled some of the public officials and laymen in their understanding of the regulation, he believes.

Mr. PHIPPS. In conclusion, I feel that the Harris measure as proposed is one which should not be enacted into law at the present time. I think it would have a very serious effect upon our relations with the countries to the south of us—not only Mexico and Central American countries, but the South American countries as well.

We have really had under way for some time what might be called a definite campaign for the cultivation of our relations with our South American neighbors through the interchange of commerce. In order to introduce the goods which we manufacture, and others which we raise agriculturally and of which we have a surplus for exportation, we have been endeavoring to cultivate the most friendly relations; and at the same time we are not only seeking to sell to these countries, but we are trying to increase our purchases of the things which they produce and which we do not ourselves make. It seems to me that an attempt at this time to fix a definite limit on the number of citizens who might come to us from any one of these South American and Central American countries would not be looked upon as a friendly act. It would be taken as an unfriendly gesture. It would have the effect of undoing much that has already been done to bring about interchange of commerce between the countries of the North American and the South American continents.

I do not myself see the necessity for imposing a fixed number or quota upon any of these countries at the present time. Where I think we have been weak, where I think the system to-day is susceptible of improvement, is in the matter of selection. I feel that wider and greater authority should be given to our diplomatic representatives abroad to pass upon the visa of passports of those desiring to come to the United States, with a view to excluding the undesirables. If we could keep out, as I believe we could, those whom we would class as undesirable who are now coming across the border of Mexico through the ports of entry into the United States, the complaints that have been made regarding this immigration would be disposed of and disappear.

Naturally, as I stated before, the undesirables go to the large centers and the big communities. They do not go out on the farms. They are not coming here to work at all. That is not their idea. They are coming to a center where they can gamble, and find some one who is susceptible and has a little loose money that they can get away from him.

If we are to fix a definite quota on Mexico and admit a fixed number of their citizens through our ports of entry, what are we going to do about the 1,800 miles of border that are not guarded, that can not be efficiently patrolled, and over which people can come from Mexico with very little difficulty, if any at all? It merely means the cover of night to get across the line; and when they do come in that way they come, as a rule, with their bedding which can not be inspected or examined, whereas that coming through the port of entry in many cases has to be fumigated. We have had the boll weevil caught right in our ports of entry on the Mexican border. We have had other insects that are undesirable also disposed of by fumigation of the bed clothing and other clothing of these immigrants.

Mr. President, I can not feel that it is a wise move at this time to make any change in the matter of immigration regarding any of the countries to the south of us, and certainly not with relation to our friendly neighbor on the northern border.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, a little later on I shall offer an amendment to the pending bill or the substitute bill, as the case may be, providing for seasonal agricultural labor in the United States. As suggesting the need of such labor, I send to the desk a newspaper story with regard to the views of Mr. Legge, chairman of the Federal Farm Board, which I ask to have read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

[From the United States Daily of February 11, 1930]

MR. LEGGE SUGGESTS SEASONAL PERMITS FOR MEXICAN LABOR—FARM BOARD HEAD GIVES IMMIGRATION VIEWS; AGENT OF COTTON GROUP ASKS RESTRICTION

Seasonal permits for Mexican peon labor in the fruit and trucking sections of the Southwest were suggested by the chairman of the Federal Farm Board, Alexander Legge, at a hearing before the House Immigration Committee February 10. The hearing was called for further consideration of the Johnson, Box, and Bacon bills (H. R. 8530, H. R. 8523, H. R. 8702), which would apply quotas to all American countries and thereby limit Mexican immigration to approximately 50,000 a year.

Mr. Legge told the committee he had no definite proposal to advance, but felt that the labor problem in the Southwest was serious enough to warrant careful consideration and investigation. A serious situation would arise, he predicted, if Mexican peon labor should be denied growers who are dependent on it at this time. Much of the farm work in the Southwest, he added, is of such a nature that American workers are not suited to it.

SERIOUS RESULTS FORECAST

If Mexican immigration is seriously restricted, Mr. Legge continued, many fruit and truck growers of the Southwest will be forced to turn to cereals, which, he said, already were being produced in surplus quantities.

J. H. Patten, representing cotton interests in South Carolina and the Immigration Restriction League of New York, said that importation of cheap Mexican labor was "driving thousands of small American farmers out of business." The situation is analogous to that "arising from negro slavery in the South," he asserted.

"Many small planters who could not afford to buy slaves were ruined, and if Mexican peon labor is not restricted the same situation will arise in the near future," he said.

Mr. Patten estimated the number of Mexicans now in the United States between 1,500,000 and 2,000,000. "And illegal entries," he said, "are far in excess of legal admissions, according to my information."

Mexican laborers are driving American farm workers out of the Southwest, he said, and are ruining cotton planters of the Southeast through overproduction.

In discussing conditions in South Carolina, he said that fully 100,000 American farm laborers could be immediately mobilized at a salary not exceeding $1 per day.

"I have no definite remedy to suggest," he explained. "I am here only to urge that some method of restricting Mexican immigration be worked out."

* * * * * * *

A written statement filed with the committee by Mr. Legge follows in full text:

"Complying with your request, I am glad to give you what information I can on the subject, referring particularly to the agricultural labor supply of the extreme southwestern districts. Quite a number of fruit and vegetable growers in that area have from time to time appealed to different members of the Farm Board, as they are naturally very much concerned over how they are to meet the labor situation if the immigration quota is to be applied to Mexico.

PROBLEM IS DIFFICULT

"It is my belief that these people have a very difficult problem to deal with if they are to continue to produce the kind of products which they have been producing in the past. This kind of labor is never very attractive because stooping, bending, and working on the knees is involved in weeding and thinning the kind of crops which many of these people find is most profitable to raise. In this area it is particularly difficult because of the extreme heat during much of the growing season. In some sections, particularly the Imperial Valley, this condition is such that the average American-born laborer simply can not stand the work which has to be done.

"The Farm Board is naturally interested, and in much of this territory we feel that if those people can not obtain labor which will enable them to continue raising the vegetables and small crops the land will probably be devoted to cereals, of which the country now produces a very great excess, and on which we are putting forth our best efforts to try to curtail the acreage. On the other hand, the best grown crops in that area, such as cantaloupes, head lettuce, and so forth, that mature at a very early date, seem to find a profitable market.

TONNAGE IS VERY LARGE

"As you gentlemen are doubtless aware, the tonnage of this product is very large. If these people were compelled to switch to other crops like wheat and barley, the change would be a bad one not only for them but for the growers of these commodities in other sections.

"More of these cereals are now being produced than can be marketed on a profitable basis. As to how to deal with the situation, I have no suggestion to offer except that I believe the situation to be sufficiently

serious to justify very careful study and investigation of the whole subject on your part before a program of action is worked out.

"Perhaps the most nearly comparable situation to this was the position of the employers of foundry labor when the immigration restrictions were first put into effect. This was another class of labor to which the American-born boy did not take kindly.

MACHINERY IS SUBSTITUTED

"In most sections of the country the foundry employers have worked this out in part by substitution of mechanical equipment and perhaps to a greater extent by substitution of forging, stamping, and press work in the making of parts for which castings were formerly used.

"In the case of these agricultural employers, however, so far very little has been accomplished in the replacing of this kind of labor by any mechanical process. The weeding and thinning of root crops is something on which very little has been, or, so far as I can see, can be accomplished through mechanical equipment. Therefore, for this class of production the grower is still dependent almost wholly on hand labor, which he must obtain from some source."

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, I am in favor of restricting Mexican labor. Let there be no mistake on that point. Also I am in favor of restricting it for any and every other purpose except agricultural production, for the reason that in so far as I know there is an adequate number of our own people to supply the needs of any and all kinds of industrial labor. In this case it is only a question of price.

As Mr. Legge has pointed out, there are seasons in the West and Southwest when if we are denied relief through labor of this kind for agricultural products, it simply spells disaster to our agricultural crops. As Mr. Legge has said, in that event those who produce special crops will be driven to the production of cereals. Also, as he has stated, the crops requiring relief through the admission of seasonal agricultural labor are largely confined to truck farming, fruit growing, and sugar beets. Of the special crops there is an undersupply. Of the cereals there is an oversupply. So if our farmers are compelled to turn from the one form of production to the other, they will simply increase the present oversupply of the one and increase the shortage of the other.

As suggested by Mr. Legge, the emergency growing out of a shortage of labor is due entirely to the objectionable character of the work, the painstaking care of thinning and weeding small, tender plants, which involves bending, stooping, and even crawling on hands and knees, imposing as it does the sheerest form of drudgery. The result is our own people decline to engage in such work.

The temporary employment of alien labor does not mean cheap labor. As a rule, the problem is to secure any kind of labor at any price. The handling and process of reducing the beets into sugar, as well as the feeding of the by-products to livestock, is all done solely and entirely by our own people and no alien is given such employment. While our people do not compete for the work of cultivation, on the other hand, under the present system, the work done by aliens actually serves to provide greater opportunities of profitable labor for our own people.

Mr. President, the Members of this body who speak for their own States probably understand the problems of those States, but I insist they do not understand the problems of the Northwest. The sugar-beet crop is the best money crop we have in the Northwest and Rocky Mountain country. It is the only crop with which we of the Rocky Mountain region can secure the funds to return to the Federal Government the cost of our reclamation projects.

Mr. President, there is no reason in the world why these people should not be allowed to come in under such restrictions as will guarantee their return to their own country at the end of a stated period. This amendment I propose to offer will guarantee that they be returned under bond. I say further, and as evidence of good faith that they would be returned, is the fact that it would be in the interest of agriculture and agricultural production to have them returned, because when they come here without restraint and restriction, they go into other lines, they go into the industries, and turn away from the cultivation of agricultural crops. Failure to obtain this relief would, I believe, greatly injure the production of other special crops; it would practically eliminate the production of the sugar-beet crop in the northwest country.

So far as I know, no good reason can be given why these people should not be allowed to come in at stated periods and do this work and return to their own country, and there is every reason why they should be allowed to come in.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KENDRICK. I yield.

Mr. JONES. As I understand it, the Senator proposes that some immigrants should be brought into the United States from Mexico for a limited time.

Mr. KENDRICK. Eight months.

Mr. JONES. And then should be returned to Mexico. How would the Senator prevent their going wherever they wanted to go when they got inside of this country, and how would he compel their return to Mexico? I would like to know how that could be done.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, the plan I have in mind would provide a guaranty, under bond, that they should be returned. Moreover, the bond can be provided by either communities of farmers, or by those providing the labor for such communities. These people could come into the country at moderate cost, and be returned the same way. As a matter of fact, it is my opinion now that a very much larger percentage of them do return to Mexico after they have been employed in our fruit and vegetable and sugar-beet production, than anyone is aware of. I think the records shown by the Senator from Arizona the other day indicated clearly that the number returning now is almost equal to the number of those coming into the country.

Mr. JONES. It may be true that many of those who come here voluntarily go out voluntarily, but, as I understand, the Senator's proposition is to have somebody, possibly, give a bond to see that those who come to the United States go back to their native countries. Suppose a man who comes here does not want to go back. He has not given any bond. Is the Senator going to keep him under the control of some individual over here; in other words, put him in bondage while he is here?

Mr. KENDRICK. Not at all.

Mr. JONES. I do not see how the Senator would provide for their going back unless he would do that.

Mr. KENDRICK. The man would come in under contract to do work in agricultural production, and the amendment provides that when he violates that contract he shall be returned at once, without regard to whether or not the time is up.

Mr. JONES. Between whom is the contract made?

Mr. KENDRICK. It is a joint arrangement, either by communities or by individuals. Nearly every farm community in the country to-day is organized. Nearly every community is organized to sell its farm products, and they could easily provide this labor under those conditions, without violating any law we have at the present time.

Mr. JONES. Does the Senator mean that this labor will be bound to the community and that the community can take it back?

Mr. KENDRICK. It would not. The amendment provides that "the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, under such regulations as he, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, may prescribe," may admit these aliens.

Mr. JONES. Then the condition is laid down by the Secretary of Labor upon which any individual will come in. Does he impose that condition on every individual and hold each individual responsible?

Mr. KENDRICK. He would.

Mr. JONES. Suppose he does; suppose when the individual gets here he leaves the community and goes somewhere else. Is the Government to go to the expense of hunting him up and arresting him and carrying him back to Mexico?

Mr. KENDRICK. All that would depend upon the arrangement and the terms laid down by the Secretary of Labor. I call the attention of Senators to the provision of the amendment, in effect, that the Secretary of Labor shall permit no alien laborers to come into the country when our own people can be found to do the work.

Mr. JONES. That is all true, but I can not conceive of the Secretary of Labor entering into a contract with these peons, as they are referred to, that class of labor, which he can enforce, and get them out of the United States if they do not comply with the contract. I doubt whether that could be carried out.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KENDRICK. I yield.

Mr. BLEASE. In answer to the Senator from Washington, when I made the suggestion in the committee to which I referred this morning, when Senator Warren was there, my idea was to have the Government, through the Secretary of Labor, as the Senator from Wyoming has just suggested, issue a permit to these people to come over under the condition that the man for whom they were to work would furnish a bond to hold the Government harmless in any expense we might be put to in order to see that those people were returned at the proper time.

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

Mr. KENDRICK. I yield.

Mr. GOULD. I might answer from actual experience the question the Senator from Washington has just propounded to the Senator from Wyoming. This might not apply to what the Senator from Washington had in mind, but I suggest this as an answer.

The Secretary of Labor has instructed the immigration officers along the boundary line of Canada, whom we have all along there, that where a responsible man wants to bring over laborers for picking potatoes, for instance, or for mill purposes, or for handling pulpwood, or anything of that kind, when the seasonal labor is wanted, whoever employs 1, 10, or 100 of those laborers, becomes personally responsible for their return after a certain time which is specified in the permit to the men to come over.

There is a list containing every man's name, his residence on the other side of the line, his age, and all that, a full description of the man, and sometimes they require a photograph. But there is an accurate account taken of the man, whoever he is, and he is sponsored by some responsible concern, some company, corporation, or individual who hires him and brings him over here. It is their affair to see that he is returned.

The past fall about 1,000 such laborers came over in the potato season. Out of that thousand, 12 undertook to get farther west. They got as far as Bangor, about 150 miles from where they were working, where they were held up. Every man was returned, and the $18 he had to put up to get over here, which he was supposed to get back when he returned, was used to help pay the expense of getting that man and taking him back across the line.

That is somewhat of an answer to the question of the Senator from Washington, although I can see that he might figure that taking people from Mexico and hauling them away up to Wyoming or other Western States might be a little more difficult task than where they are handy to the border.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, no right-thinking employer of labor would ask for the admission of alien laborers where domestic laborers were available. In any event, the provision of the amendment governing the admission of aliens would prevent such contingency. It is provided that these aliens may be employed only when "unskilled agricultural laborers unemployed are not available within a reasonable distance of the place where such labor is to be performed." It provides further that the aliens must furnish bonds to insure that at the expiration of the prescribed time, or upon failure to maintain the status under which admitted, they will depart from the United States. Under such circumstances it is difficult to understand how there could be any reasonable objection to the employment of alien laborers temporarily for such agricultural crops as truck farming, the harvesting of fruit, and the cultivation of sugar beets.

As already stated, such labor does not compete with domestic labor, but used in emergencies in the production of the crops mentioned, actually opens the door of opportunity for a wider field of employment to our own people. To my way of thinking, there can be no valid objection to this amendment and there are many reasons why it should be adopted.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, what is the exact question before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK].

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That amendment proposes to repeal the national origins clause and to reduce the number of immigrants from 2 per cent to 1½ per cent, as I understand it. The national origins clause was adopted in the last session of Congress. From talking with Members of Congress since, I am firmly of the opinion that it was adopted as the result of a misunderstanding and a complete misapprehension of the question at issue.

The immigration act of 1924 contained a provision that the question of quota based upon the national origins of the people of the United States should be studied by a committee composed of three members of the President's Cabinet, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor. This committee of Cabinet officers were given very definite instructions in the law of 1924 as to how they were to proceed to acquire the information if it was possible to acquire it. They were definitely instructed to report their findings only upon information which they found to be reliable and to report it to the President of the United States. After laboring for something over a year the committee did report to the President of the United States and in their report said that they found the sources of information so unreliable and so fragmentary, so many records have been destroyed, that they refused to assume any responsibility for the reliability or fairness of the quotas at which they arrived based upon the information they had.

The report came to the Committee on Immigration of the Senate. That committee in its wisdom discarded the report of the committee appointed according to law with definite instructions in the law as to how to proceed, disregarded the report made that the quotas were based upon unreliable information, and went afield in search of information of their own. They found what in the judgment of the majority of the committee was reliable information and so reported to the Senate.

It is not necessary this afternoon to consider and quote the testimony presented at the hearings conducted by the Immigration Committee. A great many stump speeches were made. I felt at the time that in searching for information the committee had imposed upon it the same conditions that the law of 1924 imposed upon the committee of Cabinet officers, namely, that they should confine themselves to sources of information which they found to be reliable. With all due respect to the majority of the committee I will say that I do not think they confined themselves to sources of information that were reliable.

The history of the national-origins legislation is that of a bill which occupied the attention of the Senate on several occasions and for a long time. To review the history of this piece of legislation and to analyze the unsatisfactory and unreliable basis upon which the quotas are based would take longer this afternoon than I feel that I have the ability to address the Senate. But in view of the fact that so many Senators have told me that they never did understand the national-origins quotas and the basis upon which they were fixed, I ask unanimous consent, in order to save time and in order not to have to occupy the floor longer than I feel I am able to do this afternoon, to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, a statement which I made to the Immigration Committee a year ago. I ask permission that my original remarks before the committee be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type and the quotations in 6-point type.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

IMMIGRATION QUOTAS BASED ON NATIONAL ORIGINS

STATEMENT OF HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, OF MINNESOTA

Senator SHIPSTEAD. On two previous occasions the Committee on Immigration has been called upon to examine the report of the three Cabinet officials based upon their investigations through statistical reports. On both occasions your committee has refused to accept the report. The reasons given to the Senate for refusing to accept the report are contained in the following statement by the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, February 1, 1927:

> I desire to say that under the present immigration law the President is required to promulgate a proclamation on the 1st day of April, 1927, in respect to the national-origins provisions of the law.
>
> Upon this subject two messages have been received by the Senate. The last of those messages states that figures relied upon for the quota number of various countries are ambiguous and that practical legislation could not be predicated upon them.

And further he says:

CLARIFICATION OF DATA CONSIDERED IMPOSSIBLE

> I violate no confidence, I think, in saying to the Senator from Missouri that the majority of the Immigration Committee desired to repeal the national origins law, but there being a minority in favor of it and our time being so limited, we felt that we could not at this time have definitive action.
>
> The resolution passed the Senate, came before the Immigration Committee of the House, and a majority of the committee reporting the resolution to the House reported, in part, as follows:
>
> "The committee having considered the text of Senate Joint Resolution 152, to postpone for one year the going into effect of the national-origins provision of the immigration act of 1924, is of the opinion that at the end of one year from July 1, 1927, the same uncertainty as to the results of regulating immigration by means of the national-origins plan will continue to exist.
>
> "That the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor will have little, if any, more positive evidence on which to base quota findings than at present.
>
> "That too much uncertainty exists as to the requirements of the law that 'the President shall issue a proclamation on or before April 1, 1927,' when read in conjunction with further provisions of the law.
>
> "That it seems far better to have immigration quotas for the purposes of restriction fixed in such a manner as to be easily explained and easily understood by all.

"That the committee is of the opinion that the United States, having started on a policy of numerical restriction, the principle of which is well understood, that little will be gained by changing the method."

I take it for granted that your committee has again refused to accept the report of the fact-finding commission appointed by the President according to law. I base that upon the fact that the committee has decided to hold public hearings.

LAW OF 1924 SPECIFIC

Under the provisions of the immigration law of 1924 the commission composed of the Secretaries of State, Labor, and Commerce had the task of determining the national origin of the population of the United States. The specific instruction of the law to this commission reads as follows:

Such determination shall not be made by tracing the ancestors of descendants of particular individuals, but shall be based upon statistics of immigration and emigration, together with rates of increase of population as shown by successive decennial United States censuses, and such other data as may be found to be reliable.

You will note that the mandate is quite specific in its limitations upon the commission. The purpose of this provision of the law was to create a fact-finding commission. The commission is instructed by law to confine their source of information to "immigration and emigration" statistics, "together with rates of increase of population as shown by successive decennial United States censuses, and such other data as may be found to be reliable."

The law specifies these three sources of information upon which to find the facts. The report is here; in fact, it is here for the third time by request of the committee for the purpose of determination by your committee as to whether or not the commission has complied with the provisions of the law in its search for facts and if the facts reported are of such a character that the committee in its judgment feels they are sufficient and substantial enough to form the foundation of the immigration policy of the United States.

It must be clear to everyone that the limitations conferred by law upon the fact-finding commission extend also to the Committee on Immigration in this case. The committee sits in a judicial capacity in judgment on the report, and the report of the commission must form the foundation of your decision. Under the law it seems plain that the committee is confined to the report of the commission. It therefore becomes important to learn what is the foundation of the commission's report.

Therefore, I call the committee's attention to the testimony of the chairman of the commission's "experts," whose duty it is to report to the commission of three Cabinet officials in order that we may learn upon what their report is founded.

CENSUS OF 1790 BASIS OF REPORT

On page 14 of Senate document dated March 15, 1928, and designated as "Hearing Before the Committee on Immigration, United States Senate, Seventieth Congress, First Session," we read the following:

Senator SHIPSTEAD. Doctor, upon reading the report I got the idea that the census of 1790 plays a very important part in your report.

Doctor HILL. Yes; that is true.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. It is almost a foundation for the entire report, as I read it.

Doctor HILL. Well you are talking about the census record, not about the century of population growth?

Senator SHIPSTEAD. I am talking about the census record; and the century of population growth is based, as I understand it, upon the census of 1790?

Doctor HILL. Yes.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. So the census of 1790 becomes the key to the arch of the whole basis of calculation, as I understand the report. I wanted to know if that is your idea.

Doctor HILL. Yes; for that part of the population which we call the original native stock, representing about 45 per cent of the total.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. Can you tell us how many or what percentage of the statistics gathered in that report were destroyed when the British burned the Capitol here?

Doctor HILL. Well, the records for New Jersey, Delaware, Georgia, Kentucky, and Tennessee. These records have been lost, but it is not altogether certain that they were destroyed when the British burned the Capitol, although that is the tradition.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. It was given at one time as something like six or seven States of which the statistics were burned at that time, so given by one of the Commissioners of Immigration.

Senator COPELAND. Does the Senator mean that the records relating to those States were burned?

Senator SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

In Senate document, dated December 22, 1926, and designated "Hearings Before the Committee on Immigration, United States Senate, Sixty-ninth Congress, Second Session," on page 4, while making a statement on the provisions of the law specifying the source of information upon which the commission was instructed to base its conclusion, I made the following statement:

* * * Such determination shall not be made by tracing the ancestors or descendants of particular individuals, but shall be based upon statistics of immigration and emigration, together with rates of increase of population as shown by successive decennial United States censuses and such other data as may be found to be reliable.

It will be seen from the above that the most important element in this determination is "statistics of immigration and emigration." The next important element is "rates of increase of population as shown by successive decennial United States censuses."

As reliable statistics of immigration and emigration are not in existence, the whole plan fails and leaves the determination to mere guesswork or conjecture.

Senator REED. In the absence of statistics, you say?

Senator SHIPSTEAD. Yes; I say "reliable statistics" are not available. According to the best authorities, there are no reliable statistics of immigration for the first 213 years of this country's history. I believe you stated in the debate upon this proposition that there were none until 1820?

Senator REED. Yes.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. I am quoting from your statement on the floor of the Senate, April 3, 1924, page 5460, part 6, volume 65, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "There was no official governmental record of immigration commenced until the year 1820."

Dr. Edward McSweeney, former Assistant Commissioner of Immigration, has made a statement on that, and if you would care to have me do so I would like to read it. He said [reading]:

In 1819 a law was passed making it necessary for the captains of all incoming ships bringing passengers to the United States to file a manifest of the passengers, but except to give the number of the passengers to the Government was never other than perfunctory and almost never used. These accumulated manifests were burned in the Ellis Island fire of 1896. The first real attempt to gather immigration statistics was after the Immigration Bureau was established in the early nineties.

In 1906 Congress passed a law providing that the Director of the Census be authorized and directed to publish in permanent form, by counties and minor subdivisions, the names of the families returned at the first census of the United States in 1790.

Speaking of the difficulties in this work, William S. Rossiter, then chief clerk of the Census Bureau, stated in Outlook for December 29, 1906, page 1071, marshals in the different districts who had charge of the census:

The break in official records is one of the marks of the teeth of the British lion, these papers and many others having been destroyed during the occupation of Washington in the War of 1812.

Mr. Rossiter also states:

Vagaries of size, shape, paper, ruling, chirography, and language could easily be forgiven if, however, thereby we could restore the missing schedules for Delaware, Georgia, Kentucky, New Jersey, Tennessee, and Virginia, another reminder of the British, for they were also destroyed during the occupation of Washington.

Mr. Rossiter estimates that one-fourth of the enumeration is now lacking and that it would be very difficult to comply with the law of 1906.

Director of the Census North was not seemingly deterred by the fact that such a large part of the records was missing, and proceeded in 1909 to make a voluminous report which not only used the partial records but gave meticulous percentages of the racial divisions in the country based solely on names, the same as the late Senator Lodge has done in his Distribution of Ability in 1896. Well, certainly the recklessness of that would be apparent; for instance, here is a man by the name of Murphy; suppose he marries a girl of German descent.

What would the children be? If you go by name, of course, they would be called Irish; the German would be wiped out. If an Irish girl should marry a man with a German name, a Scotch name, or Scandinavian name, the Irish descent would be wiped out.

These fragmentary statistics of immigration and emigration are, therefore, admitted by the chairman of "experts" to be the foundation of their report. One-half of the records of the census of 1790 were destroyed more than 100 years before the commission began its work. In the census of 1790 the only information gathered by the census takers was the name and age of the individual. No information was gathered to determine their national origin. The only manner in which the national

origin could be determined of the population of 1790 would be from the remaining records of the seven remaining States. Six are gone and the only manner in which the national origin of the remainder can be determined is by tracing the national origin of each individual of the population at that time by spelling or sound of his name. This is "tracing the ancestors of descendants of particular individuals," but the law creating the committee of experts says "such determination shall not be made by tracing the ancestors or descendants of particular individuals, but shall be based upon statistics of emigration and immigration, together with rates of increase of population as shown by successive decennial United States censuses, and such other data as may be found to be reliable."

It seems plain and must be patent to the committee that the census of 1790 is specifically eliminated from consideration in this work by specific provision of the law. It is plain, in view of the statement of Doctor Hill that the census of 1790 is the foundation of his report that this evidence places the report in an indefensible position. There remains, then, (a) "Statistics of immigration and emigration."

RECORDS FROM 1819 TO 1896 BURNED

On April 4, 1924, page 5460, part 6, volume 65, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I find the statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]:

There was no official governmental record of immigration commenced until the year 1820.

The immigration statistics provided for by law in the year 1819 were burned in the Ellis Island fire of 1896. As to the reliability of these records, Dr. Edward Sweeney, former Assistant Commissioner of Immigration, said:

In 1819 a law was passed making it necessary for the captains of all incoming ships bringing passengers to the United States to file a manifest of the passengers, but, except to give the number of the passengers to the Government, was never other than perfunctory and almost never used. These accumulated manifests were burned in the Ellis Island fire of 1896. The first real attempt to gather immigration statistics was after the Immigration Bureau was established in the early nineties.

Therefore the immigration statistics up until the early nineties were "perfunctory and almost never used," and what there was of them were destroyed by the Ellis Island fire in 1896. These immigration statistics are therefore eliminated not only by the provisions of the law on account of unreliability but also by the fire.

There remains, then, for the consideration of the committee "the rates of increase of population as shown by successive decennial United States censuses and such other data as may be found to be reliable." It is hard to understand what effect "the rate of increase of population as shown by successive decennial United States censuses" can have upon the determination of the national origin of the American population so long as no information bearing upon national origin of the American population was gathered by the Census Bureau until 1850, and the Census Bureau did not gather any statistics on the origin of parents that were complete until 1890.

NO NATIONAL-ORIGINS CENSUS RECORD UNTIL 1890

I desire to call the committee's attention to Doctor Hill's testimony in Senate document designated as "Hearing Before the Committee on Immigration, United States Senate, Seventieth Congress, First Session," March 15, on page 19:

Senator SHIPSTEAD. Doctor, have we got the returns for 1800?

Doctor HILL. Have we got them?

Senator SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Doctor HILL. There are some States missing still. States for which the 1800 census records are missing include Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, New Jersey, Tennessee, and Virginia, and certain limited areas in some other States; also Indian Territory and Northwest Territory.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. There were six or seven missing out of 1790.

Senator WILLIS. I was wondering whether or not that might not be a check worth while. Our committees made these computations on the basis of the census of 1790. Suppose they should start an entirely independent inquiry, taking the census of 1800 and 1810 and see where they come out. It would be a pretty useful check, would it?

Senator COPELAND. Up as far as 1830 it would be, Doctor Hill. That would be a very large undertaking, a very large task, especially as we would have to work with manuscript records. We haven't printed these schedules as we have those of 1790.

Senator WILLIS. You say you have not any printed record for the census for the earlier periods?

Doctor HILL. I mean by that the original records. Of course, we have census reports giving statistics.

Senator WILLIS. 1790 was printed; 1800 was not, or 1810?

Doctor HILL. No; nor has any later census been printed.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. Can you tell me the first census we took in which we undertook to find out what country these people came from?

Doctor HILL. 1850.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. There was nothing done up until that time by our enumerators to determine where those people came from in Europe?

Doctor HILL. That is true.

Senator COPELAND. In 1850 did they go back further than the immediate parents?

Doctor HILL. It did not go back as far as that; simply their own birthplace; whether foreign born, and in what countries.

Senator COPELAND. When did they begin to ask anything about the parents?

Doctor HILL. They made a beginning in 1880; but, as I stated a while ago, that was not a complete classification. The first complete classification made of parents was in 1890.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. Then until 1850 there was nothing to show except by assuming from the names?

Doctor HILL. Well, we have the figures, you know.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. Were there any other immigration figures other than those required by the Government to be filed by the officers of incoming ships with the immigration officers, the number of passengers, and that the passengers landed were accredited to the flag carried by the ship?

Doctor HILL. I think you are right about that. I am not familiar with the immigration regulations of those days.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. So, if the ship came in carrying passengers from all over Europe, assume she had a thousand passengers, the officer would file with the immigration department a manifest showing that a thousand came here in that German ship, and immigration officials would accredit those immigrants to Germany; is that right?

Senator REED. I doubt whether there was any ship of that capacity at that time.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. Of course, the figure I assumed merely for the purpose of illustration. For instance, an English ship coming in under the English flag, carrying passengers from all over Europe, the passengers would be accredited to England?

Senator WILLIS. The way they handled ships in those days that would not be a bad guess, because they did not have tramp vessels gathering up cargo. A ship was laden and went to a certain port.

Senator REED. Your conclusions upon that were checked, were they not, by statistics of emigrants from various countries?

Doctor HILL. So far as we could get them.

In Doctor Hill's last report he says:

In order to utilize the available data to best advantage in the determination of national origin it was necessary first of all to determine what proportion of the white population of the United States in 1920 was derived from the white population present in the United States when the first census was taken in 1790.

Suppose that it were possible to determine what percentage of the population of 1920 was descended from the population prior to 1790, what bearing could that have on the national origins of the population of 1920 unless we had some definite immigration and census records informing us on what was the national origins of the population prior to 1790?

On page 2 of Doctor Hill's last report we learn:

The national origin of the original native or colonial stock is assumed to be the same as that of the 1790 population. In its preliminary report, submitted in 1926, the quota committee accepted the classification of 1790 population by nationalities as given in A Century of Population Growth, a work published by the Bureau of the Census in 1909. It was admitted, however, that there was a "considerable element of uncertainty" in a classification based as that was upon the names of heads of families.

On page 4 of the last report and the one now pending we find that one of the experts explains the method of determining the national origins of the population of 1790. This shows plainly that the committee of experts' report is based on A Century of Population Growth, which again is based on the census of 1790, and the only excuse for basing the quotas on the census of 1790 and the only scientific thing about it is that they determine the national origin of the population of 1790 by tracing or by guessing the national origin of the individual, using his name as a basis. This method was considered so unscientific at the time of the passage of the immigration act that the Congress specifically prohibited this method from being used.

Therefore up until 1890 we find there was no complete classification made of the national origins of the parents of the American population by the Census Bureau. This is an admission of Doctor Hill in the hearings conducted by your committee. It seems to me, therefore, that the record as well as the law rules out the "rate of increase as shown by successive decennial United States censuses."

DANGERS OF GOING ASTRAY

There remains, then, "such other data as may be found to be reliable." What these data are and how reliable they may be is for

the committee to determine. In passing upon the reliability of whatever remaining data there may be I am sure it is not necessary to warn the committee against going astray on testimony presented by people whose mental complex seems biased by international and racial prejudicies and inhibitions always latent to some extent in the human breast. The law does not provide that the committee shall consult the opinions and prejudices of our various racial or national groups. The law specifically provides that the commission of Cabinet officers shall search the records for facts. The law does not provide the commission shall search emotions for prejudices. It is plain that the same provisions of law apply to the committee. The Congress of the United States legislates under the provisions of the Constitution. It is not within the province of Congress to legislate for or against any person or group representing any nationality composing its citizenship. We legislate as Americans. The Constitution does not distinguish between racial groups.

I find on reading the report of the committee of experts that they have arbitrarily divided the American population into two classes—the native American stock and the immigrant stock. The native American stock is held by the committee of experts to be composed of those whose ancestors were here before 1790, and that part of our population whose ancestors came here after 1790 are designated as immigrants and the children of immigrants. This arbitrary classification is the foundation of the report of the committee. I would like to know how this committee of "experts" discovered that the population of the United States prior to 1790 were not immigrants or children of immigrants. That is a new theory that I nominate to stand on a par with Doctor Einstein's fourth and fifth dimensions—interesting for speculative purposes but surely not to be relied on to form the foundation of an American immigration policy. I know of no provision of law, nor do I desire any such, that may prohibit those whose ancestors were here before 1790 from purchasing for themselves championship belts for the purpose of designating to the world that they are the only "simon-pure" Americans. But for purposes of legislation we can not distinguish or give any preferred status to any particular group.

The law specifically confers the duties of finding the facts upon a commission of three Cabinet officers. This commission has made its report. It is evident that the report of the Cabinet officers, based upon the work of their "experts," satisfied the committee that the data are not of such a character that they were sufficient to comply with the provisions of section (c) of the immigration act. I therefore assume that the present hearings have been extended by the committee to other sources in the hope that it may find "such other data as may be found to be reliable." How scientific and how reliable such testimony may have been as presented to the committee by the various witnesses appearing before it is for the committee to determine. It must be evident and apparent to the committee that the sources enumerated in the law have been searched and found wanting.

It is therefore plain that the committee having discarded the report of the commission appointed by law, and if the national-origins clause is to be put into effect and used as a basis for our immigration policy it can only be done by amending the immigration act of 1924. If that is the intention of the committee, I assume its recommendations will be based upon information obtained in public hearings and will be political in character, since the scientific and statistical data to which we are limited under the laws are not found to be reliable.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire to submit the following unanimous-consent agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed agreement will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that after the hour of 2 o'clock p. m. on Monday, April 21, 1930, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill under consideration (S. 51) "to subject certain immigrants born in countries of the Western Hemisphere to the quota under the immigration laws" or upon any pending amendment, and that on said day at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. the Senate shall proceed to vote without further debate upon any amendment that may be pending or that may be proposed to said bill, and upon the bill itself through its various parliamentary stages to final passage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule a quorum will have to be called before the unanimous-consent agreement can be entered into.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I understand that the proposed agreement fixes a definite time to vote upon the bill and upon amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does.

Mr. JONES. I shall object to that. If there is a limit placed merely upon debate, I shall have no objection; but I shall not agree to fixing a definite time to vote on the bill itself and on amendments. I have seen it so often happen when the time arrived for the final vote there were many amendments which had been offered that had not been considered at all.

However, I rose to say a few words with reference to the proposal of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK].

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he proceeds?

Mr. JONES. I am going to occupy only a moment.

Mr. McNARY. I assumed when I offered the unanimous-consent agreement that it probably was the order of business.

Mr. JONES. I thought I would make my objection so as to save the calling of a quorum. I shall not agree to a unanimous-consent proposal of that character.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington objects, so there is no necessity for calling a quorum.

Mr. McNARY. I thought probably on more mature reflection the Senator would recede from his position.

Mr. JONES. No; I have made that resolution. I would not object to a unanimous-consent agreement fixing a time after which debate shall be limited on any amendment to 5 or 10 minutes. I would not object to an agreement of that character.

Mr. McNARY. I think it quite appropriate that I should disclose to the Senator what I have in mind. I thought if this agreement met with the favor of the Members of the Senate I would move to take a recess until Monday.

Mr. JONES. I am not interested in that proposition at all.

Mr. McNARY. Very well, though others may be.

Mr. JONES. Yes; no doubt; especially if the weather is good.

Mr. McNARY. At 12 o'clock on Monday the debate would then proceed, and at 2 o'clock the limitation on debate would apply—10 minutes on the pending bill and any amendment pending or to be offered—and at not later than 4 o'clock a final vote would be taken.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator will leave off the last part of his proposal, I will agree to it.

Mr. DILL. I shall object to any arrangement placing a limitation upon debate.

Mr. JONES. I should like to say that I have given my views with reference to the unanimous consent, and I am fixed on that point. If the Senator would leave off the last part of his proposal, and merely limit debate after a certain hour, we would soon reach a vote.

Mr. McNARY. That is the unanimous-consent proposal, that after 2 o'clock on Monday debate be limited on the bill and any amendments pending or offered thereto.

Mr. JONES. That would be entirely agreeable to me if the Senator would go no further.

Mr. McNARY. May I appeal to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS]? Does that conform to the Senator's best judgment?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I think if we begin the limitation of debate at 12 o'clock on Monday it would be better.

Mr. JONES. I have no objection to beginning the limitation of debate at 12 o'clock.

Mr. DILL. I shall object to such an agreement.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator advise me in what particular he objects?

Mr. DILL. I object to the 10-minute limitation.

Mr. McNARY. Is 15 minutes satisfactory in the judgment of the Senator?

Mr. DILL. No; I think not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made. The senior Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, there is no Senator who stands higher in my opinion than does the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK]. There is no Senator, I believe, who comes with purer motives than he does. I am satisfied that in the suggestion he has made with reference to bringing people over here from Mexico for a limited time and then sending them back, whether they want to go back or not, he has the very best of intentions, based on the peculiar situation which probably confronts the industry in his section of the country. But as I look at it, it is a proposal—not so intended by him—the effect of which would be legislatively to legalize a system of peonage in this country. I can not vote for any proposition of that kind.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, not long ago the Legislature of Arizona memorialized Congress on this subject. I invite particularly the attention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. I want the Senator from Washington to hear the memorial from the State of Arizona on this very subject.

The memorial was adopted by a vote of 42 to 6 in the House and 21 to 4 in the Senate of the State of Arizona, and reads as follows:

STATE SENATE,
*Ninth State Legislature, Regular Session.*

Senate Memorial No. 1 (introduced by Mr. Ross) memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the provisions of H. R. 6465, Seventieth Congress, first session, known as the Box bill, thereby restricting immigration from the Republic of Mexico into the United States of America

Whereas the restrictions by law of immigration have operated to materially reduce the menace to the American workingman of competition by a large volume of cheap European labor, with its attendant low standards of living, and has thus proven of incalculable benefit as a factor in maintaining and enhancing the social and material welfare of the people of this Nation, thereby demonstrating its right to an honorable and permanent place in the laws of our land; and

Whereas it is conservatively estimated that there are now in the United States 3,000,000 or more Mexican peons, who are in direct competition with American working men and women, thus making beggars and tramps of many of our native-born citizens because of an oversupply of labor; and

Whereas the 80 per cent law of Arizona was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, while in Mexico 80 per cent of all employees engaged in any occupation must be citizens of Mexico, as prescribed by their law; and

Whereas the employment furnished to the Mexican peons by those who clamor loudest for their continued admission in unlimited numbers is of a seasonal nature only, at wages which permit of the purchase only of the bare necessities for a temporary existence, thus filling our towns and cities during the greater portion of the year with a large and growing army of unemployed, who drain our charities, fill our penal institutions, and many of whom are afflicted with infectious and loathsome diseases, and thousands of whom are saturated with Bolshevik doctrines, thus become an actual menace and danger to our institutions and Government; and

Whereas 35,000,000 foreign-stock people are already in the United States, comprising more than 40 different nationalities and speaking more than that number of foreign languages, 14,000,000 of whom are foreign born and 7,000,000 still aliens, is more than our schools, our almshouses, our jails, and our penitentiaries, and our other forces of assimilation, segregation, and elimination can possibly take care of. Under our present alleged drastic quota law each year over one-half million aliens are lawfully admitted, to say nothing of the hundreds of thousands that enter surreptitiously. It is imperative in order to adequately protect our own people and institutions that we have added restrictions to our immigration laws, especially applying to Mexican peons of the Republic of Mexico, stronger deportation, better naturalization laws, and more effective law enforcement: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the Senate of the Ninth State Legislature of the State of Arizona favors the maintenance of the basic provisions of the immigration act of 1924 and urges upon the Congress of the United States the enactment into law H. R. 6465, first session of the Seventieth Congress, commonly known as the Box bill, making the quota provisions thereof applicable to Mexico, Cuba, Canada, and the countries of continental America and adjacent islands.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Alabama when those resolutions were adopted?

Mr. HEFLIN. Just a few months ago.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I do not understand why the Senator wanted to call my special attention to that memorial. I am in hearty accord with it, I will say.

Mr. HEFLIN. I understand that to be so, but I did it because of the position the Senator took a moment ago. I wanted to support him in the position taken by him.

Mr. JONES. Very well.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator does not seem now to know exactly what his position is.

Mr. JONES. The Senator is mistaken as to that; I know what my position is, but I did not know what his intention was.

Mr. HEFLIN. I was supporting the Senator strongly.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, this morning I asked to have read at the desk several telegrams sent to me from Arizona, but in view of the fact that the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was absent I delayed having them read. I now ask that two telegrams which I send to the desk may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 16, 1930.*

WILLIAM J. HARRIS,
*House of Congress, Washington, D. C.:*

We absolutely indorse the Harris bill on Mexican immigration. Kindly read this message into the RECORD, soliciting the attention of the interested House committee and the California delegation.

EAST LOS ANGELES REPUBLICAN CLUB,
W. L. CUMMINGS, *President.*

---

WAYCROSS, GA., *April 17, 1930.*

Hon. WILLIAM J. HARRIS,
*Senator, Washington, D. C.:*

The following resolution was unanimously adopted by Georgia Federation of Labor convention to-day:

"Whereas there is pending before the United States Senate a bill introduced by Hon. WILLIAM J. HARRIS tending to restrict Mexican immigration into this country: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Georgia Federation of Labor in convention assembled indorse this bill and hope for its early passage."

LOUIE P. MARQUARDT.

LOAN OF EQUIPMENT TO AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 10118) to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment for use at the Twelfth National Convention of the American Legion, at Boston, Mass., during the month of October, 1930.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, that is a House bill similar to a bill introduced by me in the Senate, which has been pending before the Committee on Military Affairs. The committee have been desirous of reporting favorably the bill introduced by me, but I have requested them to delay action so that they might act instead on the bill which has now come over from the House. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the House bill. It is entirely a formal matter. Similar action is taken each year providing for the loaning of certain equipment by the Secretary of War to the American Legion convention.

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, as I understand the Senator from Massachusetts, neither bill has been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The House bill has been reported and has been passed by the House.

Mr. JONES. But the bill has not been reported from the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate has considered the bill introduced by me, but I have asked them not to report it, in order that we might secure action upon the House bill which is similiar in character.

Mr. JONES. I wish the Senator would have the bill acted upon and reported by the committee. The committee can be polled, and a report submitted promptly. The action the Senator proposes might set a precedent. This is a regular bill, and the course I suggest will probably not delay it very long. I ask that the bill may be referred to the committee, and I have no doubt that they will report it back shortly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

USE OF BUTTER SUBSTITUTES IN GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, it is very apparent that unanimous consent can not be obtained for an immediate vote upon the pending amendment and upon the bill, which is now before the Senate for consideration, and it is getting very close to the time when the Senate may take a recess. So I desire at this time to call to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a condition which I think ought to be remedied.

In midsummer last year I made an investigation of how much butterine, oleomargarine, and other butterfat substitutes were used in hospitals, soldiers' homes, and other institutions under the Federal Government, and also of how much food substitutes for other animal fats were used in such institutions, for the last year for which the institutions had available data. The institutions reported, and I am basing my remarks upon those reports.

I find, to my astonishment, that St. Elizabeths Hospital for the Insane, near Washington, used 121,297 pounds of oleomargarine and butterine, and that no butter was purchased or used for the year ending June 6, 1929. While no butter was used at that hospital, where butter is so essential for the welfare

and treatment of those suffering from mental diseases, there is no explanation why it was not used.

There are 11 national homes for disabled volunteer soldiers. At those homes for disabled volunteer soldiers during the year there were used 91,356 pounds of butter and 502,407 pounds of oleomargarine or butterine, and lard substitutes to the amount of 55,735 pounds. In fact, in the Maine National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers no butter is served, excepting a negligible quantity in the hospital, as special diet, and in the Virginia and Illinois National Soldiers' Homes no butter whatever is served.

In these national homes are domiciled the Civil War veterans and the Spanish-American War veterans. It will be noted that these soldiers fare scarcely any better than do the prisoners in the United States prisons.

There are five United States prisons, where 20,139 pounds of butter were served and 196,627 pounds of oleomargarine or butterine, for the 1-year period.

There are 51 United States veterans' hospitals, under the United States Veterans' Bureau, where, within the year, 979,918 pounds of butter were served and 157,073 pounds of oleomargarine, though the director advised that at the time he made the report no oleomargarine was served on the table, its use being limited to seasoning in cooking.

I think the Director of the Veterans' Bureau is entitled to congratulations and to great approval for furnishing a proper diet for those in the institutions under his charge.

There is a somewhat different story to be told in relation to hospitals for soldiers now in the service. At the United States Army hospitals, for a 1-year period, 214,780 pounds of butter were served and 11,872 pounds of oleomargarine or butterine, in only two of those hospitals, there being no butter substitutes served at the other three hospitals.

In the marine hospitals, under the Public Health Service, within the year period, there were served 187,759 pounds of butter. There are 24 marine hospitals, and only in 6 of those hospitals is oleomargarine or butterine served, and then to the amount of 8,804 pounds.

At the United States naval hospitals, 15 in number, for the 1-year period, there were served 250,875 pounds of butter, and there was no oleomargarine or butterine served at those hospitals.

A summary of the use of butter, oleomargarine or butterine, and lard substitutes I give as follows:

Butter used in the Army, Navy and Marine Corps hospitals for the year period amounted to 653,414 pounds; oleomargarine for the Army and Marine Corps hospitals, 20,676 pounds, and vegetable shortenings, as lard substitutes, 259,856 pounds, leaving for the other institutions under the control of the Federal Government, principally homes for disabled volunteer soldiers, the amount of butter used within the year period 1,082,413 pounds and of oleomargarine or butterine 977,404 pounds, almost as great a quantity of butter substitutes being served as of butter, and vegetable shortening or lard substitutes 713,008 pounds.

I have been unable to learn why butter is not served at St. Elizabeths Hospital for the Insane, and there is no explanation given why scarcely any butter is served to the veterans of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War. I think an explanation is due, however, and I have called the attention of the Senate to the facts.

If the appropriations for food at the institutions under the charge of the United States are insufficient, then it would seem that the Committee on Appropriations ought to recommend an appropriation of the necessary funds with which to buy the necessary food. Neither the financial policy of the President nor the arbitrary finding of the Director of the Budget should deny these disabled soldiers an ample quantity of wholesome dairy products, so essential to their welfare. I therefore trust that the Appropriations Committee will take notice of these facts and make up the necessary budget for the purchase of the essential food.

If the failure to provide the necessary food is due to the negligence of the superintendents of any of these institutions, then other superintendents should take their places.

Mr. President, I have made these comparisons, and I desire now to have incorporated in the RECORD certain tables regarding the subject of my remarks. The tables show the "Quantity of butter, oleomargarine, and other animal-fat substitutes used in hospitals," and so forth, for the year ending June 30, 1929, except where otherwise noted. Each institution is named, and the details are given for all the institutions to which I have made reference. There is also attached a summary showing the grand total for all institutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VANDENBERG in the chair). Without objection, the tables referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

The tables referred to are as follows:

*Quantity of butter, oleomargarine, and other animal-fat substitutes used in Federal hospitals, etc.*

(Year ending June 30, 1929, except where otherwise noted)

| Hospital located at— | Butter | Oleomargarine or butterine | Vegetable shortening or lard substitute | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Pounds* | *Pounds* | | |
| Washington, D. C. (St. Elizabeths Hospital). | None. | 121,297 | None | No butter purchased or used year ending June 30, 1929. |
| U. S. ARMY HOSPITALS | | | | |
| Hot Springs, Ark | 3,104 | 10,432 | | Calendar year 1928. |
| San Francisco, Calif. | 51,840 | 1,440 | 14,400 pounds | No oleomargarine used in lieu of butter. |
| Denver, Colo | 72,970 | None. | 17,385 pounds | |
| El Paso, Tex | 17,000 | None. | 110,000 pounds | Lard substitute (Crisco). |
| Washington, D. C. (Walter Reed Hospital). | 69,866 | None. | 14,715 pounds | Cottonseed oil, year ending May 31, 1929. |
| Total | 214,780 | 11,872 | 156,500 pounds | |
| U. S. NAVAL HOSPITALS | | | | |
| Mare Island, Calif | 20,940 | | | No substitute for other animal fats used. |
| San Diego, Calif | 37,764 | None. | 8,280 pounds | |
| Washington, D. C | 17,542 | | 8,205 pounds salad oil; 7,990 pounds vegetable shortening. | |
| Pensacola, Fla | 3,581 | None. | 6,115 pounds | 11½ months. |
| Great Lakes, Ill | 24,270 | None. | 4,230 pounds | 11 months. |
| Annapolis, Md | 7,780 | | 2,440 pounds | 11½ months. |
| Chelsea, Mass | 20,880 | None. | | No butter substitutes used. |
| Portsmouth, N. H | 4,756 | None. | | Do. |
| New York, N. Y | 28,454 | | 7,932 pounds | No butter substitutes used during calendar year 1928. |
| League Island, Pa | 27,057 | None. | 5,712 pounds | |
| Newport, R. I | 11,382 | None. | | No butter substitutes used. |
| Charleston, S. C | 2,094 | None. | 1,342 pounds | 88 gallons salad oil. |
| Parris Island, S. C | 3,766 | None. | None | Calendar year 1928. |
| Norfolk, Va | 32,380 | None. | 25,170 pounds | |
| Puget Sound, Wash | 8,229 | None. | 913 pounds | Year ending May 31, 1929. |
| Total | 250,875 | | 78,329 pounds | |
| MARINE HOSPITALS, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE | | | | |
| Mobile, Ala | 2,962 | 386 | | Used lard 11½ months |
| San Francisco, Calif. | 25,000 | None. | 1,600 pounds lard compound. | |
| Key West, Fla | 2,292 | None. | | July 1 1928, to May 31, 1929. |
| Savannah, Ga | 5,055 | None. | Use lard substitute; don't know whether it's animal or vegetable oleostearine. | |
| Chicago, Ill | 10,126 | None. | | Year ending May 19, 1929. |
| Evansville, Ind | 2,184 | None. | | |
| Louisville, Ky | 3,584 | None. | | |
| Carville, La | 9,360 | 360 | 3,960 pounds | |
| New Orleans, La | 18,234 | None. | | Past fiscal year. |
| Portland, Me | 3,309 | None. | 915 pounds | Year ending May 31, 1929. |
| Baltimore, Md | 1,804 | [1] 1,002<br>[2] 3,694 | 1,360 pounds lard substitute; 170 gallons cottonseed oil. | Do. |
| Boston, Mass | 9,245 | 817 | 35 gallons cooking oil | |
| Vineyard Haven, Mass. | 1,165 | None. | | |
| Detroit, Mich | 3,933 | 236 | | |
| St. Louis, Mo | 3,000 | None. | None | |
| Fort Stanton, N. Mex. | 15,498 | None. | 1,872 pounds cooking oil, for salad, etc. | |
| Buffalo, N. Y | 5,175 | None. | 500 pounds lard compound. | |
| Stapleton, N. Y | 16,795 | None. | | |
| Cleveland, Ohio | 5,010 | None. | 105 gallons Wesson oil | |
| Norfolk, Va | 11,232 | None. | 600 gallons salad oil; 2,180 pounds lard compound. | |
| Port Townsend, Wash. | 5,200 | None. | 500 pounds lard substitute. | One year. (approximate.) |

[1] Blended fat: Cottonseed oil, beef fat, milk, and salt.

[2] Blended fat: 40 per cent butter fat, with cottonseed oil and flavored with milk and salt.

*Quantity of butter, oleomargarine, and other animal-fat substitutes used in Federal hospitals, etc.*—Continued

| Hospital located at— | Butter | Oleomargarine or butterine | Vegetable shortening or lard substitute | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| MARINE HOSPITALS, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—contd. | | | | |
| | *Pounds* | *Pounds* | | |
| Ellis Island, N. Y. | 22,822 | None. | 110 pounds lard compound. | Year ending March 1929. |
| Pittsburgh, Pa. | 4,159 | None. | None | Buy bread and cakes. |
| Memphis, Tenn. | 615 | 2,309 | 1,710 pounds lard compound. | Past fiscal year. |
| Total | 187,759 | 8,804 | 17,747 pounds; 910 gallons. | |
| NATIONAL HOMES FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS | | | | |
| Soldiers Home, California. | 29,482 | 68,421 | | |
| Washington, D. C. | 2,100 | 43,699 | 282 gallons Mazola oil | |
| Danville, Ill. | None. | 44,980 | 4,848 pounds lard substitute. | |
| National Military Home, Indiana. | 2,385 | 46,545 | | |
| National Military Home, Kansas. | 2,135 | 51,430 | 725 pounds lard substitute. | 11 months. |
| National Soldiers Home, Maine. | None. | 30,312 | No butter except negligible quantity in hospital as special diet. | 11½ months. |
| Dayton, Ohio | 19,672 | 74,840 | 6,550 pounds lard substitute. | |
| Hot Springs, S. Dak. | 5,660 | 12,773 | Used only in convalescent wards. Butter served in all hospital messes and tubercular department. | 11 months. |
| Johnson City, Tenn. | 22,432 | 34,736 | 28,312 pounds Cottolene; 228 pounds vegetable oil. | |
| National Soldiers Home, Virginia. | None. | 50,830 | 5,238 pounds cottonseed oil products. | |
| National Home, Wisconsin. | 7,490 | 43,841 | 9,578 pounds | Year ending Apr. 30, 1929. Lard from meat fats in home kitchens, 17,013 pounds. |
| Total | 91,356 | 502,407 | 55,479 pounds; 282 gallons. | |

*Data on butter, oleomargarine, cooking fat, and salad oil at United States veterans' hospitals, April, 1927, to March, 1928*

| | Rations served | Butter | Oleomargarine [1] | Cooking fat | Salad oil |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | *Pounds* | *Pounds* | *Pounds* | *Gallons* |
| 1. Alexandria, La. | 283,981 | 11,341 | 1,564 | 17,941 | 1,476 |
| 2. Algiers, La. | 107,560 | 7,834 | | 1,525 | 361 |
| 3. American Lake, Wash. | 180,489 | 22,289 | 1,936 | 9,465 | 655 |
| 4. Aspinwall, Pa. | 111,332 | 11,566 | 2,296 | 3,600 | 215 |
| 5. Atlanta, Ga. | 39,356 | 3,807 | 398 | 4,500 | 185 |
| 6. Augusta, Ga. | 277,366 | 19,264 | 3,098 | 16,906 | 272 |
| 7. Boise, Idaho | 69,367 | 7,055 | 1,170 | 2,996 | 170 |
| 8. Bronx, N. Y. | 443,300 | 50,226 | 1,176 | 7,465 | 510 |
| 9. Camp Custer, Mich. | 247,395 | 26,291 | 3,060 | 15,500 | 750 |
| 10. Castle Point, N. Y. | 217,853 | 25,920 | 4,730 | 7,400 | 698 |
| 11. Chillicothe, Ohio | 219,966 | 19,775 | 2,484 | 8,887 | 300 |
| 12. Dwight, Ill. | 54,070 | 6,922 | 790 | 900 | 65 |
| 13. Excelsior Springs, Mo. | 43,126 | 3,550 | 547 | 1,950 | 220 |
| 14. Fort Bayard, N. Mex. | 174,564 | 22,203 | 2,698 | 8,669 | 635 |
| 15. Fort Harrison, Mont. | 125,966 | 16,959 | 480 | 3,350 | 335 |
| 16. Fort Lyon, Colo. | 164,625 | 21,308 | 1,542 | 12,539 | 315 |
| 17. Fort Snelling, Minn. | 243,788 | 24,228 | 600 | 6,400 | 386 |
| 18. Gulfport, Miss. | 149,875 | 13,316 | | 5,299 | 639 |
| 19. Hines, Ill. | 452,424 | 45,224 | 9,190 | 8,515 | 690 |
| 20. Jefferson Barracks, Mo. | 139,255 | 13,217 | 1,538 | 8,750 | 355 |
| 21. Kansas City, Mo. | 96,677 | 11,199 | | 6,295 | 370 |
| 22. Knoxville, Iowa | 256,190 | 40,683 | 2,044 | 5,330 | 400 |
| 23. Lake City, Fla. | 89,057 | 7,796 | 720 | 3,165 | 215 |
| 24. Legion, Tex. | 177,628 | 16,546 | 2,160 | 12,600 | 629 |
| 25. Livermore, Calif. | 148,316 | 21,223 | 720 | 5,750 | 600 |
| 26. Memphis, Tenn. | 125,239 | 544 | 13,959 | 5,452 | 158 |
| 27. Minneapolis, Minn. | 92,583 | 12,191 | 978 | 1,750 | 255 |
| 28. Muskogee, Okla. | 140,200 | 13,407 | 1,586 | 6,050 | 215 |
| 29. Northampton, Mass. | 210,482 | 18,089 | 790 | 2,250 | 600 |
| 30. Northport, Long Island, N. Y. [2] | 409,926 | 38,770 | 5,056 | 8,600 | 900 |
| 31. North Chicago, Ill. | 239,399 | 27,084 | 2,072 | 3,636 | 370 |
| 32. North Little Rock, Ark. | 281,793 | 17,808 | 1,100 | 8,580 | 366 |
| 33. Oteen, N. C. | 362,826 | 33,982 | 8,167 | 34,210 | 1,115 |
| 34. Outwood, Ky. | 160,932 | 16,625 | 1,970 | 9,580 | 262 |
| 35. Palo Alto, Calif. [2] | 467,331 | 34,920 | 10,912 | 14,500 | 1,600 |
| 36. Perry Point, Md. | 402,169 | 41,222 | 11,536 | 13,557 | 676 |
| 37. Philadelphia, Pa. | 201,394 | 25,344 | 4,076 | 6,600 | 425 |
| 38. Portland, Oreg. | 57,252 | 8,437 | 656 | 1,750 | 218 |

[1] Use limited to seasoning; not served on table.
[2] Data from July, 1928, to June, 1929.

*Data on butter, oleomargarine, cooking fat, and salad oil at United States veterans' hospitals, April, 1927, to March, 1928*—Continued

| | Rations served | Butter | Oleomargarine | Cooking fat | Salad oil |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | *Pounds* | *Pounds* | *Pounds* | *Gallons* |
| 39. Rutland Heights, Mass. | 204,741 | 20,230 | 2,552 | 5,900 | 459 |
| 40. San Fernando, Calif. | 117,698 | 12,153 | 1,144 | 4,090 | 400 |
| 41. Sheridan, Wyo. | 203,019 | 20,841 | 3,694 | 2,759 | 413 |
| 42. St. Cloud, Minn. | 152,174 | 15,565 | 3,406 | 3,500 | 266 |
| 43. Sunmount, N. Y. | 175,863 | 26,394 | 2,282 | 3,750 | 870 |
| 44. Tacoma, Wash. | 107,690 | 13,048 | 1,312 | 4,025 | 925 |
| 45. Tucson, Ariz. | 137,008 | 14,148 | 2,708 | 5,345 | 407 |
| 46. Tuskegee, Ala. | 287,779 | 13,704 | 12,158 | 13,930 | 402 |
| 47. Walla Walla, Wash. | 110,578 | 10,096 | 549 | 3,368 | 225 |
| 48. Washington, D. C. | 80,250 | 9,997 | 2,390 | 6,260 | 345 |
| 49. Waukesha, Wis. | 95,151 | 12,116 | 1,300 | 1,880 | 150 |
| 50. West Roxbury, Mass. | 130,093 | 14,820 | 3,240 | 5,400 | 310 |
| 51. Whipple, Ariz. | 288,916 | 29,641 | 12,088 | 13,474 | 1,040 |
| Total | 9,756,012 | 979,918 | 157,073 | 375,893 | 24,118 |

*United States prisons*

| Institution located at— | Butter | Oleomargarine or butterine | Vegetable shortening or lard substitute | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Pounds* | *Pounds* | | |
| Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kans. | 1,300 | 99,840 | None | Oleomargarine the only substitute. |
| Penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga. | [1] 786 | 72,000 | 38,000 pounds | Letter Oct. 5, "Past year." |
| Penitentiary, McNeil Island, Wash. | 3,867 | 11,022 | 19,303 pounds compound. | |
| Industrial Institute for Women, Alderson, W. Va. | 6,933 | [2] 2,065 | 144 gallons oils | Dressing and cooking. |
| Industrial Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio (men, 17 to 30). | 7,253 | 11,700 | 17,981 pounds lard substitutes, 1,250 gallons cooking oil. | |
| Total | 20,139 | 196,627 | 75,284 pounds, 1,394 gallons. | |

[1] Butter, year ending Oct. 31, 1929.
[2] Includes oleomargarine, lard substitutes, and lard.

*Grand totals, all institutions*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Butter | pounds | 1,735,827 |
| Oleomargarine or butterine | do | 998,080 |
| Vegetable shortening or lard substitute, salad oil, etc. | do | 759,232 |
| Vegetable shortening or lard substitute, salad oil, etc. | gallons | [1] 26,704 |
| Total vegetable shortening or lard substitute, salad oil, etc. | pounds | 972,864 |
| Deduct totals used in Army, Navy, and marine hospitals, of— | | |
| Butter | pounds | 653,414 |
| Oleomargarine or butterine | do | [2] 20,676 |
| Vegetable shortening, etc. | do | 259,856 |
| Leaving, for other institutions: | | |
| Butter | pounds | 1,082,413 |
| Oleomargarine or butterine | do | 977,404 |
| Vegetable shortening or lard substitute, salad oil, etc. | pounds | 713,008 |

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. I desire to ask the Senator if he has obtained the figures in regard to the amount of butter substitutes used in the Government Indian schools?

Mr. BLAINE. I might say that my investigation did not include any institutions except hospitals.

Mr. FRAZIER. Of course, we have some Indian hospitals, too. It is my understanding that butter substitutes are used practically entirely both in the hospitals for the Indians and also in the tubercular sanitoriums and boarding schools.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, my investigation was limited to the Army, Navy, and marine hospitals, the disabled soldiers' hospitals, the veterans' hospitals, and the institution for the insane, just outside of the city of Washington.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, may I say that this is the first intimation I have had in regard to this situation. No complaints have come to the Appropriations Committee. My recollection is that the appropriation for the maintenance of these institutions is a lump sum for subsistence, not divided into so much for butter and so much for something else; and the matter of supplying well and satisfactorily these various institutions rests primarily with the department. We have not, within my recollection, reduced any appropriations recommended for the maintenance of these institutions.

[1] Or 213,632 pounds (at 8 pounds per gallon).
[2] None in Navy.

I shall call the attention of the War Department and these various institutions to the statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin. We shall soon have some of them before the committee on the military appropriation bill, and we will make it a point to ask them in regard to this matter. I am rather inclined to think that if an investigation is to be made, it should be made by the legislative committee; but I am not sure about that.

Mr. BLAINE. I am not asking for an investigation, except such an investigation as the Committee on Appropriations would naturally make in view of these circumstances. Doctor Smith, of the Public Health Service, informs my office that, as the Senator from Washington has stated, a lump allowance is made to the director of the hospital, and they use that money in their discretion. That is, if a director wishes to economize on the food bill in order to purchase surgical instruments, laboratory equipment, or anything else, he may do so. So if these departments have sufficient appropriation to buy the necessary wholesome food for the inmates, clearly the responsibility rests with the superintendents; and they have been negligent, at least in some of these cases, in furnishing the necessary butter so essential to the welfare of the individuals who are in those institutions through no fault of their own.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think that must be so.

Mr. McNARY obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McNARY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

INVESTIGATION OF SALES OF UNITED STATES SHIPS

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 129, which provides for the appointment by the Vice President of a committee to investigate the activities of the Shipping Board. That resolution has been pending since October 5, 1929. It has been in the hands of two committees. It first went to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. It passed favorably there, and now has been to the Commerce Committee, and has received a favorable report from that committee. I hope it may be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Was not this resolution on the calendar that was called this morning?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it was not. At the request of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], a day or two ago, it was taken from the calendar and sent to the Commerce Committee for consideration. That committee to-day made a report, through its chairman, in favor of the resolution; and I hope it may pass.

Mr. McNARY. Has it been referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it has been referred to both committees.

Mr. McNARY. And reported favorably?

Mr. McKELLAR. And reported favorably.

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

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I was on the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate when the matter came before us. The statement made by the Comptroller General was rather convincing to me, and I thought the investigation should be made.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I think I shall have to ask that the resolution go to the calendar until I can look into it carefully.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made. The resolution goes to the calendar.

MUSCLE SHOALS—CHESTER H. GRAY

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. FESS. On yesterday the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] made a very interesting address, in which he referred to the activities of Mr. Chester H. Gray, and in which he also mentioned a statement made by the president of the Farm Bureau Federation.

I have in my hand the statement of Mr. Thompson. I think it ought to be put in the RECORD, as it was the subject of comment yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have no objection; but I want to add to my remarks now, since the Senator wants to put in the statement. I should have been very glad to put it in yesterday as part of my remarks, because I referred to it, although I did not go clear through with it. The fact that it is put in now may make it necessary—the hour is late, so perhaps it should not be done now—for me to answer some things that I did not refer to yesterday relating to myself. I referred to them briefly; but, because it was talking about me, I did not care to put myself into the discussion any more than necessary; therefore I only analyzed a few—just one, I think—of the condemnations that Mr. Thompson made against me. There are several of them there, and I am prepared to defend myself on every one of them. Now the Senator has added to it, and I think I ought to say, for instance——

Mr. FESS. What does the Senator mean when he says "the Senator has added to it"?

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator has added to it by putting in the RECORD the other charges that Mr. Thompson has made against me that I wanted to eliminate, so as to put myself out of the equation as much as I could.

As I said, it is not a question whether I am a competent Senator, or whether I ought to remain here, or whether I am a false friend of the farmer, or whether I am, like Chester Gray, a deceitful one who does not help the farmer, and never did help the farmer.

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

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment. The question involved here is Mr. Thompson and Chester Gray.

In the statement that Mr. Thompson makes, whether it is justified or not—in other words, in defense of Chester Gray—he says in effect, "Why, this man NORRIS, of Nebraska, is a hypocrite. He is not a friend of the farmer. He never was a friend of the farmer. It is all a mistake. His record shows that he is not as good a friend of the farmer as his colleague [Mr. HOWELL]. His record shows that he is not as good a friend of the farmer as the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. His record shows that while the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] is a good farmer's friend, the Senator from Nebraska is not a friend of the farmer," and so on. Then, to make that out, for instance, he says that the Senator from Nebraska, disagreeing with the Senator from Kansas, disagreeing with his own colleague, voted against an increased tariff on sugar.

I did not refer to that yesterday, because, as I said yesterday, it was not a question of whether I was a good man or a bad man; it was a question as to whether Chester Gray had practiced deception upon the farmers of America, and whether he had practiced deception upon the Senate of the United States, upon the Agricultural Committee of the United States Senate, and had tried to deceive the National Legislature.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Therefore I can not yield.

Mr. McNARY. I yielded to the Senator from Ohio; then I yielded to the Senator from Nebraska; and I now reyield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. NORRIS. All right.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I read the article before I put it in, and I especially noted where Mr. Thompson spoke about the Senator's vote on items in the tariff bill; but I thought that would be justified because of what the Senator had stated about the attitude of Gray on the tariff bill. Now, if the Senator says to me that this article is a reflection upon his character, I am going to withdraw it.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not say that.

Mr. FESS. I would not insert in the RECORD anything that reflected on the character of any Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. But the putting of the article into the RECORD brings up a new issue. It puts me into the issue, which I was trying to eliminate yesterday.

I do not want the Senate or the country to get off on the wrong foot. The question was not as to whether I had done right. The question was whether Chester Gray, pretending before the Senate and the Agricultural Committee and the country that he is an honest representative of the farmer, was, in fact, while clothed by the farmer's clothing, representing the Cyanamid Co. and the other big corporations; whether he failed to represent the farmer. Even though I am a crook, even though I have just come out of the penitentiary, it is no defense to Chester Gray to say that my duty has not been well done.

Now, since the Senator has put in this statement, I am going to take the opportunity, with the permission of the Senator from Oregon, to say a word about my vote in opposition to the increase of the tariff on sugar. I explained it during the debate, and I am willing to stand on it. I know that I get a great deal of criticism from it from some pseudofarmer friends.

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

Mr. NORRIS. Not now. I know that I get a great deal of criticism from my own State; and yet I am willing to stand or die on that vote. I have never yet, in my judgment, been false to the interests of American agriculture. On the other hand, I have never knowingly asked anything for agriculture that, in my judgment, was unfair. When they say to me, while agriculture is prostrate, while the farmers are producing at a loss everywhere over the United States, that the beet-sugar farmer, while not enjoying the prosperity he ought to have, is better off than his fellows, making a little money anyhow, and I am opposed to saddling upon the other farmers of America and upon the consumers of America an additional tariff, it seems to me under the circumstances that we, as friends of the farmer, can not honestly come before the American people or the American Senate and demand for the farmer something that is not fair to the balance of the country; and I believe that under existing circumstances the tariff on sugar should not be raised.

Another reason why I was opposed to it was because the farmer—even the farmer who produces the beets that make the sugar—will get only about one-third of the benefit of this tariff. It will go to the producers of sugar in Hawaii; it will go into the pockets of those who produce sugar in Porto Rico; it will go into the pockets of the producers of sugar in the Philippine Islands. In none of those places is the sugar agriculturist in need of the protection that is needed by the American farmer who produces the ordinary food that goes to the American people, the American farmer who produces the hogs and the cattle and the corn and the wheat that feed the American people and in part feed the world. Yet they are going to be burdened by having added to their cost of living an increase on sugar that is going into the pockets of men who produce sugar in the Philippine Islands, the millionaires who own the estates in the Hawaiian Islands and in Porto Rico; and the American farmer who produces sugar, for whose benefit and in whose name this robbery is taking place, is not going to get the benefit of it.

I am opposed to it. It is not fair, in my judgment, in the first place. The man in whose name you are doing it is not going to get the benefit, in the next place. I am not ashamed of my vote. I am defending it now; and when Mr. Thompson makes that an issue with me, I am ready to defend it.

I am sorry that I am brought into this equation, because, as I said before, the question is Chester Gray and not me. However, if they want to put me into this issue, I welcome it. I am not afraid of it. I am ready to meet it here or anywhere else, and I do that without casting any reflection upon any of my colleagues who voted differently. It seems to me to say that I am an enemy of the American farmer, as Mr. Thompson tries to draw the conclusion, because I refused to vote for an increased tariff upon sugar, is to make a statement that all the records will falsify—a statement that is not borne out by any record.

So, so far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection to the printing of this article; but I do not want the Senate or the country to get off this question of Chester Gray, and I want to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. He has heard the testimony, he has heard how Chester Gray changed his testimony, gave testimony before the Agricultural Committee which he admitted afterwards was untrue. He has heard the letters which have been brought out, written by Chester Gray, and I want to ask him now if he is willing to say in his place here as a Senator that he believes that Chester Gray has been fair either with the Senate or with the American farmer or with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I have yet to hear a Senator defend Chester Gray, or stand for what he has done. I believe he stands in disrepute and disgrace in the mind of every Senator, regardless of how that Senator may feel on any of the disputed questions that arise.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I have not examined the record, and know nothing about the matter except what I heard the Senator from Nebraska state——

Mr. NORRIS. Let the Senator ask the Senator from Oregon, who has the floor and who heard the testimony.

Mr. FESS. As far as I know of what Mr. Gray has done and said, I regard him as an honest, fair representative of a great group of men and women. I have never known anything to his discredit. The only thing I have ever heard to his discredit is what the Senator from Nebraska stated on yesterday, when he said that anybody who knew the facts as they were would find fault with him.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator know the facts?

Mr. FESS. No; I have not examined into them.

Mr. NORRIS. Let the Senator ask the Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, what he thinks of Chester Gray's testimony before the committee.

Mr. FESS. The Senator can ask him that question.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator is anxious to find out, he can get the information.

I did not know there was a Member of the Senate who would defend Chester Gray and his attitude. I did not know there was a single Senator here who would raise his voice in defense of that man, after the record he has made, and if the Senator believes he is right, then in order to be consistent he should have offered Chester Gray's amendment when the Muscle Shoals resolution was before us; he should have offered that thing, full of jokers, known as the Cyanamid bid. He did not do it. Chester Gray has been hunting all through the Senate with a fine-tooth comb to get a man to offer that. Evidently he overlooked the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. The Senator from Ohio is not on the committee. He would not come to the Senator from Ohio, and had he come to the Senator from Ohio——

Mr. NORRIS. He came to the former colleague of the Senator from Ohio, who is now dead, Senator Willis, when the matter was up before, and he had it printed and it was laid on the table. After it was debated, the Senator's colleague, the late Senator Willis, refused to offer it, although he had it printed and came before the committee and said he was going to offer it. After he heard the analysis, after he listened to the debate, he refused to offer it, and the RECORD shows he never did offer it.

Mr. FESS. The truth about the matter is that the Senator from Ohio to whom the Senator refers offered that bill on the same plane Representative Madden offered it in the House. The Representative offered it in the House, and Senator Willis was requested by Representative Madden to offer it here. I do not know that Mr. Gray had anything to do with it at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Gray has been spending a good share of his life on that measure. All these misrepresentations, these letters, which have been read in evidence—and I have not read half of them yet, some of them are worse than any I have read—were written by Gray while he was propagandizing in favor of that very bill. He sent out to the newspapers all this propaganda, paid for by the Cyanamid Co., illustrated articles, his own picture, and anything else he thought might help out. He got that printed in hundreds of newspapers without ever letting anybody know that the cost of the whole thing was borne by the very Cyanamid Co. that was the beneficiary of the bid he was advocating. These mats went all over the United States to all the newspapers.

Not only was the expressage and postage on the mats paid but the return postage was paid. There was a blank all ready for the publisher of the paper to sign his name and send it back and get everything for nothing. All that is undisputed, it stands uncontradicted, and Chester Gray, with other men bearing letters of introduction from him, paid a salary by the Cyanamid Co., the Union Carbide Co., and the Tennessee Improvement Association, all in the same business, all three of them, these men who went out, were pretending to be representatives of the Farm Bureau.

The letters of introduction from the officials of the Farm Bureau showed they were such, when, as a matter of fact, their expenses were paid by one of these corporations I have mentioned, and the farmers of the United States who heard them speak, who heard them make their pleas to have them write letters and to influence them in controlling their local farm bureaus and their State farm bureaus and the National Farm Bureau in favor of this Cyanamid bid—all of them believed these representatives were honest, that they were faithfully working for the Farm Bureau. They did not know these emissaries sent broadcast over the country were being paid by the very beneficiary of the thing they were to put across.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Farm Bureau Federation Weekly News Letter, April 8, 1930]

THOMPSON IN ANSWER TO SENATORIAL CHARGES—ISSUES STATEMENT IN REFUTATION TO CHARGES MADE BY SENATOR NORRIS

In answer to an attack on Chester H. Gray, legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation, by Senator G. W. NORRIS, of Nebraska, advocate for Government ownership of Muscle Shoals, President Sam H. Thompson last week issued the following statement:

"It is unfortunate that this senatorial group, headed by Mr. NORRIS, of Nebraska, should, in their eagerness and desire to saddle Government operation on the people of this country, resort to such tactics.

"Senator NORRIS yesterday in the Senate charged Chester Gray, legislative representative of this organization, with being a traitor to the cause of agriculture and demanded that the Farm Bureau repudiate him.

"According to press reports, the Senator's charges were, first, that Chester Gray supported the American Cyanamid Co.'s bid for Muscle Shoals, and that second, Chester Gray, during the recent tariff fight, 'sat by, seeing the farmer flimflammed from morning to night without raising his voice in protest.'

GREATEST EFFORT YET

"To dispose of the second charge first, the Senator's statement, if correctly quoted in the press, is contrary to the facts in the record. At no time in its 10 years' existence has the American Farm Bureau Federation through its legislative department more energetically represented the cause of agriculture than during the recent tariff debates. Chester Gray and his assistants have issued statements, submitted briefs, talked with individual Senators and Congressmen, in fact done everything within their power to secure a tariff equality for the farmers of this country. In fact, within the last two weeks, an unusual mark of distinction was conferred on Mr. Gray's department when the United States Senate ordered a 115-page brief on the subject of tariff prepared in Mr. Gray's office to be printed by the Public Printer as a Senate document. This particular brief had to do with the efforts of the Farm Bureau to protect the dairy interests of the United States from the competition of imported oils and fats.

IN BLACK AND WHITE

"Senator NORRIS's charge that Chester Gray failed the farmer in the recent tariff battle is most amazing in view of the printed record of Senator NORRIS's vote on various tariff provisions. In this statement space does not permit a lengthy review of the Nebraska Senator's position. But these facts are illustrative. An effort by Senator CAPPER, of Kansas, to secure a duty on tropical starches to protect the corn growers of the Midwest found Senator NORRIS against the measure. An amendment to the tariff bill submitted by Senator SMOOT, of Utah, to increase the duty on sugar for the protection of sugar interests found Senator NORRIS voting against the measure. An effort on the part of Senator HOWELL, who comes from Senator NORRIS's own State, to increase the tariff on casein to protect the dairy interests found Senator NORRIS voting against the measure. A last-minute attempt to secure protection for the livestock industry with a duty on hides found Senator NORRIS voting against the measure. An amendment by Senator HARRIS, of Georgia, proposing duties on jute and jute bagging in order to promote the substitution of American cotton for jute found Senator NORRIS lined up in opposition.

"These examples cite the part Senator NORRIS was having in what he terms the 'flimflamming' of the farmer.

SENATOR MISUNDERSTANDS

"The charge against Chester Gray's support of the American Cyanamid Co.'s bid for Muscle Shoals indicates that Senator NORRIS doesn't understand what he is talking about. Chester H. Gray, legislative representative of this organization, did not indorse the American Cyanamid Co.'s bid for the operation of Muscle Shoals. He took the indorsement which was given to this bid at the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation held in Chicago on December 8, 1926, and, acting under those instructions, proceeded to support the measure.

"This resolution read as follows: 'Further delay in deciding upon the national policy at Muscle Shoals is indefensible. That policy, when adopted by Congress, must contain among other features the following: A unit lease of the power, fixation plant, and accessories; a 50-year term of lease; the protection of fertilizers containing at least 40 per cent plant food; the elimination of royalties for the use of patented air-fixation processes; the use of nitrate plant No. 2; a farmer board with adequate functions in regard to cost factors in manufacturing fertilizers and relative to the geographical distribution of same; no separation of power from fertilizer production; a rapid progress to the annual capacity production of the project; and definite assurances without possibility of evasion that the project will be devoted in peace times to the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen and the making of fertilizers. Under legislation now pending in Congress this policy can be best advanced by Congress passing the necessary legislation to approve the proposal made under date of April 24, 1926, by the American Cyanamid Co.'

BACKED BY STATE FARM BUREAUS

"Representatives from 39 States, selected by the county and State and farm bureaus, were present at that meeting, and their combined judgment indorsed the American Cyanamid Co.'s offer as the one promising agriculture the greatest benefits from the operation of Muscle Shoals.

"For that reason the American Farm Bureau legislative representative found himself under orders to support this particular measure. He has done so, and at the last board of directors meeting, on March 21, the board went on record in the following words: 'That we reaffirm our position on Muscle Shoals and approve the efforts of our legislative committee and legislative department in carrying out the policy of the American Farm Bureau Federation with reference to Muscle Shoals.'

"Senator NORRIS has consistently espoused the Government operation of Muscle Shoals. The American Farm Bureau Federation is definitely on record as opposing the Government operation of public utilities. It would appear that the present activities of Senator NORRIS are merely efforts on his part to saddle on this country the unpopular and uneconomic theory of Government operation."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I add just a word to what I have said? I want to say to the Senator from Ohio one of the things I did not show that I will probably show later if this goes on is a letter in evidence showing that Mr. Gray was about to educate the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], but he probably never got around to it; so the Senator is not posted on the question.

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, April 18, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, *April 17, 1930*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein. For He hath founded it upon the seas and established it upon the floods. Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord or who shall stand in His holy place? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart, who hath not lifted his soul unto vanity or sworn deceitfully. He shall receive the blessing of the Lord and righteousness from the God of his salvation. This is the generation of them that seek Him, that seek Thy face O Jacob. Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of Glory shall come in. Who is this King of Glory? The Lord strong and mighty; the Lord mighty in battle. Lift up your heads, O ye gates; even lift them up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of Glory shall come in. Who is this King of Glory? The Lord of Hosts, He is the King of Glory. 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 a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6343. An act to provide for the extension of the boundary limits of the proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the establishment of which is authorized by the act approved May 22, 1926 (44 Stat., p. 616).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3585. An act to eliminate certain land from the Tusayan National Forest, Ariz., as an addition to the Western Navajo Indian Reservation.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the following titles:

S. 2757. An act to authorize the United States Shipping Board to sell certain property of the United States situated in the city of Hoboken, N. J.;

S. 3425. An act to amend the act of Congress approved March 1, 1929, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a children's tuberculosis sanatorium"; and

S. 3440. An act authorizing the exchange of 663 square feet of property acquired for the park system for 2,436 square feet of neighboring property, all in the Klingle Ford Valley, for addition to the park system of the National Capital.

THE TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LANDING OF THE HUGUENOTS

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing an address of the Rev. James H. Taylor, of this city, delivered in the city of Charleston last Sunday, April 13, on the struggle of the Huguenots for religious freedom in France and this country, one of the most remarkable addresses to which I ever listened.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an address delivered by the Rev. James H. Taylor at Charleston, S. C. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, who is the Rev. James H. Taylor? Is he connected with Congress?

Mr. TUCKER. Yes; in a way. He was helping to carry out a celebration in the city of Charleston in which the Congress of the United States participated through a delegation sent from this body and the Senate.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Was his address delivered at the invitation of Congress?

Mr. TUCKER. Of course not; but it was on an occasion recognized by the Congress of the United States, and the Congress was represented by a committee, and this was the culmination of that celebration.

Mr. UNDERHILL. How many other speakers were there?

Mr. TUCKER. A number; but I am only asking to have this address published.

Mr. UNDERHILL. The gentleman makes his request because of the historic nature of the address?

Mr. TUCKER. Yes; and because of its inherent excellencies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I include the following address delivered in the Huguenot Church of Charleston, S. C., on the occasion of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the landing of the Huguenots, by Rev. James H. Taylor, D. D., pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.:

THE SPIRIT OF THE HUGUENOTS AND THE MAINTENANCE OF A GREAT TRADITION

Text: "These are they which came out of great tribulation."—Revelation vii, 14.

All pioneers in the history of the world have been men and women of great spirit. They have blazed the way through the centuries, and those who have followed them have made a beaten track; and the beaten track has become a highway along which the spirits of men have moved to high endeavor and noble achievement; such a highway as is described by the Psalmist, on which the spirit itself goes from strength to strength as each one in Zion appears before God. (Psalm lxxxiv, 7.)

The character of a nation is determined by the spirit of its people. The quality of the spirit is the index of character, and the value of the spirit is determined by the quality of the soul. There have been here and there through history many groups who have contributed much to the founding and the progress of this Nation. They have enriched the life of the people to whom they came. Among these groups that have contributed so greatly to the founding and progress of this Nation have been the Huguenots of France. There are certain dominant things that contribute to the value of a people: the quality of the spirit, the depth of faith, and the loyalty to convictions. These things make character and life.

Against the background of a medieval darkness the great ideas of the Protestant Reformation shone like beacon lights. These ideas spreading through Europe lifted the darkness of the centuries and gave hope to mankind through the proclamation of those inalienable rights of soul and mind and body: the right to worship God without restraint, the right of conscience, the right to think, and the right to express the sovereignty of the people. Such rights as these were not to be prohibited by political restraint or ecclesiastical control. It was a long and bitter struggle for truth and freedom. Mankind had long been in medieval darkness, and the minds of men for ages had been imprisoned by ignorance and superstition.

These doctrines of freedom and light percolated into France, and found in the minds and hearts of nobles, gentry, and peasants fertile soil. But even before the entrance of the reformed doctrines into France, there had been those who for many years were committed to the great cause of the freedom of the soul. The Vaudois of France, like the Waldenses of Italy, were really early Protestants, long before Luther nailed his ninety-five theses to the door of the church at Wittenberg, and before the doctrines of the Reformation had spread in France. From earliest times the spirit of religious freedom was in the heart and life of the Vaudois. Many years before Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli had rocked the continent of Europe with their protests against ecclesiastical and political tyranny, the Vaudois had planted the seeds of freedom and political equality in the life of France. The Vaudois represented the ideas of freedom of worship, of conscience, and of life. They were really the spiritual ancestors of the Huguenots. They were the heralds of a new day, for they held a torch which the Huguenots, their spiritual descendants, took, and lifted so high that its radiant light penetrated beyond the confines of France into Europe, and eventually across the seas.

It is the spirit of a people that creates a great tradition, and the tradition comprises not only the spirit, but also the deeds of those who have translated this spirit into action. It is a duty to maintain a great tradition, because only by the preservation of a tradition can the spirit itself be preserved and passed on to posterity. The spirit of the Huguenots is in itself a great tradition. The history of the Huguenots is a constant marvel, illustrating the power of deep faith and strong convictions. No people through the ages of history have endured more persecution, and there have been none whose spirit has been more radiant. This spirit of religious freedom was a heritage that the Huguenots received from the Vaudois.

The spirit and tradition of the Huguenots are not abstract things; they are realities. It matters not if in some measure they appear to be intangible qualities; the very fact that they seem to be intangible is a proof that they are intensely real, for the realities of life are the intangible things, and the permanent things of life are the invisible things; for, says the Apostle Paul, "the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." (II Cor. iv, 18.) The reality of this spirit is demonstrated by the persecutions, perils, and sufferings which they endured. Surely if the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church, then the persecution of the Huguenots has proven to be the benediction of the nations, and countless people to-day will rise up and call them blessed.

The bitter hatred of Catherine de' Medici; the interminable plotting of the Jesuits; the massacre of Vassy (1562); the slaughter of St. Bartholomew's Day (1572); the outrages inflicted upon La Rochelle; the treacherous slaying of Coligny; the opposition of the league; the war of the three Henrys; the proud boast of Pope Sixtus V, who declared he was "ready to shed plenty of blood"; the plotting of Cardinal Richelieu, that arch enemy of the reformed doctrines; that monstrous suicidal act of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685) which will forever brand the name of Louis XIV with undying infamy; these are some of the examples of massacre, persecution, and brutal outrage which the Huguenots endured with amazing fortitude and glowing faith.

Against the background of these shifting scenes the spirit of the Huguenots shines with a luster and radiance that thrill the souls of men, and give new confidence in the reality of the convictions of conscience, deeper belief in humanity, and a fresh hope for the world.

Two types of spirit were dominant and effective through the Reformation era. They were the religious spirit and the political spirit. Yet they were not separate and distinct, but in reality combined into one. In the mind of the Huguenots the religious spirit took precedence over the political spirit, in the sense that their ideas of government grew out of their conception of God. No one represented the clarity and virility of this spirit more than John Calvin, himself a Frenchman, who was one of the first émigrés forced to leave France because of his allegiance to the reformed ideas. It is impossible to think of John Calvin, of Martin Bucer, or of Theodore de Beza, without seeing in them the splendid union of great religious convictions with the concept of political freedom. They believed in the sovereignty of God, the sovereignty of the soul, and the sovereignty of the people. It was such a conception of sovereignty which shook the ecclesiastical and political foundations of Europe. So also the spirit of Margaret of Valois, of Jeanne d'Albret, of Admiral Coligny, of Condé, and of Henry of Navarre, while expressed more particularly in a governmental and military way, was in reality the same sort of spirit that animated Calvin and Bucer and Beza.

It is not correct to say that the history of the Huguenots was only a political movement; of course it had its political implications and necessities, but it was a deeper movement than a mere political one, for it had to do with a sense of a man's inalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience. To secure and maintain this right, it was necessary to resort to the conflict in arms. The Reformation itself did not come about save through the way of struggle and strife. Great reforms and great ideas, if they clash with existing political and social order, eventuate in battle. It is impossible to conceive that such tremendous ideas as liberty, equality, and justice, could become a common possession of men without a great struggle. The religious ideas, therefore, which were embedded in the minds and hearts of the Huguenots meant that conflict was inevitable.

The type of religious spirit was distinctly Calvinistic. It was John Calvin who typified that spirit which became the dominant spirit of the Huguenots. The historian Seebohm says, that "the Protestants of France, called Huguenots, were mostly the offspring of Calvin." (Seebohm: The Protestant Reformation, p. 204.) It was John Calvin who wrote their Confession of Faith, adopted by the first synod meeting in Paris in 1559. (The Huguenot Church, a Brief History of the Church, published by the Huguenot Society of South Carolina.) The Calvinistic idea of church government by a bench of elders which came to be known as Presbyterian, was the form of government of the French Huguenot church.

There were other important contributions to the Huguenot spirit, but the outstanding contribution was that of the spirit of Calvin. The testimony of the Romanist, Abbé Anquétil, is of interest. He

speaks of that noble leader D'Andelot, the brother of Coligny, as "of all the Calvinistic chiefs one of the most honestly persuaded of the truth of his faith." (History of the Huguenots, by W. C. Martyn, p. 329.)

The Calvinistic spirit has always been a dominant one whether incarnated in the Huguenots of France, the Reformed of Holland, or the Presbyterians of Scotland. It has contributed much to the intellectual, political, social, and spiritual progress of the world. Whatever may be said in criticism of the severity of the Calvinistic spirit, it must be admitted that this spirit has always been a dominant and vital force in religion and government wherever it has gone.

It is difficult to think of the depth and strength of the faith of the Huguenots, of their bravery in battle, of their heroism and suffering in persecution, as at Vassy, Rouen, and on St. Bartholomew's Day; of the outrages of the dragonnades; of the intense suffering endured following the revocation of the Edict of Nantes; of their persistent effort to worship God in the assemblies of the desert, without realizing that such faith and such convictions are embedded deep in the soul, and can not be eradicated by the sword. Not even the horrors of the Inquisition of Spain, nor the atrocities of the Duke of Alva surpass the horrors that these faithful people of God suffered for the cause of righteousness. Their names are writ large in the annals of history and enshrined in the memory of all those who love righteousness and truth.

The Calvinistic spirit represented certain very distinct facts. It stood for intellectual freedom, for spiritual freedom, and for political freedom.

The intellectual freedom of the Calvinistic spirit was the freedom of the mind. The mind of man had been in intellectual thraldom, for medieval darkness had settled upon the world. Ecclesiastical tyranny had imprisoned the minds of men and barred the way to knowledge. Centuries before the Reformation, the Waldenses, the Albigenses, and the Vaudois, had raised the torch in the darkness. Ecclesiastical tyranny devoted itself unceasingly to quench this light. Then came that morning star of the Reformation, John Wyclif (1384), who in England translated the Bible into the English language. Then came Jan Huss, who lifted the torch in Bohemia, only to be tried and falsely condemned by the Council of Constance in 1415. But the light was already burning in France among the Vaudois, and now Calvin lifts the torch, and all France and Switzerland take fire.

To free men from intellectual bondage, from the denial of the right to think for themselves, was the task to which the Reformers gave themselves. The right to think meant that men could think for themselves spiritually; and that cut and dried dogma, which often did violence to the sacred rights of conscience, need not be taken merely because they were ecclesiastical dicta. Thus the minds of men, imprisoned to a large degree for centuries, were released, and men began to think, and in thinking began to act. It was significant that this intellectual freedom, or the right to think, expressed itself in widespread education. John Calvin is said to have been "the father of popular education." (Bancroft's Miscellanies, p. 406, as quoted by Egbert W. Smith in Creed of Presbyterians, p. 96.) The freedom of the mind was a vital element in the Calvinistic spirit, and the Huguenots in expressing that spirit were willing to make any sacrifice to secure that right for themselves.

The spiritual freedom of the Calvinistic spirit was the freedom of the soul. Religious liberty is the very essence of spiritual freedom. It involves the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience, and implies that the individual conscience is free to act without let or hindrance. To deny the right of the individual conscience is to impugn the validity of the conscience. To say that conscience is implanted by God in the constitution of man and then in the next breath to deny the right of individual conscience is both illogical and inconsistent. Conscience is a reality, and every man is aware of that fact. It can not be read out of existence by a mere denial, and the rights of conscience can not be destroyed by an ecclesiastical fiat. It was this deep conviction in the soul of the Huguenots which urged them to worship God according to the dictates of conscience, no matter what the peril might be.

To-day we view with admiration and gratitude that superb heroism the Huguenots displayed in worshiping God in spite of the opposition of king, queen regent, Jesuit, cardinal, and Pope. Defeat in battle, prohibitory edicts, pillage, and massacres did not deter them from worship, or frighten them from their faith. Even after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, those who had not been able to escape the country gathered without fear and worshiped God in the open, in the assemblies of the desert. A brilliant line of men kept alive this flaming passion of the soul. Among those who did escape the country, and were refugees in other lands, there were men of eloquence and renown, like Saurin, Claude, Pierre Jurieu, Pierre DuBose, and Daniel de Superville. These men along with other refugees kept alive that great spirit which contributed to the liberation of the consciences of men, and to the cause of religious liberty.

The political freedom of the Calvinistic spirit represented the sovereignty of the people.

It meant the right of the individual to have a part in the arrangement and direction of government. It stood for another inalienable right, the right of citizenship that inheres in man by virtue of the fact that he is primarily a subject of God before he is a subject of any civil power. This idea the Huguenots accepted and sought to exercise. The criticism of history that the Huguenots were always on the side of popular government seems to be a strange prophecy in the light of subsequent events. De Tocqueville in his Democracy in America prophesied that all Europe would march toward the goal of democracy. If the world is marching toward democracy, if the people are coming more and more into the possession of inalienable rights denied to them by kings and emperors, the Huguenots of France must be credited with an important part in this movement which has been growing constantly ever since their dispersion among the nations of the earth.

The Calvinistic spirit in the Huguenots of France, in the Reformed of Holland, and in the Presbyterians of Scotland has contributed conceptions of human rights and ideas of government that have had expression in the form and order of government of the United States of America. The Huguenots were good citizens, the very best of France. The Protestant doctrine was not confined to any one class; for royalty, nobility, gentry, and peasantry all espoused the common cause. It is this very unusual fact that made the Huguenot movement in France one of the most significant in history. The very mention of such names as Margaret of Valois, Jeanne d'Albret, Henry of Navarre, Admiral Coligny, D'Andelot, Condé, Calvin, Bucer, and Beza, is an eloquent reminder of the fact that a great cause had captured the minds and spirits of powerful and influential men and women.

The spirit of the Huguenots is evinced against the background of blood and persecution. The moral and spiritual heroism they displayed stands out as a glowing page in history. It is an undeniable fact that the great examples of heroism, when we turn the pages of history, are nearly always connected with deep religious convictions. This is quite logical and true. It is a consistent movement of history, for it is the lofty conception of righteousness and justice that gives power and permanence to conviction, and impels men to high endeavor and to heroic sacrifice. In nothing was the heroism of this spirit displayed more truly than in the terrible persecutions that were designed, as was claimed, "to extirpate heresy." This heresy consisted in the insistence upon inalienable rights, the rights of intellectual, spiritual, and political freedom. If this be heresy, make the most of it! The mere mention of these persecutions produces a feeling of horror. There can be no possible excuse for the atrocious massacres that were inflicted on the Huguenots.

Perhaps no one person did as much to keep alive the fires of hatred and to instigate these persecutions as that brilliant and wicked queen, Catherine de' Medici. She seems to have been the counterpart of that famous queen in Israel, Jezebel by name, the wife of Ahab, who hounded and persecuted all those who did not worship the image of Baal. Of such a kind was Catherine de' Medici. Her intrigues were constant and infamous. To destroy the Huguenots seems to have been her whole ambition. It was the spirit that she engendered that expressed itself in the terrible persecutions. She represented and typified that spirit of hatred and violence that was continually launched against the Huguenots, and which culminated in the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. In spite of all this suffering, the spirit of the Huguenots was never broken; subdued temporarily perhaps, but never conquered. Even if their blood mingled with the soil of France, their spirit survived long after the bodies had turned to dust.

Could anything be more frightful in human annals than the murder at Tours, when 300 people, tied together two by two, were led out and slaughtered like beasts; or the atrocities at Sens when to the music of the cathedral bell, citizens were invited to murder those who espoused the reformed faith. The massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day stands in history as one of the most colossal examples of hatred and violence. The marriage of Henry of Navarre and Margaret of Valois was the occasion for this vast concourse at Paris. Little did the people think that behind the mask of nuptial festivities lurked the diabolical grin of Catherine de' Medici, the Jesuits, and the Guise faction. What sardonic irony to have the wedding ceremony take place on the scaffold outside the Notre Dame! On signal the massacre began, and the streets of Paris flowed with the finest blood of Christendom. Thousands fell, and Coligny who had been wounded some time before, did not escape, as an assassin entered his room and plunged a dagger into his body.

Charles IX will go down in history along with Catherine de' Medici dishonored and execrated wherever honor and justice are known among men. The effort to explain away this massacre on the ground that it was a misunderstanding is futile. The processions and tolling of bells in praise of the massacre were genuine expressions of hatred. The medal struck by Gregory XIII with the image of the Pope on one side and the destroying angel slaying the Huguenots on the other side are proofs of the fact that the massacre was planned. Such heroism as the Huguenots displayed is not seen apart from religious convictions.

The Edict of Nantes, signed by Henry IV (1598) had raised the spirits of the Huguenots to a high pitch. It looked as if some sort of modus vivendi might result. But the fires of hatred did not die down. In spite of the Edict of Nantes, the rights of the Huguenots, supposedly guaranteed under the edict, were constantly being violated. Such guaranties of the edict as full amnesty, liberty of conscience, the right of chiefs and nobles to hold services for themselves and their dependents; the right to establish churches outside of Paris; and eligibility to civil office were being gradually but methodically violated. More and more of these guaranties were being taken away, and the edict was being treated with indifference and contempt. Louis XIV pretended in a declaration made in 1652 that the rights granted in the Edict of Nantes would be maintained. Upon the death of Cardinal Mazarin, who, like Richelieu, by intrigue and cajolery had ruled with an iron hand, the persecution of the Huguenots broke out afresh. The Edict of Nantes was fast becoming a dead letter. The emigration of the Huguenots from France began.

In 1661 a decree forbidding emigration was issued, with the threat of fine, or imprisonment, or the galleys. Yet in spite of this decree the emigration continued, and the spirit of the Huguenots remained unbroken. They continued to worship God in accordance with the dictates of conscience.

Then began that final test of the spirit of the people, the test of the dragonnades. Dragoons of soldiers were quartered upon the people. They persecuted, they pillaged, they tortured, and they murdered the people. Every sort of cruelty was used. They beat and whipped and bayoneted men, women, and children. They dragged women by the hair through the streets, and through the mud and mire. Such was the persecution of the dragonnades; a persecution that paralleled and even surpassed the persecutions of the preceding centuries.

Into the provinces of France went this brutal soldiery, spreading terror, and slaying innocent men, women, and children. Then came the crash. The Edict of Nantes was revoked (1685) by Louis XIV, and every vestige of right that was given was now taken back under the hypocritical claim that the majority of those who had espoused the "pretended reformed religion" had returned to the fold of Rome. But the emigration had begun which was to decimate France and inflict losses that have left their marks until this day.

The courage that the Huguenots displayed in battle was the sign of their devotion to their cause. The spirit of a people is demonstrated by the way in which they defend their cause. The battles were forced upon them. They never sought conflicts except in the defense of those rights which they believed to be inalienable. In spite of disaster on the battle field, they held to their convictions and ideas of freedom with a tenacity and a courage that are inspiring. The Battle of Dreux (1562), in which their great leader Condé was wounded, did not dismay them.

They continued to pray and worship, and as they prayed, they fought for the truth. The defeat of Condé's army near Jarnac, which was a disastrous defeat, when the army was saved from utter rout by the skill of Coligny, only served to bind the Huguenots together in the determination to stand by their cause. The defeat at Moncontour (1569) when Coligny was badly wounded did not destroy their enthusiasm. They refused to be subdued by the loss of a battle. It was the victory at Ivry (1590) that brought hope to the Huguenot cause. It was on this field of battle that Henry of Navarre whose white plumes were the standard to be followed, said to his followers, "If the standard fail you, keep my plume in your eyes." Whether on the field of battle or imprisoned in the city by a siege, their courage and endurance never failed. Even when La Rochelle was besieged the second time, the defenders held out for nine months, offering the most stubborn resistance.

Louis XIII ordered the fortifications to be completely destroyed and the "Grand Temple" of Protestantism to be leveled to the ground. All who professed allegiance to the "pretended reformed religion" were denied admission to the city as inhabitants. Many were forced to leave under the most pitiable circumstances. Yet, in spite of it all, the faith of the people did not wane and their devotion and loyalty to the cause did not die. Here again is seen that invincible spirit which keeps no company with compromise and does not speak the language of surrender. It is such a spirit of heroism, of endurance in suffering, of devotion and loyalty to a great cause, of martyrdom for a truth, and of the preservation of faith in spite of torture, that makes a people strong and great.

The diffusion of the spirit of the Huguenots took place coincident with their emigration to other lands. Long before the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, many Huguenots sought to leave France. It did seem at one time after the death of the King of Navarre and the Duke of Guise as if there might be a cessation of hostilities and some peace secured. But the peace urged upon Condé was a mere sham. There could be no peace while Catherine de' Medici still had power. Beneath the surface there was the undercurrent of hatred and violence. So through the years the emigration continued. Thousands left France for Switzerland, Germany, Holland, and England. Into the spirit of these nations they added their spirit of faith and of freedom. Into the blood stream of the nations they poured their crimson flood.

The increase of persecution after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes was a constant urge for many Huguenot families to leave, for the revocation of the edict was a death blow to the Huguenot cause as well as a physical, moral, and spiritual disaster to France. One historian says, "The banishment of the Huguenots from France took away the backbone of her religious life." The French Revolution and the spread of infidelity were the logical outcome of this suicidal policy. France sowed the wind and reaped the whirlwind. The later years proved the futility of trying to kill an idea or a cause with an edict. An idea can not be killed by the sword, and a cause is not lost because an edict has been issued against it. The spirit of a people which represents their faith and their devotion to great ideas is not destroyed by an ecclesiastical decree or subdued by the noise of musketry. After the revocation of the Edict of Nantes over half a million Huguenots left France to enrich the nations of Switzerland, Germany, Holland, England, and America.

The industrial collapse in France, the decline of manufactures, the loss of state revenues were practical suggestions to Louis XIV of his disastrous policy. In 1669 an edict was passed forbidding emigration, but it was not entirely successful. The vast emigration continued, and the spirit of the Huguenot was released for the world. In history, art, literature, and science the nations of Europe benefited by the influx of these refugees. No wonder some of these countries offered asylum for these people, as for example the edict of Potsdam by Frederick William, the Margrave of Brandenburg. (See the French Protestant Revolution, by Weiss, vol. 2, p. 390.)

The influence on Holland was tremendous. To that virile nation the Huguenots contributed their strength and spirit. Their influence on government is well shown in their support of William of Orange, who represented much for which they had suffered. In following the course of events that culminated in the Dutch Republic, account must be taken of the contribution of the vast number of Huguenot refugees in Holland, who found such a welcome asylum in the Netherlands. Their views on government as well as on religion found fertile soil in Holland, and Protestantism in Holland has in it the elements of the Huguenot faith and spirit. A large number of Huguenot refugees translated their French names into the Dutch language, and names which are synonymous with the direction of the affairs of state, the progress of industry and the purity and power of religion are found among them. But the blessing was not confined to Europe alone. Perhaps the influence of the Huguenot spirit in America is even greater than the effect upon Holland.

The large number of Huguenots who came to America prior to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes and afterwards, explain the great influence that they had upon our national life. The States of Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania profited by the emigration of the Huguenots to this country. Such settlements as at Oxford, Mass.; in Ulster County, and Westchester County, N. Y.; and in New York City demonstrate the wide dispersion of the Huguenots and the consequent influence upon life and thought. It is estimated "that in the year 1610, one-fourth of the population of New York City was Huguenot." (The Huguenot Church, A Brief History, published by the Huguenot Society of South Carolina, p. 9.) The Huguenots helped to soften the rigorous severity of the Puritan in New England, and added their strength to that of the Dutch in the settlements of New York.

The South profited greatly by the landing of the Huguenots. Maryland, Virginia, and Carolina welcomed the oppressed Protestants of France. In the year 1562 Jean Ribaut undertook an expedition to this country, and built a fort which he called Charles Fort, on Parris Island. Later, Laudonnière undertook an expedition in 1564, and established Fort Caroline near the St. Johns River in Florida. Upon the return of Ribaut, who was forced to land near Fort Caroline, the Spanish Admiral Menendez wreaked vengeance upon this settlement and massacred the people.

To the city of Charleston the Huguenots came, 250 years ago. It is eminently proper that the celebration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the landing of the Huguenots on this soil be synchronous with the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the removal of the city of Charleston from the site of old Charles Town on the river to this favored and strategic spot. Charleston was a city from the beginning. It did not grow from a village into a town, and from a town into a city. It is one of the few places in the land that was a city at the first. Here the Huguenots found a most welcome city of refuge. Like the cities of refuge of old that guaranteed safety and protection, so the city of Charleston was a city of refuge for the persecuted and oppressed Huguenots. It was to this city that they came in the very wake of Ribaut's ship, but with no Menendez to oppose their landing.

These Huguenots, God's clientele of faith, came here and built their places of worship in Charleston, Goose Creek, Orange Quarter, French Santee, St. John Berkeley, Purysburg, and New Bordeaux. Here in their new homes they adjusted themselves among an English-speaking people and gave themselves with diligence and loyalty to the purposes and life of the province. They merged their interests and their lives into the interests and the life of the colony, until they became a vital and integral part of the province. Perhaps the French Huguenots had more power of adjustment than the phlegmatic English or the hard-headed Scotch. At any rate, the infusion of the Huguenot spirit into

the life of the Province of Carolina was a most beneficial one. It was by this spirit that they could help to broaden the spirit of the Anglican, as well as soften the theological austerity of the Scotch Presbyterian.

The infusion of this spirit into the religious life of the province has had many varied and helpful results; not such results as are visible and may be catalogued, but results that are woven into the fabric of a people's character; and in the weaving have become the common property of all. It is a proud but justifiable boast that in this noble city by the sea, which thus far has escaped the tragic blight of being "modern," Huguenots, English, and Scotch have combined to make a people who love the spirit and traditions of their forbears, and who seek in the coming days to pass on to posterity those graces of character, those convictions of soul, and those standards of practice which are the real elements that make a people great.

The spirit of the Huguenots was the spirit of patriotism. In the new-found home, the Huguenots espoused again the cause of freedom. Into this cause went loyalty, fidelity, and sacrificial service. The mere mention of such names as John Jay, of New York, President of the Congress in 1774 and succeeding Boudinot as president of the American Bible Society; Elias Boudinot, of Pennsylvania, President of the Congress in 1782 and president of American Bible Society; Henry Laurens, of South Carolina, president of the Committee of Safety in 1775, Member of Congress in 1776, and later minister to Holland in 1779, is significant of the patriotic spirit. The spirit of the Huguenots knew no compromise. Nothing illustrates this spirit better than the answer of Henry Laurens to his English captors. It is strangely like the words of Jeanne d'Albret, who said to Catherine de' Medici, "Rather than deny my faith by attending mass, if I had my son in one hand and my kingdom in the other, I would throw them both into the sea." So when Laurens was captured on the high seas on his way to Holland, and imprisoned by the English in the Tower of London, he was offered his liberty if he would serve the interests of England, and to such suggestion he indignantly replied, "I will never subscribe my name to my own infamy, and to the dishonor of my family." (The Huguenots, by Smiles, p. 438.)

Another patriot was the brilliant John Laurens, the son of Henry Laurens. His splendid service in the Revolutionary cause was cut short by his untimely death on the field of battle, at the age of 27. Another great patriot was Gabriel Manigault who, too old to carry arms, loaned $220,000 to the Revolutionary cause. But the patriotic spirit of the Huguenots did not consist only in their devotion to the cause of liberty in their new land. They still held in deep affection the land they had left behind.

To undertake to determine what was the most important characteristic of the spirit of the Huguenots would be a difficult if not impossible task. Many elements entered in and contributed to that spirit. Such a spirit must be composite, made up of various qualities of mind and heart, for the spirit is the expression of the soul. Faith, loyalty, courage, patience, hope, the desire for freedom, the sense of justice and of right, all these enter into the composition of that spirit.

The traditions of the Huguenots must be maintained. All that the spirit of the Huguenots represented constitutes the traditions. No people can afford to lose their interest in the traditions that are their own peculiar property. The Huguenots have had a large share in the traditions of this city, of this State, and of this country. It would be a tragic thing for these traditions to be lost. To keep alive the ideas of freedom: intellectual freedom, spiritual freedom, and political freedom—this is of itself a noble purpose.

Into the life of the Nation God sent an oppressed people. Cast out of their own land by bitter hatred and ruthless persecution, they have enriched the nations of the earth in every sphere of human endeavor and in every department of spiritual experience. It was the "finest of the wheat" that God the Father took and with a mighty sweep of His arm cast among the nations of the earth. The seed fell on good soil, it took root and sprang up, and has borne fruit everywhere to the blessing of the world and the glory of God. The name Huguenot is a noble name to bear. Mrs. Sigourney in her poem on The Huguenot Fort at Oxford, Mass., says:

"On all who bear
Their name, or lineage, may their mantle rest;
That firmness for the truth, that calm content
With simple pleasures, that unswerving trust,
In toil, adversity, and death, which cast
Such healthful leaven 'mid the elements
That peopled the new world."

It is a very great advantage to have some visible and tangible thing to help maintain a great tradition. No tangible thing and no visible object could be more effective for such a purpose as is here contemplated than the maintenance of this church building as the shrine of a great spirit. The very walls of this church building if they could speak, would testify with eloquence, of the faith and devotion of that people which this church represents. It would be most fitting if this building could be made a permanent shrine. It should not be a matter of interest and concern to only a few. It should be the united effort of all those who hold physical or spiritual kinship with the Huguenots of America.

This church building should be preserved, not only as a landmark of colonial settlement, nor merely as a place of deep historic interest, but as a noble monument to the faith, loyalty, devotion, and sacrifice of a people who, cast out of their own land, found a haven of refuge in the New World, and helped to build a nation. The traditions must be maintained. They must not be lost; for the spirit of the Huguenot is imperishable.

---

THE SPIRIT OF THE HUGUENOT

By Rev. James H. Taylor, D. D.

(Written on the occasion of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the landing of the Huguenots in Charleston, S. C.)

The spirit of the Huguenot
  Pervaded all of France
And helped the cause of freedom
  To make such great advance

That high and low and mighty
  Among the sons of men
Renewed their hope and faith in God
  And pledged themselves again

To urge the cause of freedom
  Of mind and soul and life,
And win that freedom for mankind
  No matter what the strife.

The spirit of the Huguenot
  Undaunted by the cry
Of hate and noise of soldiery
  And dragoons coming nigh

To place of worship and to homes,
  To palace and to cot—
Amid the turmoil and the din
  That spirit wavered not.

Not Vassy, Tours, nor La Rochelle,
  With all the hate and wrong,
Nor Jarnac's loss nor Dreux defeat,
  Could break that spirit strong.

The settlement for massacre
  And payment of just due,
Will God in heaven render men
  For St. Bartholomew.

The spirit of the Huguenot
  Of soldier, martyr, saint,
Of nobles, gentry, peasant too,
  With which men are acquaint,

Could not be crushed or even dimmed,
  When hate and rage, twin-yoked,
Demand the Edict good of Nantes
  Be ruthlessly revoked.

The spirit of the Huguenot
  To Carolina came.
The noble sons and daughters, too,
  Won wealth and power and fame,

And rendered service fine and true
  In cause of liberty,
And laid down life with sacrifice
  To make a people free.

The spirit of the Huguenot,
  The spirit in the blood—
Into the life stream of our land
  It poured a crimson flood

To fuse convictions of the soul:
  Right, Truth, and Liberty;
And from the union of such things
  A nation came to be.

The spirit of the Huguenot
  Is marching through the years.
It does not cringe, or compromise
  With perils or great fears.

Along the highway of the age
  It moves, as if a wraith,
Invisible, invincible—
  The heritage of faith.

The spirit of the Huguenot
Is calling from above:
Maintain, preserve the cause of Truth,
And Justice, Faith, and Love.

Take, hold the torch, and hold it fast,
And let it shine on high.
The spirit of the Huguenot—
It lives, and shall not die.

REFERENCE OF BILLS TO COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement touching the reference of a joint resolution. The Chair has retained on the Speaker's table for some time Senate Joint Resolution No. 3, providing for an amendment to the Constitution. The Chair did this in the hope and expectation that a rule now pending, and pending for some time, in the Committee on Rules, providing that all joint resolutions with reference to amendments to the Constitution should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, would be reported by that committee. The Chair is distinctly of the opinion that such a rule should be passed. The Chair thinks that all matters with reference to amendments to the Constitution should be considered by the Committee on the Judiciary. The Chair, of course, has the greatest confidence in the learning and ability of the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, which has had jurisdiction over this matter for a number of years, but at the same time the Chair would have been glad, if it were possible, to have had the Committee on the Judiciary pass upon this resolution. However, in view of the fact that the Chair is convinced that that rule will not be adopted at this session of Congress, and in view of the further fact that an almost precisely similar joint resolution has been reported by the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress and is now on the calendar, the Chair thinks it proper to now refer Senate Joint Resolution No. 3 to the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Mr. GARNER. Will the Chair permit an interruption at this point?

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. Would it have been in order at any time since the resolution was reported by the Committee on the Election of President and Vice President to have called up a similar Senate resolution which has been on the Speaker's desk?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that at any time after House Joint Resolution 292 had been reported and placed on the Calendar it would have been in order, provided such report antedated the messaging over of the Senate joint resolution. The rule on the subject—clause 2, Rule XXIV—is that where a Senate bill or resolution is messaged over to the House after a similar House bill or resolution has been reported from a committee and is on the House Calendar, then the Senate bill may be called up as privileged by the committee having jurisdiction of the House bill.

Mr. GARNER. If the Chair, then, is anxious for the consideration of this legislation, may I suggest to the Chair to hold this on his desk so we may have an opportunity to exercise the privilege of calling up the Senate resolution with a view of considering it in the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated the general rule, as applied to these cases, but in this case the Senate resolution was messaged over before the House resolution was reported. The privilege therefore would not apply in this particular case, but if it would apply in this particular case, the only complaint the Chair has heard from any source is that it has been retained on the Speaker's table.

Mr. GARNER. If it were sent over before the bill was reported and was still held by the Speaker, why would not the rule apply after the bill had been reported by the committee?

The SPEAKER. In order to give the matter privilege it would have been necessary that the House bill should have been on the calendar before the Senate bill was messaged over.

Mr. GARNER. While I am on my feet and while the subject is up for discussion, Mr. Speaker, what is the probability of the House being permitted to consider the resolution reported by the Committee on Election of President and Vice President during this session of the Congress?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think that question might better be addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Rules. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARNER. May I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] what the prospects are for an opportunity being given the House to consider the resolution reported by the Committee on Election of President and Vice President?

Mr. SNELL. That resolution has just been reported out within the last few days and the matter has just come to the Committee on Rules for consideration. We have several other important matters ahead of it, and I would not be able at the present time to say whether it would be considered or not.

Mr. GARNER. Is the gentleman disposed to give a rule for it if he can reach it?

Mr. SNELL. Well, I can not tell the gentleman at the present time whether I am or not. I have not given the matter consideration. The resolution has just been reported out. It will receive consideration the same as about 100 other things that are before the Committee on Rules at the present time.

Mr. GARNER. Then, if I understand the gentleman from New York, his mind is a blank on the subject of the consideration of this resolution?

Mr. SNELL. Oh, it will compare favorably with the gentleman from Texas on the same subject. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Speaker with respect to the resolution coming over from the other body and lying on the Speaker's table, whether any Member of that body ever made any inquiry concerning the disposition of the resolution; or was there any request or any move on the part of any Member of this body that action of any character be taken upon that resolution up to this time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has never had a request or suggestion from any Member of either body with reference to the resolution.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, in order that the record may be clear, may I ask the Speaker a question? Is it not customary when bills are sent from the other House to this body for the Speaker to refer them to the respective committees unless some Member of the House asks him to hold them on his desk with a view to taking some action upon them? If it were necessary in each instance for some Member of the House to request the Speaker to send a bill to the respective committees, then every Member would have to take note of every bill sent over here and make a special request of the Speaker of the House of Representatives. So I think the question of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] does not mean anything, because the custom in this House, since I have been a Member of it, has been that when a bill is passed by the Senate and sent to the House of Representatives, it is sent to the proper committee unless there is some special reason why it should be held on the Speaker's desk. The rule requires this, I am advised by my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], who is probably as well or better informed on the rules than any man in the House of Representatives.

If the rule requires it to be done, there ought to be some reason why the matter was not referred. I have not heard any good reason given except the one given by the Speaker, which I think is a reasonable one. If you will pardon me for saying so, the Speaker was hoping the Judiciary Committee would have an opportunity to consider this and other resolutions having for their purpose the amending of the Constitution.

Mr. TILSON. Does not the gentleman consider the explanation made by the Speaker as full, clear, and ample?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. And as fully justifying the action he has taken?

Mr. GARNER. But the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] left the impression it was the duty of some other Member of the House to suggest to the Speaker that he refer the matter.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman from Texas is, as usual, wrong. I only asked for the record fact and the Speaker has given that, and the fact is more important than a construction of a custom in this House.

The SPEAKER. While conceding that the gentleman from Texas, in his interpretation of the rules of the House, is almost invariably right, the Chair will call his attention to the fact that the rule requiring reference by the Speaker to a committee is not mandatory. The word "may" is used. The Chair will be pleased to read the rule if the gentleman would like to hear it. The Chair has the rule before him. It is as follows (clause 2, Rule XXIV):

Business on the Speaker's table shall be disposed of as follows:

Messages from the President shall be referred to the appropriate committees without debate. Reports and communications from heads of departments, and other communications addressed to the House, and bills, resolutions, and messages from the Senate may be referred to the appropriate committees in the same manner and with the same right of correction as public bills presented by Members; but House bills with Senate amendments which do not require consideration in a Committee of the Whole may be at once disposed of as the House may determine, as may also Senate bills substantially the same as House

bills already favorably reported by a committee of the House, and not required to be considered in Committee of the Whole, be disposed of in the same manner on motion directed to be made by such committee.

Mr. GARNER. Let me ask the Speaker this question: As I understand, under the rules, the Speaker can take any bill passed by the Senate and retain it on his desk indefinitely unless the House orders him to send it to committee?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is in the discretion of the Chair, under the rule. The Chair will say it is very rare, indeed, that the Speaker does not make immediate reference, but there may be very good and valid reasons why a bill should lie on the Speaker's table for some time. This may very frequently speed the passage of legislation or it may be for such a reason as alleged by the Chair in this instance. This interpretation by the Chair is in complete accord with the decision laid down by Speaker Henderson in Volume IV, section 3111, of Hinds' Precedents. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Texas will agree that matters relating to an amendment of the Constitution ought to be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GARNER. I do agree with the Speaker on that. I think the Judiciary Committee ought to consider all proposed amendments to the Constitution.

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair had in mind in retaining the bill on his desk in this instance.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, since my colleague has brought me into this discussion, may I be permitted to say that for a number of years anyone desiring to introduce bills had to introduce them from the floor of the House and they had to be referred to the proper committee. Some years ago in the interest of conserving time and doing away with the necessity of bills having to be introduced from the floor and referred to committee, this rule was adopted which provides that the Speaker may refer bills originally introduced and Senate bills to the proper committees. I know the word "may" instead of "shall" is used in the rule, but the courts in considering the context of such matters have frequently construed "may" to mean "shall," and I think when we take into consideration the whole history of this rule, as well as the object and the purpose of the rule, it is fair to say that it is the duty of the Speaker, unless extraordinary reason exists in a particular case, to refer the bills.

I have no criticism whatever to make of the Speaker's conduct in this matter. I think the Speaker gave a valid reason for holding it up, but in view of my being brought into the matter, I desired to make this explanation.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made by my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] that he never heard any mention of this matter of the resolution now under consideration—the lame duck resolution—I desire to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he sat here the other day, spellbound, under the influences of a magnificent address that I was delivering on the subject of the gag rules, in which I called attention to the fact that that poor Norris lame duck resolution was being choked to death by a hostile committee. I want to apologize for that statement, for at that time I did not know that it was being choked by other hands. [Laughter.]

AMENDING THE ACT RELATING TO THE PILGRIMAGE OF MOTHERS AND WIDOWS OF DECEASED SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4138) to amend the act of March 2, 1929, entitled "An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries," with Senate amendments, to disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference and to appoint the House conferees.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4138, with Senate amendments, to disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, has the gentleman consulted the minority of the committee?

Mr. RANSLEY. I have talked with the ranking minority member, and he was willing to serve as one of the conferees.

Mr. GARNER. Was he willing that the bill should go to conference?

Mr. RANSLEY. He was.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed as conferees Mr. RANSLEY, Mr. WURZBACH, and Mr. QUIN.

STATE RIGHTS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech made by my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK], and also one made by the Senator from Minnesota, Senator SCHALL, on Tuesday, February 4, 1930, before the Woman's Club in Philadelphia.

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

There was no objection.

The speeches are as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON JAMES M. BECK, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Madam Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, I left my place in the House of Representatives late this afternoon, hence my late appearance at this dinner. I am perfectly in accord with what was said about the matter of distribution of plums. It seems as though this unequal distribution is given on the basis of the old Bryan ratio of 16 to 1. The only explanation I can have is that in that first garden of history a great deal of trouble came when Eve gave Adam an apple. However, that, of course, is not the explanation. It is simply a pleasantry.

There is another reason why I should not trespass any time on your presence and that is to do so would be to postpone the pleasure you are going to have of listening to the Senator from Minnesota, whom we owe a great deal of gratitude. I know the firm response that he will receive, for when the right to a seat in the Senate and, as it should have been, the inviolable right of the State of Pennsylvania to have seated in the Senate the man whom it had chosen, there was one who did not fail to defend not only the rights of the State of Pennsylvania but also the Constitution of the United States; the most eloquent defender of the rights of Pennsylvania was this gentleman who honors us with his presence to-night, who with a most eloquent speech, filled with strength and power, and fighting to the last, fought to defend the rights, not of his State but the rights of the State of Pennsylvania. I only interpret your views now in thanking him for the great service, the great patriotic service, that he rendered this Commonwealth on that notable occasion.

Now, we are approaching, ladies and gentlemen, the birthday of the Republican Party. I am going to make a few remarks upon a question which is suggested by the facts that the dominant patience of Abraham Lincoln was instrumental in the preservation of the Constitution of the United States. That was his great ideal; for that he was prepared to make any sacrifice, and for that he poured out his heart's blood.

The question that I want to commend to you, and to which I shall give no answer, because it does not admit at the moment of any answer, but which is a question of pregnant interest and should be of great interest to everyone is this: How long will the Constitution, framed in this historic city of Philadelphia, endure the constant attacks upon its integrity and the tendency of Americans to undermine it by unprecedented acts of aggression? You will say that the very fact that it lasted 143 years is enough evidence of its lasting preservation. But let me suggest to you that, after all, the life of the Constitution has been a very short one. I have been very fond of relating an instance, and that is, that when I was a boy of 13 years of age in Philadelphia I might well have known the greatest lawyer that Philadelphia ever produced, old Horace Binney, who was 94 years of age, in the year 1874, when I was a boy of 13. Now, Horace Binney, when he was a boy of 7 years of age, and while walking with his father across Independence Hall, had pointed out to him by his father George Washington and Benjamin Franklin, engaged in earnest conversation, and even then engaged in the work of the framing of the Constitution in 1787, so that the whole life of the Constitution can be measured in less than two lives—Horace Binney's life and my life, as yet unfinished—and in that period of time there have been at least six times that the Union was on the verge of dissolution, and in the same period, and, indeed, in the lifetime of men now living, there have been assassinated four Presidents of the United States.

Secretary Hay had the unhappy privilege of standing by the bier of four—three—murdered Presidents. I said four. I should have said four attempts have been made upon the lives of Presidents, but the one which was directed against Andrew Jackson failed of its purpose. The other three unfortunately fell from the assassin's bullet.

The fact is that the first great rebellion took place in our own State of Pennsylvania. The second took place in New England, when the representatives of New England, revolting against James Madison, threatened to leave the Union. The third took place a hundred years ago, when South Carolina insisted upon the right to nullify any law of the Federal Government that it regarded beyond the power of the Federal Government to pass. The fourth was, of course, the Civil War. I forget for the moment the fifth one, but the sixth, in 1876, I think, would have resulted in disastrous consequences, only the memory of a recent Civil War prevented the disruption because of a heated presidential contest.

While that is not encouraging as a reply to the questions that I have propounded for your consideration, it can be said on the more hopeful side of the matter that if the Constitution of the United States tomorrow were made the subject of a great referendum and 110,000,000

people, through their qualified officers, voted upon it, it would be readopted by a majority more nearly approaching unanimity than would be the case of any written constitution in any country in the world, and that, of course, is due to the fact particularly because we love the Constitution as an abstraction and particularly because we have enjoyed n this country an almost unprecedented career of material prosperity.

That is true; but the immortal Father of his Country said long ago that the danger to the Constitution would not come from attacks from without but it would come from the slow process of undermining its foundations and throwing down its stately pillars until eventually, if the progress were not stopped, the whole noble edifice of our freedom would crumble into ruin, and that process of undermining has been going on with such persistence in my lifetime that it gives me the most serious apprehension.

We destroy the great principle that political power and direct taxation should go hand and hand. That if a State only had one-tenth of the power in the Federal Congress with reference to taxes, it could only be subjected to one-tenth of direct taxation instead of having, as we now have, three States of the Federal Union paying 33 per cent of the taxes and being represented on the floor of the Senate by less than one-thirteenth of that body. So that we destroy that principle of the equitable distribution of taxation in proportion to the burdens of taxation.

We have destroyed the most inviolable rights of a sovereign State to secure its own Senator, without the advice and consent of the Senate, always provided that he has the qualifications specifically provided in the Constitution. We destroyed it in the case of Smith in Illinois, we destroyed it in the case of Vare in Pennsylvania.

Of what avail was it to the founders of the Constitution to prescribe the right of a sovereign state to be represented in terms of equality in the upper body of Congress if the Senate can treat itself as a social quality and reject the choice of the State because of the color of his hair, the character of his religion, or any other circumstance that you can imagine. I don't intend to go into that subject.

I only took two, but I can give you a dozen instances in my lifetime of the slow undermining of the Constitution, and the pity is that the people are quite unconscious of the process of the undermining or are indifferent, otherwise they would resent this constant destruction of the symmetry of the noblest edifice of orderly government that the world has ever known.

The trouble is ours is an age of pragmatism. Pragmatism may be a moral pragmatism that is suggested by some passing immortal reform or it may be a pragmatism of another character, and the significance of what I am saying is the great value of women in politics, and I may frankly say that 15 years ago I was very doubtful about it. Women are after all the high priestesses of the abstract and the ideal. They are less affected by the spirit of pragmatism to which I refer. Women see through an important situation into some great principle that lies behind it, and therefore it is for the women of this country, especially the mothers of this country, to have their children know not only the value of the Constitution but to teach them that no immediate good can ever sanction or justify the destruction of any principle of the Constitution.

You will remember in the jungle books of Rudyard Kipling that he speaks of a race of monkeys that lived in the tree tops, and he says they were the most despised of the animal creation, because they had no memories—they could not recall anything. They, therefore, could not remember the past and the future was a blank, and they would chatter and talk about their rights up in the tree tops and make a number of resolutions touching what they would do, and suddenly the falling of a coconut would make them forget and they would tumble down in the scramble for the coconut and all their fine ideals be all forgotten.

Well, now, this Constitution can never last if it imitates the characters Kipling speaks of. If we have no memories, if we live only in the present, the Constitution is bound to perish, as in my judgment it is slowly perishing. It is to inculcate the memory of the sacred past that the mother should tell the child that the mighty past is a power to the living present, and it is the sacred duty of the living to pass the mighty history of the past on to the unborn. That is the task of women—I don't say the only task of women, but it is the uppermost task, because we men in trying to preserve the Constitution have made a sad situation of it. Because we are practical we want immediate results and care little about eternal principles, but you women can uphold the great banner of a noble idealization—you can teach your children the sanctity of the Constitution—you can impress upon them the great obligations of the past, and in so doing if the Constitution, or what is left of it, is still to be preserved it may be largely the work of the women of America, who will be far more far-sighted in this respect than the men.

I remember that George Washington wrote a beautiful letter which I quoted in a book that I once wrote, which expresses to the women of America his sense of obligation for what they had done in the creation of the Constitution—that is, in enlisting the support for that noblest charter of human labor that the world knows, and I trust that a future George Washington, if, indeed, any such can be conceived—but at all events, the future may say that the Constitution, thus powerfully aided in its birth by the women in America, has been preserved by their patriotism.

---

ADDRESS OF SENATOR THOMAS D. SCHALL, OF MINNESOTA

My friends, I have a little cold which makes it almost impossible for me to enunciate and I will ask your indulgence for a few moments until I can get the voice box loosened up.

My name is SCHALL. That's Pennsylvania Dutch. It means sound. There are two branches of sound—music and noise. You can decide which branch I belong to after I get through.

You have just listened to one of the great men of the United States, one of the great men of the world—he is your man. Everywhere intelligence dominates, the name of JAMES BECK is known. He is not only a great defender of the common rights of the people but he is a thorough outstanding student and knows whereof he speaks every time he opens his mouth.

I wanted to call the name of SCHALL to your attention to give you an inkling of the fact that my ancestry came out of Pennsylvania, and therefore must be good, however much depreciated the descendants may be. My parents, fortunately for me, drifted to one of those backward States, of which you have heard so much lately, but we out there in the Northwest still have liberties. We out there in the West—Minnesota—still continue to think and say what we damn please. I am a Lincoln Republican. I am a Lincoln-Roosevelt Republican. In my State when I became a Roosevelt Republican and joined the Bull Moose movement in 1912, there were some Grundys out there who did not believe in that kind of Republicanism. These Grundyites when I attempted to file on the Republican ticket in 1916 for Congress, set out, because I had supported Roosevelt, to keep me from filing on the Republican ticket and were successful and I was again forced to file on an Independent ticket; but the people of my district returned me nevertheless with a good majority. In 1918 I again offered my filing as a Republican. The secretary of state accepted that filing but the Grundyites protested and appealed it to the supreme court of our State. The supreme court held that I was a Republican and that my filing as such was correct. Therefore you may have no fear as to my Republicanism for I am the only Republican in the State of Minnesota who has been vouched for as such by the highest lawgiving power in my State. The people of my district sent me to Congress for 10 years with ever-increasing majorities, despite the fact that the standpat Grundy element did not want me there and the same element did not want me in the United States Senate and will oppose with all the power they have my return in 1930 to that Senate.

I give you this that you may know I have had some personal experience. There is nothing like personal experience to acquaint you with what the other fellow is up against. My experience is very similar to my friend Vare's experience.

My father was a Republican; I have always been a Republican; he fought and voted for Abraham Lincoln. Personally I don't believe that any individual or a small group of individuals in the country has any right to prescribe the ingredients of Republicanism. Republicanism should be what the needs of all our country demand and not the demands of a small group of a small section of that country, however wealthy, powerful, and influential that small group may be.

I am a friend of Bill Vare's. I came to be a friend of Bill Vare from knowing him, just from meeting him in the House, where I served with him 10 years. He is an honest, faithful patriot.

I could not understand the opposition, as I sat in the Senate during all the discussions that were going on while this State was seeking its honest representation in that Senate. There has never been one word spoken there against Bill Vare personally. The only impeachment was that he spent too much money in the primaries. Nobody has ever claimed that he broke a law of the State of Pennsylvania, that he broke a law of the United States, but the sole complaint as set out in the United States Senate was that he spent too much money. His opponents spent three times the amount that he did, and the beneficiary of that amount of money now sits in Vare's place in the Senate of the United States. If the people of Pennsylvania are not dumb-driven oxen, they will not stand for that kind of a deal. If I know the hearts of the people of Pennsylvania, I believe they will rise up and strike back.

Through manipulation your champion of the people has been thrown in the discard, and special privilege fills his place. The name of the man who spent three times as much money as Bill Vare in the primaries now takes its place on the roster as one of the Senators from the State of Pennsylvania.

Bill Vare is a man of the common people. There are many who think that they might be disgraced perhaps by sitting with him. They will only be elevated by one of God's great works. Bill Vare, the common lad that earned his way up from a little boy earning two and a half dollars a week. He knows the trials and tribulations and hardships through which the ordinary people of this country pass. He understands. He has a heart of understanding, one King Solomon spoke of. When the Lord asked King Solomon what he most desired, he replied,

"Give me a heart of understanding that I might discern between right and wrong." Bill Vare has that sort of understanding that gives the judgment and justice of soul to decide between right and wrong, for he believes that the right of government is founded upon the most good for the most of the people. In fact, you people of this State were fortunate in having Bill Vare to make the fight in behalf of the common people of your State and the country. What would you have done if you had had Mr. BECK or some other candidate as poor financially as he? He would not have had enough to make the fight, or one-third of the money the other fellow spent. You are fortunate you had a man who had the money to make the fight and who at the same time believed in the common people of this State.

Abraham Lincoln said, "The Lord loved the common people; that's why he made so many of them." The injustice that has been dealt out to the people of Pennsylvania by the striking down of Bill Vare as your Senator is the kind of injustice that is the beginning of the disintegration of the foundation upon which rests the rights of the States and the rights of the individuals of those States. It is the people of Pennsylvania that were struck at through Bill Vare. He only has been the instrument that has been struck in your name. If the people of this State do not resent it there is something lacking in your spirit, something gone from your soul; and you are not worth fighting for.

This is a great country that we live in. Just think of it, my friends. When I think of the time I found myself out in Minnesota, at the age of 9, without parents, without influence, without anything to put bread into the inside of me. A bootblack, a newspaper boy, I could not read or write at the age of 12. By accident I came into a little town in Minnesota from working with a threshing crew at 75 cents a day, got into a fight with a man and beat him up so badly that the city authorities thought I ought to go to jail. The school professor who came along about that time and witnessed the fight said that a boy who had the courage to fight like that must have something good in him. He said, "Let he have him," and, following a consultation, I was turned over to the professor. He took me over to his home and began to talk to me about my country, told me about Abraham Lincoln, and wanted to put me in school. I consented and began my education under him in his schoolroom. That education has continued throughout the years and has finally landed me in the United States Senate.

I could not help but think, when they were talking about gardens here a few moments ago, and talking about the women and the flowers that grow in those gardens, that I have been pretty fortunate in my garden of roses I have here at my right in my better three-fourths.

At 26 I began the practice of law and was successful. It is all right to say that now—I am not looking for business. If I had been allowed the sight of my eyes I would have accumulated my share of the money, because I felt that money was power and I was too ready to sell my services for that money. At 30 I went to Fargo, N. Dak., to try a lawsuit. During the noon hour I stepped into a cigar store, purchased a cigar and attempted to light it with one of these little electric cigar lighters that should have been connected with a 6-volt battery, but the battery had become dead and the young folks of the store had hooked the machine onto the electric current of the city, 220 volts. I was the first one to use it since its connection with the city current. There was a flash that sent me sprawling. In less than a year I was totally blind.

At the age of 30 I had lost my sight. Mind you from the age of 9 I had taken care of myself. I went through common school, high school, and the University of Minnesota. I won every oratorical contest during my entire time at the university and represented my State at interstate oratoricals during all these years. In 1902 I won the Northern Oratorical League contest for the State of Minnesota. The original motive that caused me to enter these oratorical contests was the large money prizes. It was this money so won that helped me in getting through the university.

If Eve had not given Adam that apple spoken of here a few moments ago, Adam might have wasted his life in frivolous laziness. The moment he bit that apple he became blessed because he was forced out into the stream of life where he had to contend and overcome difficulties, and in the doing of this he acquired a strength of understanding. He had to fight—he had to swim against the stream of life, and that made a man of him. If Eve had not, through her actions, had Adam kicked out into the world, he never would have known tribulation. You remember what Paul said: "Tribulation, we should be thankful for." Through tribulation you secure patience, through patience you come to an understanding, through an understanding you come into the vibrations of the great intelligence about us. I want you to know, my friends, that I would not trade all the tribulations and all the pains and sufferings that have come to me, that have given me that heart of understanding, that have given me a soul, that have given me the power to stand and tell anyone to go to hell, for all the eyes in the world.

For 12 years of my life I acquired the adjectives of the alleys and sometimes in the heat of extemporaneous discussion they creep in and expose the origin. Mrs. Schall tries to keep me within bounds and she succeeds pretty well if she is close enough to step on my toe in time; but down deep in my heart I want you to know that there is no one more reverent of the Great Intelligence than I am. I have never gone into a battle that I did not pray, "God help me." As a little boy upon the street when somebody interfered with what I deemed to be my rights I declared war and always before the attack I prayed, "God help me." He must have helped me because I am not conscious of ever having been licked. I to-day pray as the people's representative in the United States Senate: "God help me to do the right; God help me to preserve the independence and liberties that the individuals of this country might have the opportunity to go on and develop a heart of understanding."

Did you ever stop to think that nowhere in the world is there an opportunity given for the individual as there is in this country? The more troubles you have the better off you are. God gives each of us so much trouble. If you have a big, stout pair of legs, you have a big cross. You have a cross in proportion to the amount you can carry. Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth. Some time ago my little daughter here, when about 5, climbed on my lap and said: "Daddy, can you see me with your eyes?" and I said, "No; I can't." After a moment she said: "You can see me with your heart, can't you?" In her innocent prattle she had struck the keynote of life. It is with the heart that we all see; it is with the heart that we all understand. The heart is the source of power, the source of love, the source of everything that's good in the world. You can grow only when you are a part of a great thing. You have to have individuality to choose between right and wrong to grow a soul. You have to have tribulations, you have to carry burdens, you have to fight, and if you won't fight you are not worth a damn.

If ever the people of Pennsylvania were right, they were right when they picked Bill Vare and sent him to the United States Senate.

I want to say to you to-night that if you stand here and allow this next election coming up and don't force Bill Vare to run for the United States Senate, you are not worth fighting for. I know that Bill Vare wants to do what you people want him to do. There should be a concentrated effort to make him run for the Senate, and, if I am a judge of human nature, there won't be any question about whether he comes back or not. These are my sentiments—you can take them or leave them, but this is true, that if you can induce Bill Vare to run for the Senate you will have an honest representative of the cause of the people; and I for one should be glad to come into your State and talk to the people in his behalf and do whatever I can to further his election.

Marian Pyle, the chairman of this meeting, just told me a few moments ago that Ed Vare, the brother of Bill Vare, gave her inspiration and insight into life. I didn't have the pleasure of knowing him. He said to her, "When you are wrong, admit it and stand up against the world and admit it; but when you are right, go to hell before you give in." I think that's pretty good advice and I thoroughly approve of the last noun which in my mind is the only adequate expression. I know my approval of that noun will get me into trouble with Mrs. Schall. She advises me that I have already talked long enough. I agree with her and think that it is already too long and will say in summary and conclusion that I would not trade the understanding and heart, if you want to call it such, that comes to me in the 21 years of darkness, for all the eyes of the world. I would like to see, but I would not trade back on the same basis. I was bullheaded, stubborn, materialistic; I wanted money, because money would have given me power, and I would have gotten it if I had had my sight, but through it I might have lost my soul.

I am an instrument, as we are all instruments to do what we can to preserve the purpose of the founders of this country. This great country won't last long, just as Mr. BECK told you, if we don't let the Constitution alone. He just told you practically that they kicked Bill Vare out of the Senate because they didn't like the color of his hair, and only a couple of days later they seat Mr. GRUNDY. I have nothing against Mr. GRUNDY; he is a fine gentleman. I like his frankness. But they kicked Vare out because he spent too much money and seated the man that furnished the money for the Vare opposition—three times as much. Everybody elected upon that ticket had the same votes that were given for Bill Vare. Was there any difference between the votes that were cast for him and the votes that elected the rest of the crowd? If you people let that go on you are not worth the powder to blow you to hell, and the way to remedy that is to insist on Bill Vare running for the Senate and send him back there. A flag is a meaningless thing unless it be associated with all it represents. Our flag means all there is of human freedom and human equality. It represents the freedom of civilization—the symbol of the most powerful and the most progressive Nation under the sun.

I believe we ought to sleep nights. I believe we need a Navy that is going to protect us. Our flag floats over every sea. To the immigrants across the sea this is the promised land; these are our homes; this is the land we love so well. It is by taking care of the things that Mr. BECK told you about that the liberties in this country will be preserved. We have never failed in battle anywhere, but we will fail if we do not keep the rights of the individuals, the rights of the State

under the Constitution, and go out and fight to maintain and hold these rights.

If you stand and insist upon this man Vare going back to the Senate you will be maintaining your dignity, your principle, and there can be no reason why Bill Vare should not sit in that Senate. Bill Vare means to the State of Pennsylvania what the La Follettes stand for to Wisconsin. He is the common man's friend. He is the worker's friend. He has always been for the under dog. He is a man who has a heart of understanding, that knows the difference between right and wrong. I thank you.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any special orders that have been made up to this time, I may address the House for one hour on the subject of the effect of certain items in the proposed river and harbor bill upon the Great Lakes and the waterways.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that on April 22, after the conclusion of the remarks by the gentleman from Texas, he may address the House for one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from North Dakota to withdraw his request until we see whether we are going to finish the veterans' bill by that time. I announced yesterday that I would object to any more requests to address the House until the veterans' bill was finished.

Mr. BURTNESS. In response to the gentleman I may say that I have asked the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] whether we would finish the veterans' bill by Tuesday and he assured me that we would. If there is any doubt about it, I will modify my request so as to make it apply after the veterans' bill is disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota modifies his request to make it apply after the veterans' bill is disposed of. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LONDON NAVAL TREATY

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the London naval treaty.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Speaker, the general outlines of the pending naval treaty have been published in cabled dispatches to the press, and on the basis of such information the very able gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] a few days ago presented to the House an interesting interpretation of them. I have attempted a similarly provisional analysis, differing in some respects from his interpretation, which perhaps may be of interest to some of the Members. Possibly this comment at certain points may prove inapplicable to the final draft of the treaty, when it is adopted, but such irrelevancies are apt only to have reference to its details, as the groundwork of the proposed treaty seems to have been agreed upon.

Let me preface what I am about to say by conceding that our American delegates have undoubtedly done the best that they could with a very difficult situation, and that they are not to blame for the rather feeble output of the conference. They have from the beginning labored under heavy handicaps.

HANDICAPS OF OUR DELEGATES

The world had been misled to hope for much more sweeping achievements than it was within reason to expect. When Premier MacDonald invited the other governments to participate in the conference he grandiloquently referred to it as a "disarmament conference." Under present conditions it could not have been anything of the sort. He and others spoke as if great reductions in naval expenditures were going to flow from it. This was also an impractical and Utopian dream. The conference presumably might put the brakes upon such an inordinate increase in naval expenditures as the British demands at Geneva had seemed to forecast, but it was chimerical to expect from it any substantial reduction in naval appropriations in any country.

The achievement of any current reduction in American naval tonnage or expenditures was from the start impossible because of our persistent neglect of auxiliary ship construction during the previous years. No sort of agreement within the range of realities could relieve the United States from paying the cost of cruiser construction that had been so long overdue.

The negotiation of reductions in France and Italy was also rendered difficult by the circumstances under which the conference was called. After the sensational trip of the British Premier to Washington had been heralded throughout the world and it had been generally published that he had reached an understanding with our authorities, the Governments of France and Italy could scarcely have been expected to cooperate with enthusiasm in what they regarded as an Anglo-American undertaking. When during the conference our Government was placed in the attitude of supporting the British 2-power standard, it was but natural that the continental governments should have been even less inclined to fall in line.

WEAKNESSES OF THE LONDON TREATY

All things considered, it is not surprising that the terms of the London treaty, as provisionally announced, fall short of what had been hoped for in several important respects.

First. As originally announced, the London conference was intended to do for auxiliary vessels what the Washington conference had done for the dreadnoughts or battleships. This has not been accomplished. The purpose could only have been realized had Premier MacDonald at the outset followed the example set by Secretary Hughes when he opened the Washington conference with an offer on behalf of this country to sacrifice our supremacy in capital ships by scrapping some 800,000 tons—the half of our battleship fleet.

Had Premier MacDonald at the first session of the London conference matched that amazing sacrifice of Secretary Hughes by a similar offer to reduce the British cruiser tonnage to the level or our own, there might well have resulted a general reduction in the cruiser construction program of the several countries. But the British do not handle conferences in that way. As a result, according to the terms of the London treaty in order to attain parity we shall be obliged to build considerably more than double the number and tonnage of cruisers that we now have built and building. In addition to the 90,000 tons afloat and approximately 60,000 more tons building—a total of 18 cruisers, aggregating 150,000 tons built and building—the treaty provides for our building 173,000 additional tons—apparently about 20 additional cruisers.

Second. A very surprising feature in reference to these new cruisers lies in the restriction limiting our use of the additional tonnage to types of vessels that we do not need, and preventing our taking advantage of recent developments in naval construction. Our delegates seem to have been persuaded by their British confreres to agree that nearly half of this additional tonnage shall be limited to a type of cruiser which every American naval authority has hitherto contended is ill adapted to our needs. We are apparently to build some 10 or 11 cruisers which the naval board have told us are unsatisfactory in view of the great distances which separate our naval bases, and limited in armament to the type of guns installable on merchant vessels, which have no particular value to us in view of our lack of a merchant marine available for war service.

Our delegates are reported also to have agreed that not more than half of these new cruisers, which we are still to build, shall be equipped with decks allowing planes to land on them. Why our representatives, after having accepted a cruiser-construction program which will cost the American people more than $300,000,000 to build, should have allowed our naval designers to be hamstrung so that they can not use their ingenuity in making these vessels as effective as possible is difficult to understand. It is doubtful whether the American people will be satisfied with such an arrangement.

Third. It is doubtful, too, whether our people will be pleased with the concessions made to Japan. Apparently, in order to save the treaty from being an exclusively Anglo-American agreement, the British and American delegates were willing to concede almost anything that the Japanese delegates asked. Japan's rating goes up from 60 per cent, established at the Washington conference, to more than 70 per cent in the destroyer and cruiser classes, and to 100 per cent in submarines. Not only is Japan given complete parity in submarines but, according to some of the press reports, she has asked the privilege of transferring destroyer tonnage to the submarine category, which, if granted, would give her actual superiority in the latter class of ships.

Fourth. The whole treaty so far as limitations upon construction are concerned rests upon an unfortunately unstable and insecure foundation. It is based upon recognition of the British demand for a 2-power standard fleet, coupled with the dubious assumption that France and Italy will not build the fleets which they have affirmed their intention of building.

Our delegates apparently support the British contention that their fleet is entitled to a strength double that of any European power or equal to that of any two such powers combined, and at the same time they apparently assume that the program frankly announced by the French and Italian delegates at the opening of the conference as their final terms, and which, if executed, would invalidate the British 2-power standard, will

never be adhered to. The terms negotiated with the British, establishing for Great Britain and the United States tonnage limitations for each category of ships, are predicated upon the maintenance by the British of their 2-power standard, and our delegates are reported to have agreed, through what is known as the "escalator" or "safety" clause, that if France and Italy should proceed to construct what they have declared that they intend to construct, then the British tonnage quotas established by the treaty need not be observed. It would be difficult to conceive of a more tenuous or hypothetical arrangement. The British tonnage limitations are made contingent upon the validity of the supposition that France and Italy do not mean what they say.

Fifth. Such a treaty, even with Japan included, runs the risk of being regarded by the rest of the world as primarily an Anglo-American agreement, the purport and implication of which other peoples will be inclined to distrust. It is perhaps not to be wondered at if the people of Italy and France resent our apparent support of the British 2-power standard and our apparent agreement with the British to make their countries responsible for the failure of the treaty if they do not acquiesce in accepting that standard. However much and with whatever good faith we may insist upon our neutrality in European affairs, we are likely to be considered as having taken sides in a controversy between the British and the continental powers.

SOME OF THE ACHIEVEMENTS

The most substantial accomplishment of the conference seems to be in a field not contemplated in the agenda—the scrapping of obsolete battleships without replacement. Under the terms of the Washington treaty six American battleships were to be dropped before 1936 and eight new ones were to be laid down in anticipation of replacements. According to the London agreement we are to scrap or demilitarize three battleships within 18 to 30 months of the ratification of the treaty and postpone all replacements until after a conference to be called in 1935. The British at the same time are to demilitarize five vessels and the Japanese one during like periods, and both powers also will declare a similar battleship-building holiday until the next conference. This proposal involves important eventual savings to the three countries both in construction and in operation, although as no one anticipates the ratification of the treaty before next year, the economy is not likely to begin much before 1934, or about two years from the end of the proposed naval holiday.

The willingness, however, of the principal naval powers to postpone replacement of battleships would seem to indicate a growing belief that the present type of battleship has lost prestige in the navies of the world and perhaps to forecast their abolition or replacement by smaller vessels. No battleships have been built by any country since the Washington conference. France and Italy have not even taken advantage of the quota of battleship tonnage, amounting to 70,000 tons for each, allowed them by the treaty of 1922.

If by the time of the next conference our cruiser fleet has been brought up to substantial equivalence with that of Great Britain, the conference of 1935 may agree to do away altogether with the massive battleships, so costly to construct, maintain, and operate, and in that event the discussions of the London conference of 1930 will have contributed very substantially toward a reduction in this field of naval expenditure.

Much has been said about a vast reduction in cruiser tonnage, and a resultant saving of hundreds of millions of dollars to be brought about by the conference. This it should be understood does not refer to the United States, where no reduction in cruiser tonnage, cruiser construction, or cruiser authorization is contemplated. The terms of the treaty provide for the further construction of cruisers by the United States of greater aggregate tonnage and cost than have ever been proposed in any bill reported to Congress.

What is meant so far as the United States is concerned, is that there will be a saving of what we would have had to construct or spend, if we had agreed to the terms put forward by the British at the 1927 conference in Geneva. This would have reached enormous figures. But those terms we not only did not agree to, but even refused to discuss at Geneva. And any suggestion of the possibility of their revival by the British delegates would certainly have resulted in a refusal to participate in the London conference on the part of President Hoover.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE INDEPENDENT OFFICES BILL

Mr. WASON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9546) making appropriations for the Executive Office and the sundry independent bureaus, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire calls up the conference report on the bill H. R. 9546, and asks that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9546) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 5, and 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, and 9, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$553,523,166"; and the Senate agree to the same.

EDWARD H. WASON,
JOHN W. SUMMERS,
C. A. WOODRUM,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

HENRY W. KEYES,
REED SMOOT,
W. L. JONES,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
CARTER GLASS,
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9546) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

On No. 1: Provides $1,160,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,040,000, as proposed by the House, as the amount which may be expended for salaries in the District of Columbia out of the appropriation of $1,500,000 made for general expenses of the Federal Trade Commission.

On Nos. 2 and 3, relating to the Interstate Commerce Commission: Provides $3,547,313, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,540,000, as proposed by the House, for valuation of property of carriers.

On Nos. 4, 5, and 6: Provides $1,000,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Porto Rican Hurricane Relief Commission.

On Nos. 7 and 8, relating to the United States Geographic Board: Provides $6,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,900 as proposed by the House, for printing and binding, and makes $1,100 of the same immediately available.

On No. 9, relating to the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that payment of losses due to the maintenance and operation of ships may include operation through an agreement to pay a lump-sum consideration.

On No. 10: Corrects the total of the bill as agreed to in conference.

EDWARD H. WASON,
JOHN W. SUMMERS,
C. A. WOODRUM,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report:

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., April 16, 1930.*

Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,
*Speaker House of Representatives.*

SIR: On the 11th instant, I was elected a member of the standing committee of the Committee on Military Affairs. I therefore tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN M. WOLVERTON.

WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10381) to amend the World War veterans' act of 1924, as amended.

Mr. RANKIN. I ask the gentleman to withhold the motion for a moment.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it the hope of the gentleman from South Dakota to finish general debate upon this bill this afternoon?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and myself have conferred, and we find that there is not a great number of applications for time under general debate. It is my hope to conclude general debate to-day and start the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule, but not to proceed with any amendments, and to adjourn after the conclusion of the general debate.

Mr. RANKIN. In reply to that, that suits me exactly, and then we may take up the bill under the 5-minute rule to-morrow and finish it to-morrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It seems to me that if there are not any more amendments than I know of at present we ought to conclude and have final votes on the bill to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker, I renew the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10381, with Mr. MAPES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one hour.

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, those of you who were here on Tuesday will recall the attitude that the chairman of the committee has taken toward this legislation. I have not attempted to take the membership of this House back to Chateau-Thierry or to the Argonne. I have tried to do nothing except to discuss this entire matter from the fiscal and economic viewpoint. It has its humanitarian features, which we all must consider. My attitude on the bill has been that if this measure is amended vitally, if the Rankin amendment be accepted by the House, it will make the cost of the measure prohibitory, and that the President of the United States would be justified in vetoing it; and, in my judgment, he will veto it, and we would therefore secure no legislation at all.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, there was so much noise in the Chamber at this moment that I could not hear exactly what the gentleman said. I would like to get that statement again.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I heard what the gentleman said, and it is a very interesting statement. I ask the gentleman from South Dakota if he has any information in regard to what the President will do in this case providing the Rankin amendment is adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. No. I stated Tuesday that the President has not expressed to me his viewpoint. I stated that in my judgment the addition of the Rankin amendment would mean $300,000,000 a year at least added to the expenditure, and that it would be so unscientific that in my judgment the President would veto it and would be justified in so doing, and that if we did that, this House would be in the position of having kept 177,000 men from receiving what they would receive under the present bill, and the effect of that ought to be well known on the part of both the taxpayer and the service men.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Certainly; I am always glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman bases such a statement upon the theory that my amendment would be to strike out "1925" and insert "1930" in the Johnson bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. That was the theory upon which the gentleman proceeded in the House on Tuesday last, but I understand now that he has changed it.

Mr. RANKIN. I am speaking about the gentleman's theory.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It would be $400,000,000 in my judgment upon that former theory, but it would mean an addition of $300,000,000 a year, proceeding upon the amendment which the gentleman now proposes, which is to add his particular bill to the so-called Johnson bill, now under discussion. This matter has been before the House for some little time. The gentleman from Mississippi not long ago filed a petition at the Clerk's desk to force the committee to report the bill.

It was never necessary to have that petition presented, because there has never been any intention upon the part of the chairman of the committee this year to do other than to let the House decide on this legislation. It is indicative of the sentiment of the House that with all of the advertising done by the gentleman from Mississippi, notwithstanding all the requests he made on the floor of the House, only 127 Members signed the petition; and, in my judgment, about half of them now wish that their names were not upon it. It is not a commitment for them in any way to vote for the so-called Rankin amendment. What they have done is to ask that the House have an opportunity to vote on it only.

I now call attention to what is requested in the way of veterans' legislation. There are pending before the Veterans' Committee, and we have had hearings upon it recently, and have had them every day, requests from 26 States for new hospitals or additions to new hospitals. Those States have requested an appropriation of $28,535,000 for new hospitals, above and beyond the $110,000,000 already appropriated.

What are those beds to be used for? They are not going to be used for service-connected cases. The hospitals already built and now building will take care of service-connected cases. Those hospitals are to be erected to take care of men who are or may be run over by automobiles to-morrow or men who meet with some other casualty or who have contracted some disease not connected with the service.

Now, take that in connection with the Rankin amendment, and what do you find? You find that you are putting in 10,000 beds, to cost $28,500,000 this year. For what purpose? So that you can get those men into the hospitals and pay them the compensation provided in the Rankin amendment, so that every man occupying one of those beds shall be in receipt of $225 a month.

You might just as well meet that issue. The country can not afford to pay these service men $225 or $250 a month. In my judgment the service men do not want it. There are 4,220,000 of these service men living now and there are 4,000,000 not getting anything from the Government, and there are 3,500,000 service men who are not asking for it. Their sons and their daughters are not asking for a pension. They are not going to ask for anything like that in this short period after the war.

Day before yesterday the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], in a very eloquent, inspiring, and touching address, brought up the case of a service man from South Dakota, where he said the ex-service men were very strongly in favor of his bill. I am not surprised that the gentleman found one man for it. I am not surprised that the gentleman found one man in South Dakota who is for his bill. There are 750,000 people in that State, and yet it seems he can not find more than one ex-service man who is in favor of his bill. The fact is that the agitation for this measure has not come from the service men, but from the gentleman from Mississippi, and no one else. I ask the gentleman how many requests he has received from people throughout the United States?

Mr. RANKIN. I have received requests from 10,000. The gentleman from South Dakota knows that he has also received requests from all over the country. I have petitions on my desk over in my office now with at least 10,000 names on them, asking for the passage of that bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman says that he has 10,000 requests out of the entire number that will be beneficiaries of the bill. The gentleman says he has requests from people in South Dakota. I challenge him to put them in the RECORD. If there are 10,000, I would like to see them.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by inserting therein the petitions that I have received.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Mississippi may have that permission if he wants it. I go further than that. The gentleman has his files over in the Office Building, and he can call for a page and send over there for them right now.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not want the gentleman from South Dakota to get up and challenge me. I accept that challenge. I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD the petitions that I have received.

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

Mr. SNELL. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman has as much of his own time as I have, and he can put them in the RECORD in connection with his remarks. I know the mail he is getting, and I know he is not getting as many letters in two weeks as I get in one day calling for a change in the veterans' legislation. I am closer to the veterans than he is. Even if he puts in all of the letters that he says he has, it is only 10,000 out of 125,000,000 people. Personally, I have nothing against the gentleman from Mississippi, and I like him. He has the right to fight for his bill as well as any other legislation. But, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this is a fiscal policy affecting the financial condition of the United States more than anything else that is now before the American people. I think I know how these letters indorsing the Rankin bill were secured. In an executive session of the committee, after we had voted in the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the gentleman from Mississippi immediately sent to every hospital where these boys are, stating how the members of the committee voted in executive session. I have a copy of one of his letters.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman has that letter I will be very glad for it to go in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. What was the result of that letter? At Castle Point and at a hundred other places they were asked to sit down and write letters every day. There are only 500 people who have written all the letters that have been received. It is a fine exhibition of propaganda.

I have been a Member of this House for 16 years. I have been bombarded on every conceivable subject. I remember that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] on one occasion had 800 unopened telegrams and I had 300. I have been on the steering committee, and I know of no other case where one man with 500 others to help him has put up such a propaganda as this, where only a small percentage out of the total population have been urging the passage of a bill. You will find upon inquiry that I am exactly right.

Mr. PEAVEY. The gentleman referred a moment ago to a provision in this bill under which 10,000 men will be provided with hospitalization.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes; I know it is provided for. There is in the bill a provision which, taken in connection with the Rankin amendment, will accomplish that.

Mr. PEAVEY. What is your provision as to that?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. This is a compensation bill, not a hospitalization bill. We are asked to provide this year a lot of beds for service-connected cases, and the non-service-connected men will move into them, and then those non-service-connected men will receive $225 a month under the Rankin amendment.

Mr. PEAVEY. Would it not be cheaper for the Government to recognize them and give them a small pension and enable them to live in their own homes, under their own home conditions?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I may offer such a motion to recommit. I am not certain but what I will do so, if the Rankin amendment is adopted, because I want to make it clear, when we do not get any legislation, just where the responsibility is, and it is not going to be on my shoulders.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I am sorry, but I did not hear all of the debate. I am satisfied my friend from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] knows the facts. What is the real difference between the gentleman from South Dakota and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] as to the increased cost which will ensue, provided the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. In the estimates made by the Veterans' Bureau the estimates were based on the number of cases already filed with the Veterans' Bureau. It was estimated by them that under the provisions of the original Rankin amendment the cost would be about $44,000,000 the first year. Under the provisions of the bill which I introduced it would be $76,000,000. Both bills are entirely unscientific. You will find that I alleged the provisions are unscientific; that they would cure some discriminations and preferences by making others; but our dispute comes with the total load that must be considered and not the number of cases filed. For instance, under the provisions of the Johnson bill a man who became ill of diabetes in 1928 would never dream of filing a claim against the Government, because he did not contract the disease in the service. Yet under the Rankin bill he will file a claim immediately. I do not blame him for that. He will enter a hospital and receive $100 a month besides. That man and all men like him have not been considered in making the figures given by the Veterans' Bureau. Therefore it is the best guess of anybody. But based on the figures taken from the Pension Bureau if the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] had moved to strike from my bill the figures "1925" and insert the figures "1930," then the total cost would have been about $423,000,000. Now, the gentleman says he will not make that motion, but will move to substitute the Rankin bill. Based on those figures, in my judgment, the cost will be $300,000,000 per year—either one prohibitive, as far as the finances of this Government are concerned.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. YON. What does the gentleman estimate this bill will cost the Government?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Does the gentleman mean the bill that is now before the committee?

Mr. YON. Yes; in addition to what it is already costing?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. One hundred million dollars a year, and will take care of 177,000 men in some degree, their average compensation being about $45 per month.

Mr. YON. Does not the gentleman think there is an opportunity here to take care of the veterans who are now service connected, under the Veterans' Bureau, and provide some cheaper compensation, that will be more satisfactory, under some pension legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. There is no pension legislation that has been presented yet the cost of which will not be almost prohibitive. If the Rankin amendment is adopted, I think I shall offer a motion to recommit, and I will introduce a highly restricted piece of legislation such as is suggested by the gentleman, and which I have suggested many times.

Mr. YON. Has the gentleman studied the provisions of the Swick bill that is now before the Pension Committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Oh, yes. I am very familiar with its provisions.

Mr. YON. What will that cost?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have not the figures before me. The gentleman probably has them. The gentleman is a member of the committee.

Mr. YON. I am a member of the committee, but I do not have the figures.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I do not want to quote the figures. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWICK] is present, and perhaps he can give you the figures.

Mr. SWICK. The estimated figure for the first three years was $80,000,000 per year. For a period of five years it would be approximately $130,000,000. That is the highest figure that has been estimated. Other estimators have given a figure as low as $85,000,000 per year for a period of five years.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Did the Pension Bureau make those estimates?

Mr. SWICK. Those estimates were made by the Pension Bureau estimators.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWICK] if, under the bill offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, each man would be paid up to $50 a month?

Mr. SWICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. So a man who is totally permanently disabled from tuberculosis or any other cause would not draw over $50 a month under the Swick bill?

Mr. SWICK. Yes; up to $72 a month.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] made the suggestion that he might offer a motion to recommit and offer legislation providing for a pension for veterans. On what authority would the gentleman offer that amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Solely on my individual authority as a Member of Congress, in case the Rankin amendment is adopted by this House, which would load the Government up with a three or four hundred million dollar expense.

Mr. SNELL. I may not be exactly correct in this, but if I remember correctly, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] in years gone by has made the statement that the American Legion members were not interested in a pension, would not ask for a pension, and would not take a pension. What they wanted was fair and decent compensation. Have they changed their position, and do they now want a pension, or

are they of the same mind that they were when we passed the original compensation laws?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The American Legion has never made any request for a pension. Individual members have.

Mr. SNELL. I think it is important to know.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I remember the agreement as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL]. When the compensation act of 1921 and bonus bill was being considered the commander of the American Legion, also Mr. John Esch, of Wisconsin, and Sam Winslow, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the leaders of the American Legion gave their pledge at that time that if the adjusted compensation law and the Sweet bill were passed they would not ask for a pension, and they have not asked for a pension. Individual members have, but the organization has not.

Mr. SNELL. Then why force a pension on them if they do not want it?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. For only one reason. If it would cost, under the highly restricted pension law I have suggested, $50,000,000, I would rather see that done than to see the Rankin amendment adopted, which will cost $300,000,000 a year, or nothing done.

Mr. SNELL. I am glad to hear the gentleman state that the American Legion, as an organization, has not asked for a pension.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Not only that but they made the pledge that they never would until the bonus had been paid, and I was present when that pledge was made.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that the gentleman from South Dakota is exaggerating the cost of the Rankin bill, as I will show you in a few minutes.

Mr. SNELL. I have not attempted to discuss the cost of either bill but was discussing the attitude of the American Legion.

Mr. RANKIN. The highest figures we have on it are $44,250,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I want to answer that. That is based on the number of cases that have been filed in the past and not based on the cases which will be filed. A man who never has filed a claim—because he had some disease he knew was not service connected—would immediately file a claim if the Rankin amendment were adopted. If the Rankin amendment is adopted, I can get a pension at once under something that happened in 1927.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. In that connection, on page 33 of the testimony, General Hines said that the number of cases affected and the amount involved, $48,000,000, under the Rankin bill, were taken purely from the disallowed cases. That is General Hines's statement on page 33 of the hearings.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Certainly; and not based on the other cases at all.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. The gentleman has referred to a meeting held in the Ways and Means Committee room at which a few Members of Congress and certain representatives of the American Legion were present.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Including their commander.

Mr. WOODRUFF. And he has referred to an agreement that was entered into between the representatives of that organization and certain Members of this House at that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Who were handling the legislation.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Is it the gentleman's opinion that those representatives of the American Legion who were present on that date were authorized to speak for all time to come for all ex-service men who served in the World War? Is it the gentleman's opinion that those few men could commit and bind all the ex-service men for all time to come on this very important question?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. They assumed to do so at that time. They stated they wanted the passage of the Sweet bill, which was a most favorable piece of legislation, and they also wanted the passage of an adjusted compensation law, which will cost the Government in the end three billion and a quarter dollars. They said that if Congress would pass those two bills, they would guarantee that the Legion would not ask for a service pension until the bonus is paid. I think they are morally bound on that statement. I was there and heard it, and they secured at that time an agreement to pass those two pieces of legislation, and we did pass them.

Mr. CONNERY. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman knows that at the very first national convention of the Legion the leaders of the Legion did not want a soldiers' bonus, when practically 3,000,000 men throughout the United States in the Legion did want it. So they could not bind the American Legion.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. In answer to the gentleman, I will say that I was the only member of the subcommittee at that time who was in favor of it.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Does the gentleman believe that those representatives of the American Legion who were present on that date could bind some veteran who is now or who may become disabled and who can not connect his disability with his service thereby prevent him from asking of Congress a small pension during the years to come? Does the gentleman think they were authorized to bind each and every individual soldier in this country?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman knows as much about that as I do. He belongs to the American Legion, and I know they said that would not be done.

Mr. WOODRUFF. The gentleman knows and I know that was not the case. I do not feel, I do not think the gentleman feels, and I do not think any Member of the House feels they were justified in assuming that responsibility.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I am not so sure.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman has characterized his bill, as well as the Rankin bill, as in effect a pension bill. I am wondering, in view of the question put to the gentleman by my colleague from New York as to the action of the American Legion, whether the American Legion has officially, by its executive committee or otherwise, indorsed either of these bills?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. They have indorsed the bill now before this committee.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. In what way?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. They have openly indorsed it by their testimony before the committee.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The commander of the Legion himself?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Oh, yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman does not want to make that statement—that the commander came before the committee and indorsed the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. His representative, Watson B. Miller, did appear before the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. He said he was personally in favor of the Rankin bill.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. What is the basis for the gentleman's statement that the Legion has indorsed this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It was done at the Louisville convention, and I introduced the bill at their request.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman from South Dakota has indicated that under a certain contingency he may move to recommit this bill to the committee with the purposes in mind of undertaking to report out a pension bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Well, it depends on what happens in the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have heard it intimated by a member of one of the committees on pensions that his committee had already unanimously agreed to report out a straight pension bill. Has the gentleman any information concerning that?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Oh, I have heard rumors to that effect, but I doubt it very much.

Mr. KNUTSON. May I interject the statement that that is true?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think that is a matter we are entitled to have some information upon.

Mr. KNUTSON. The Pension Committee is ready to report out the Swick bill provided this legislation fails of passage.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a slip from the bulletin sent out by the American Legion News Service, as follows:

[From the Washington Bureau of the American Legion News Service, 501 Woodward Building]

LEGION MEMBERSHIP VITALLY CONCERNED IN JOHNSON BILL

WASHINGTON.—Every one of the hundreds of thousands of veterans who have helped strengthen the American Legion this early in 1930, through their enrollment, in the hope that it would show Congress the concern of veterans in legislation for the relief of disabled comrades, is vitally interested in the situation over the Johnson bill, now pending.

This bill, which is the House of Representatives' Veterans' Committee omnibus bill 10381, was introduced by the chairman, ROYAL C. JOHN-

son, following the approval by the committee and the American Legion after thorough study and much testimony. It has been declared by O. L. Bodenhamer, national commander, as one of the best pieces of legislation for the disabled that has ever come out of a committee hearing. One provision, alone, would relieve 84,000 disabled cases. The national commander has urged that no further delay be permitted in the passage of this bill. In general, the bill conforms to the legislative program of the Legion, which also meets the approval of veterans in general. It grants important additional benefits, and it cures sundry administrative defects that experience has disclosed. The national commander urges that this legislation be enacted upon its own merits without delay by debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I think that settles it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] whether he has any information as to whether the national commander of the American Legion had seen the Swick bill when he gave out that interview?

Mr. LUCE. I have no information on that subject.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. What is the date of that statement?

Mr. LUCE. Unfortunately, the date is not on it, but it was issued within a few days. My colleague states it was issued last week.

Mr. HASTINGS. By whom is it signed?

Mr. LUCE. It is a mimeographed news bulletin which comes out under the heading of "The American Legion News Service."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I can settle that. I have sat around the table with Commander Bodenhamer and discussed all these bills with him, and there is hardly a service man of any prominence anywhere that does not know as much about this proposed legislation as we do.

Mr. CRISP and Mr. CONNERY rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CRISP. I simply desire to state that I was a member of the Ways and Means Committee when the adjusted-compensation legislation was considered, and the gentleman has correctly stated the attitude of the officers of the American Legion before the committee, that they would not ask a pension. Of course, we all recognized that those gentlemen had no power whatever to bind the general membership of the American Legion on that question. Now, I would like to ask my friend this question. In view of the gentleman's statement that he would probably offer a motion to recommit, providing for a pension——

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. If the Rankin amendment is adopted.

Mr. CRISP. Yes; I understand, with that qualification. We are expending now about $196,000,000 through the Veterans' Bureau for compensation and overhead.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. For compensation.

Mr. CRISP. What would be the cost of granting these boys who served in the war a pension commensurate in amount with the pension that the veterans of the Civil War are receiving?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I think it would at once cost $100,000,000 and would go up so fast as to be almost unbelievable, based on that rate of compensation.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONNERY. My colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] read a statement of the American Legion. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] day before yesterday read a statement from the American Legion Magazine discussing both of these bills in which the Legion did not make any recommendation whatsoever except to say they were both good bills.

Mr. PEAVEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. PEAVEY. I am sure the gentleman has no intention of leaving the House under any misapprehension in regard to the Swick bill. The gentleman understands that the Swick bill is not a pension bill but provides a small rate of pension for the disabled soldier who can not show any service-connected disability. It is not a general pension law in any sense.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. But it does not have "need" in it. They only have to show disability and not need.

Mr. PEAVEY. And not service-connected disability.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I am clearly of the opinion that whenever we adopt such a pension bill, if one is adopted, it must be based upon three things—service, need, and disability. There is no other sound or logical foundation for such a bill.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I have deferred questioning the gentleman until he had finished with the subject matters which seemed to interest my colleagues. I asked the gentleman when the bill was before the House a couple of days ago to give the House his construction of the proviso incorporated in section 18 of the bill in connection with the new rule promulgated by the Director of the Veterans' Bureau permitting compensation to veterans who had filed their claims under the original war risk insurance act prior to June 7, 1924, and as to whether or not the proviso to which I have referred would abrogate that rule. At that time the gentleman preferred to defer an expression of opinion or any conclusion upon the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I may say to the gentleman I have had an opportunity to make an investigation of that question since our colloquy day before yesterday. I do not think this legislation will abrogate that back payment. I think the gentleman is correct in making the statement he did day before yesterday.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SNELL. I understand the gentleman has permission to extend his remarks and to put several statements in the RECORD. Does not the gentleman think it would be a good proposition to put in the RECORD the letter that General Hines wrote me, as chairman of the Rules Committee, answering the question I asked him before we considered the rule for this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I believe it should be put in the RECORD, and I will be pleased to put it in my remarks at this point.

Mr. SNELL. I will be pleased to have the gentleman do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will change my request, and will now ask that the Clerk read the letter.

Subsequently it was ordered that the letter from Chairman SNELL to General Hines should be printed, preceding the letter of General Hines.

The letter of Chairman SNELL is as follows:

APRIL 8, 1930.

Brig. Gen. FRANK T. HINES,
*Director United States Veterans' Bureau,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR GENERAL HINES: There has recently been reported out of committee in the House, H. R. 10381, by Representative JOHNSON of South Dakota. This bill makes substantial changes in "the World War veterans' act of 1924, as amended." The question of a rule to expedite its consideration will come up in the near future. In the meantime I would like, for the information of myself and the committee, certain information, as follows:

1. What are we now expending annually for the relief of the World War veterans?

2. What has this country expended for the relief of the World War veterans, including disability compensation, vocational training, hospitalization, etc., up to the present time?

3. What will the enactment of this bill add annually to our present expenditures? I refer to the first year and thereafter.

4. The war risk insurance and Veterans' Bureau acts based compensation, not upon mere disability of the service man, but upon a disability incurred in the military service. Does this bill depart substantially from that principle? If so, to what extent?

5. To what extent does it initiate a pension system?

Any other or further suggestions or comments which you may think are helpful, or which may occur to you, will also be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

B. H. SNELL,
*Chairman Rules Committee.*

The Clerk read the letter of General Hines, as follows:

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
*Washington, April 10, 1930.*

Hon. BERTRAND H. SNELL,
*Chairman Rules Committee of the House,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SNELL: I have your letter of April 8, 1930, requesting certain information for your committee concerning H. R. 10381, a bill to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended. In response to your specific questions the following data are submitted:

I

On the basis of existing legislation the bureau, for 1931, estimates for its operations net appropriations totaling $511,225,000. This total is made up as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Death and disability compensation | $196,000,000 |
| Military and naval insurance | 120,000,000 |
| Adjusted service certificate fund | 112,000,000 |
| Medical and hospital services (not including salaries of operating personnel) | 35,600,000 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Hospital construction | 2,000,000 |
| Printing and binding | 125,000 |
| Salaries and expenses (including salaries of hospital personnel) | 45,500,000 |

II

On behalf of World War veterans, for all purposes, there has been disbursed to date $5,058,681,000. Direct benefits included in this total, for the veteran or his dependents, are as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Death and disability compensation | $1,572,758,344 |
| Vocational training | 644,984,110 |
| Medical and hospital services (including hospital construction) | 412,251,688 |
| Government term insurance (minus premium receipts) | 861,581,000 |
| Adjusted compensation | 111,760,200 |
| Allowances (during service) | 282,083,472 |

It is anticipated that, without amendatory legislation, by 1940 these disbursements will have risen to a figure in excess of $11,000,000,000.

III

It is estimated that the enactment of H. R. 10381, when fully in effect, will add to the annual expenditures of the bureau a minimum of $96,966,650; and for the 10-year period, 1931 to 1940, it is estimated that, over and above the expenditures on the basis of existing legislation, the additional cost due to the proposed bill will approximate $705,000,000. These estimates are minimum figures, and it is my feeling that the true cost will materially exceed the figures cited and may possibly rise to as high as $200,000,000 a year.

IV

The proposed bill contains provisions which go materially beyond what was originally contemplated when Congress desired to depart from the military pension system during the World War. Section 10, which amends section 200 of the present act, presumes all disabilities of a 10 per cent degree or more existing prior to January 1, 1925, to be the result of injuries or diseases incurred in or aggravated by military service. While this presumption does now obtain for tuberculosis and neuropsychiatric conditions, it has not obtained for all other conditions. This provision does represent a radical departure from the existing compensation theory. Cases unquestionably distressing have arisen throughout the country which are definitely outside the provisions of the present World War veterans' act, as amended. Appeals on behalf of these cases have been made to the Government, and this proposal has been introduced largely on the basis of these cases, but does extend the act to a point where the question of service connection can no longer logically be considered as an essential factor, by liberalizing existing presumptive periods which automatically insures service connection and, consequently, disability compensation.

This section is rather a difficult one to estimate as to cost, but, giving consideration to those claims which have been disallowed—some 600,000 of them—the bureau approximates the minimum cost at over $76,000,000 per year, plus an administrative cost in excess of $5,000,000.

V

You ask to what extent does this bill initiate a pension system. In addition to the provision covered in the immediately preceding paragraphs, which tends to eliminate proof of origin of disability in service, another entirely new provision is made which provides compensation to the dependents of veterans hospitalized for disabilities which are not the result of their military service. The intent of this provision is to provide a dependency allowance to those men who take advantage of the opportunity afforded by the Government to be hospitalized on account of nonservice-connected disabilities. This is clearly a pension provision, and represents another radical departure from the underlying principles of the World War veterans' act, as amended.

The estimated annual cost of this provision is $10,000,000. Potentially the future cost of this provision is considerably more than $10,000,000, but it is impossible at this time to estimate what it might be.

There is attached hereto a memorandum which discusses by sections the entire bill, with sufficient detail to enable your committee to fully judge its effect. The bill is good in many particulars, especially those dealing essentially with administrative provisions; but following the policy heretofore adopted by the bureau, to keep Congress fully advised on changes in legislation and the possible effect of such legislation, I feel it my duty to call your particular attention, in some detail, to certain provisions which, if they become a law, as above indicated will constitute a broad departure from the established policy dealing with the World War veterans.

At the outset it may be stated that we are all in agreement with the desire to fully compensate any disabled veteran whose disability is due to service. From the detailed information which will follow I am sure that it can be said without fear of contradiction that Congress has dealt most generously with the veterans of the World War, and I know it to be their desire, as well as those charged with the administration of the law, to make sure that the maximum benefit and service are provided for the service man who has a disability due to his military service.

I do not feel it necessary to comment on the administrative items of the bill, and will pass them over. Your attention is called first to section 4 of the bill, which amends section 19 of the existing act. This section extends the time during which suits may be instituted one year from the date of the approval of the amendatory act. When we give consideration to the fact that some 5,000 suits on insurance are now pending against the Government—90 per cent of which are based upon a claim for permanent and total disability existing at the time of discharge of the veteran from military service—it would not seem to me that this extension is justified. Most certainly a claimant who was actually permanently and totally disabled some six or eight years ago would have presented his claim before the bureau and, if it were disallowed, would have had ample time to enter suit before this.

The Government's liability under term insurance now exceeds the premiums collected on such insurance by approximately $1,300,000,000. The suits now pending have a potential liability of $50,000,000 more, and when it is estimated that it will cost the Government about $4,000 to defend each of these suits you may readily estimate the possible liability of any further extension of the time for filing suits. It is the desire and policy of the bureau to make insurance awards when the facts of record will permit under the law, and while a number of suits are lost in court many decisions against the Government may be charged to the natural sympathy for the veteran both on the part of the court and jury. For these reasons the bureau has reported adversely against this amendment.

The next provision of the bill to which I desire again to call your particular attention is section 10, which amends section 200 of the present act by presuming all disabilities of a 10 per cent degree or more existing prior to January 1, 1925, to be the result of injuries or diseases incurred in or aggravated by military service. The presumption is rebutted by clear and convincing evidence in all cases except those of tuberculosis, spinal meningitis, paralysis, paresis, and blindness, and veterans permanently helpless or permanently bedridden. No doubt the committee had in mind, by further broadening the presumptive clause of the present World War veterans' act, taking care of a number of cases which they feel are meritorious and which the law at this time does not cover. If it was only the intention of the committee to take in border-line cases, they have in some measure accomplished that by the first section of the bill by including in that amendment the provision that the bureau will give due regard to lay and other evidence not of a medical nature in connection with the adjudication of claims. The bureau would interpret that provision as sufficiently broad to permit liberal adjudication of border-line cases.

It is realized that it is difficult to legislate for a relatively few cases without admitting to benefits many other cases not equally meritorious. Even suppose there were 10,000 border-line cases—and I am sure that there are not that many—the proposed legislation not only will benefit these cases but will comprehend ten times that number, represented by veterans whose disabilities can not be shown to be due to their military service. This legislation, moreover, will immediately create another border line—a situation which will always obtain where limits are prescribed. It would appear to me some other means should be sought to take care of border-line cases than to so broaden the legislative authority as to bring in cases which, on the theory of disability compensation, have actually no merit. I would recommend, for the consideration of Congress, the creation of a special board with authority to grant relief beyond the limits of the present law in border-line cases involving combat service, where necessity for relief is shown, even though evidence of acquirement of disability in service may not actually exist. Beyond this it would seem unwise to go without a complete study of the needs of all disabled veterans.

If it is the desire of Congress to depart from the policy by compensating veterans for injuries or diseases regardless of whether they are due to service or not, then the provision should be made to do it. It has been my thought, however, that it was not the intention of Congress to award compensation except for service-connected disabilities. While it is true that by the adoption of the original presumptive clause certain inequalities have been brought about, and this amendment will tend to eliminate some of the inequalities, nevertheless, its further extension will create greater inequalities. It will not take care of many of those uncompensated veterans who are now sick in the Government hospitals and who have made a determined effort to obtain compensation for their disabilities. It is simply compensating by presumptive evidence for disabilities not due to service, and in the final analysis we must admit that if this provision becomes a law we have adopted a disability pension.

It seems to me that we are at a critical point in the matter of legislating for veterans, and it would be my desire to suggest to the Congress that they give careful consideration to a thorough study of this entire problem in order that the veterans may not be placed upon the compensation rolls for disabilities not due to service at such high rates that they will stand out as discriminating against other veterans whom the Congress at some future time, undoubtedly, will have to consider.

Section 13 of the bill amends the act by providing a $50 statutory award for all cases of arrested tuberculosis, irrespective of whether

active tuberculosis can be shown between the date of entrance into the service and January 1, 1925. This amendment must be considered in the light of the amendment to section 200 just referred to. Sound medical advice indicates that at least 75 per cent of the entire population is or has been infected, at some time or another, with tuberculosis, but due to immunity and physical resistance the condition does not become active or disabling in the majority of cases, although scars may be left indicating the infection which would result in a diagnosis of arrested or cured tuberculosis. It is hard to see the justification, in view of this, of providing compensation for these men at the rate of $50 per month for the remainder of their lives unless the Government is prepared at this time to take care of other veterans with equally meritorious service and make similar awards for other disabilities which are, in fact, more disabling. The cost of this amendment is estimated at $1,800,000 per annum.

By section 14 of the bill, a new provision of the law is made which authorizes payment of compensation to the dependents of veterans hospitalized for nonservice-connected disabilities, when the veteran files an affidavit with the commanding officer of the hospital that his annual income is less than $1,000. By this provision the committee evidently intends to take care of those cases where men take advantage of the opportunity of being hospitalized for nonservice-connected disabilities. This is clearly a pension provision and departs from the underlying principles of the World War veterans' act. It would not be so bad if we were prepared to embark upon a pension program at this time, and if it were not for the fact that it creates such a marked discrimination, under the existing law, whereby all veterans are furnished hospitalization for all disabilities whether due to service or not, within the limits of available facilities.

The Congress has only to date authorized construction essentially for the existing or contemplated service-connected load. It has not undertaken a program of construction to provide sufficient beds for all nonservice-connected cases; therefore, those in need of hospitalization and for whom no beds are available, would be at a great disadvantage over the veteran who is able to obtain a bed, and, in addition, the provisions above indicated for his dependents. It would seem to be wise, therefore, to give consideration to the fact that this provision, if it becomes a law, will, undoubtedly, necessitate the Government undertaking a further extensive building program in order that these inequalities may be eliminated. Until the Congress has decided this important question, there is for consideration the advisability of enacting this provision. As previously indicated, the estimated cost of this amendment is approximately $10,000,000 per annum. If, however, hospital construction were to be developed to take care of all veterans, the cost would be very materially increased both as to hospital construction and operation and in allowances to families. Were the proposed amendment enacted, it would seem that demand would immediately arise for this increased hospital service with consequent additional hospital construction.

Certain provisions in the bill result in economies. These are pointed out in the memorandum attached. The largest item which might be said to somewhat offset the above-outlined cost is that claimed as a saving of $42,000,000. In connection with this item it should be understood that under the bureau's decision no saving is made because the bureau has felt that it has correctly interpreted the wishes of Congress in not making the provisions under the World War veterans' act as amended June 7, 1924, retroactive; that is, in so far as the new benefits granted by that act are concerned. It is felt it would be very difficult to substantiate individual claims involved, in view of the legislative history of the amendment under which these cases fall. It must be kept in mind that it is not an annual saving and that the most that can be said for it is that this amount of money would not have to be appropriated by Congress.

Thus far the beneficiaries of the World War veterans' legislation have fallen into two distinct groups, those with service-connected disabilities, together with their dependents, and all others disabled or not disabled. The provisions for the former I have already indicated. For the second group, namely, those not disabled by reason of military service, many benefits and privileges have been provided which are outlined in the attached memorandum. Chief of these, I feel, may be cited the privilege of hospitalization to the extent Government facilities are available. At present more than 40 per cent of our patient population of 30,000 are being treated for disabilities which are not shown to be the result of military service, and are being hospitalized under the provisions of the amendment of 1924, which, so far as facilities permitted, made Government hospital facilities available to all veterans regardless of the character or origin of their disabilities. During 1929 alone this general hospitalization provision cost approximately $15,000,000.

Of course, for all veterans there was enacted the World War adjusted compensation act. The future obligation of the Government under this act exceeds $3,500,000,000.

In closing may I again reiterate what I have previously stated to the World War Veterans' Committee, that it seems desirable that the Congress should at the earliest possible date make a study of the entire problem of veterans' relief, with the object of adopting a permanent national policy dealing therewith, having in mind the elimination of whatever inequalities now exist and the adoption of a policy in dealing with all veterans who are disabled and are in need, which can be extended in the future to other veterans who follow those now being cared for. In my judgment, further liberalization of existing acts, without such study and consideration, will only create further inequalities and in the final analysis work to the detriment of the actually disabled veteran whose disabilities are directly due to service. I need not tell you that it is my earnest desire to do everything possible for the disabled veterans, but I have felt it incumbent upon me to frankly discuss the several provisions of this proposed amendment, which definitely indicate a departure from the basic principles of our World War veterans' legislation, for whatever benefit it may be to your committee and to the Congress as a whole.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, *Director.*

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two minutes. Since my quotation of the statement emanating from the headquarters of the American Legion there has come to my hands a telegram, sent to a Member of this House, signed by R. L. Gordon, State commander of the Legion of Arkansas, in which he says:

The American Legion of Arkansas solidly favor passing of Johnson bill, H. R. 10381, as reported out of committee and without amendment. Would appreciate knowing your opinion, and, above all, we are seeking your assistance in passing that bill at present session.

R. L. GORDON, *State Commander.*

I would emphasize that the American Legion of Arkansas solidly requests the passage of the pending bill without amendment.

I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, one of the things coming from the World War has been a great number of cases of osteomyelitis. Those who remember the old Civil War veterans remember that a great many of them were afflicted with this trouble, and their bodies were never healed. We have the same bone disabilities from the World War. There are thousands of cases. I have in mind one case where a man was sent to the Mount Alto Hospital who lost a foot which has never healed, and that foot and leg has been amputated 34 times. We have many cases of that kind. William S. Baer, head of the surgical service of Johns Hopkins, has discovered a marvelous cure for these cases. To-night in the caucus room in the House Office Building Doctor Baer, of the Johns Hopkins University, an eminent surgeon, will be there and demonstrate that cure by moving-picture slides and other equipment that goes with it. It is a marvelous discovery, because it utilizes something that has never been used since antiseptic surgery came into existence. All Members are invited to be present at 8 o'clock in the House Office Building, third floor.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one hour.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD these petitions, signed by veterans of the World War, asking for the passage of the Rankin bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the petitions which he has in his possession be inserted in the RECORD as a part of his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that include a long list of names?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. Let me say to the gentleman from Connecticut, under his reservation of the right to object, that this is in response to the challenge of the gentleman from South Dakota. I said that they contained 10,000 names. I say now that they contain between 20,000 and 50,000 names, and if we put anything in the RECORD, I want to put in the names of the boys who signed these petitions.

Mr. TILSON. Fifty thousand names to be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman said that there were only 10,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, there are between 20,000 and 50,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I doubt if there are 5,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Doubting Thomases never did see anything in the right light. There are that many from Mr. LEHLBACH's district alone.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this request is in substance the request previously made when the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, objected. He has left the Chamber, and to present the request again in his absence is, in my judgment, taking unfair advantage. For that reason I object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, in reply I desire to say that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] is not the

censor of the ethics of this House. If he were, we would be in a pitiable condition.

The statement of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], made this morning, was extremely ridiculous in the light of the hearings and the statements from the Veterans' Bureau on these bills. I have in my hand a letter from Gen. Frank T. Hines, which says the estimated cost of H. R. 7825 standing alone, which is the Rankin bill, is $44,250,000. Why does he want to get on the floor and tell you it will cost $300,000,000? There is not a word of testimony to that effect.

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

Mr. RANKIN. No; not just now.

Mr. PERKINS. I just want to read something that General Hines said.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, the gentleman read that the other day. The gentleman will please not interrupt me. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PERKINS] has done all that he could to block this legislation ever since we have been on this fight, and he knows that I know what he is up to.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Is it fair to make a statement of that kind and then not yield for a short statement?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. PERKINS. I knew the gentleman's sense of fairness would require him to yield. I am fully in favor of the Johnson bill, and if the Rankin bill had never been heard of, I would still favor the Johnson bill. My being in favor of the Johnson bill is in no sense dependent upon the fear that anybody would criticize me for not favoring the Rankin bill. Furthermore, the Johnson bill equalizes the rights and privileges of all the service men, and that is the reason I am in favor of it.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from New Jersey does not think it does in the tubercular cases?

Mr. PERKINS. The tubercular men have been taken care of in previous legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. That is just those who broke down prior to 1925. All of these tubercular men, many of whom signed these petitions, who are appealing for this legislation, are left out; and I want to say to the gentleman from New Jersey that he is one man who has the courage of his convictions in this House. He would never have voted for the Johnson bill if it had not been for this fight on the Rankin bill, because he never would have heard of it. The Johnson bill is brought out to kill off the Rankin bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter here from Gen. Frank T. Hines, dated to-day, in which he says that on the same figures that he estimates my bill to cost $44,250,000, he estimates the Johnson bill to cost $76,000,000, or nearly twice as much. Therefore, if my bill would cost any more than he estimates here, the Johnson bill would cost proportionately more. In order that you may not be deceived by these unreasonable misstatements the gentleman from South Dakota makes on the floor of the House, I ask the Clerk to read this letter in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
*Washington, April 16, 1930.*

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. RANKIN: In compliance with your request there has been prepared draft of an amendment to H. R. 10381, for the purpose of substituting for the amendment to section 200 now contained therein, which extends the presumption of service origin to all disabilities arising prior to January 1, 1925, the provisions of H. R. 7825, of which you are the author, which proposes to broaden the present presumption for the specified diseases so as to include a number of chronic constitutional diseases and extend the time to January 1, 1930. In this draft there has also been included the limitation which appears in the last proviso of section 200 as written in H. R. 10381, which limits payment of compensation in any case made payable solely by virtue of the new presumption to a period not more than three years after the approval of the amendment. The conclusive presumption for cases of tuberculosis, paralysis, paresis, blindness, those permanently helpless or permanently bedridden, and spinal meningitis contained in H. R. 10381 has also been incorporated in the draft in accordance with your request.

There is also transmitted, in accordance with your request, draft of an amendment which would leave the Johnson amendment to section 200 as it now stands in H. R. 10381 and add thereto the amendment proposed by H. R. 7825. The effect of this would be to place all disabilities which developed prior to January 1, 1925, on a par and give to disabilities resulting from the diseases specified in H. R. 7825 the benefit of a presumption of service origin which would extend to January 1, 1930.

As you have heretofore been advised, the estimated cost of the amendment to section 200 proposed by H. R. 10381—to wit, $76,033,000—would be increased approximately $31,750,000 per annum, by superimposing upon it the provisions of H. R. 7825. The estimated cost of H. R. 7825 standing alone is $44,250,000.

As you have heretofore been advised, all estimates heretofore prepared by the bureau bearing upon the extension of the presumption of service origin are based upon claims which have heretofore been presented to the bureau and disallowed. This being the case, the figures represent the minimum cost in all cases. However, in connection with H. R. 10381 a study has recently been made which projects the cost of the presumption therein contained year by year for a period of five years, were it to be extended beyond 1925. This study has been made on three different bases; the first basing the estimate on the number of claims filed in the bureau heretofore and disallowed; the second based on the experience of the Pension Bureau in permanent cases, and the third based upon the experience of the Pension Bureau increased to include temporary cases.

A copy of a table showing the results of this study over the period of years extending from 1925 to 1929, inclusive, is inclosed.

There is also transmitted copy of a letter to-day addressed to Hon. ROYAL C. JOHNSON with respect to this same legislation, with inclosures.

A copy of this letter is inclosed for your use.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, *Director.*

Mr. RANKIN. Members will note that he says, basing his figures on the same thing, the number of claims filed, my bill would cost $44,250,000 and the Johnson bill would cost $76,035,000. That is the difference. Why all this misquoting of figures? General Hines sent me this copy of the statement referred to on Tuesday last. My attention was called to the fact that it had no reference to the Rankin bill and was based on the Johnson bill. It shows that. It does not limit them to the cases we now take care of, does not limit them, as is done in the Rankin bill, to tubercular, neuropsychiatric, and other chronic constitutional diseases, but throws it wide open to everybody—as the gentleman from South Dakota said on Tuesday, to the man who might stub his toe—and on that basis General Hines says that if you take the figures in the Pension Bureau the Johnson bill, without my amendment, would cost possibly $319,000,000, but that the Rankin bill will cost only $44,250,000 a year.

Now, gentlemen, the substitution of the Rankin amendment for the Johnson amendment to section 200 will save to this Government anywhere from $30,000,000 to $100,000,000 and, besides that, it will give relief to the tubercular men and the neuropsychiatric men, all of whom are left out of the Johnson bill, as well as all those who have incurred their disabilities since 1925.

Now I want to refer to the publicity to which the gentleman referred. As a matter of fact, I told the gentleman from South Dakota in the committee hearings, in the first executive session, that so far as I was concerned there would be no executive sessions. I was not going to be denied the right of a hearing and then have the rule invoked as to secrecy of proceedings in committee sessions. They ought not to object to publicity as to how they voted in the committee.

Now, as to the propaganda. When we had up the hospitalization bill early in the session I said on this floor that we were not doing our duty. I said these men were suffering and dying by the thousands. Their friends were at that time in the gallery, including members of the Legion. They appealed to me to introduce the Rankin bill. I waited until January 22, and then I introduced it. These letters are coming to me from men I never heard of. They are coming from every State, and every district in the United States is represented in that pile on the table here, and that is small as compared with the accumulation that I have in my office, letters and telegrams, some of them appealing to me for help, not knowing that I had reported the bill; others appealing to me to press the bill in behalf of those suffering from neuropsychiatric diseases and tuberculosis.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] has referred to the letter that I received from one of his constituents. I did not know whether he was a constituent of the gentleman or not. In that letter the writer referred to the distressing case of Albert U. Wheeler. The writer, Walter J. Dumas, wrote me a letter on the 17th of February. It was such an appealing letter that I had a copy made of it and sent it to papers in my district. I did not send it to the district of the gentleman from South Dakota. Then I wrote to find out when this sick man entered the service. I was informed that he entered the service in July, 1918, and was discharged on December 24, 1918.

Now, since the gentleman from South Dakota has attacked me and misrepresented me, in accusing me of starting this propaganda and inspiring all these letters and petitions that have been sent to me, I am going to ask the Clerk to read this letter in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES VETERANS' HOSPITAL NO. 72,
*Fort Harrison, Mont., February 17, 1930.*

Hon. J. E. RANKIN,
*Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. RANKIN: To try and convince the Congress of the United States of the great importance of your bill, H. R. 7825, and to show why it should have precedence over all other veteran legislation, I would like to cite the case of Albert U. Wheeler, who is a tubercular patient in this veterans' hospital.

Some time during last October Albert U. Wheeler was sent to this hospital from the eastern part of South Dakota, where he left a family consisting of a wife and six small children, without any means of support except a pittance from charities of the county in which they live. I have been told that said proceeds for their necessities of life amount to $30 a month. You can imagine how much of a living a family of seven can have with $30 a month as their sole income.

Wheeler landed in this hospital without anything except the clothes on his back and a well-advanced case of active pulmonary tuberculosis in his chest. For two or three years he had been unable to do enough work to support his family properly and at the same time earn and lay away enough to tide him through the long period of hospitalization that would be necessary to restore his health, if it can be restored. He filed a claim for compensation at the regional office of the Veterans' Bureau in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., some time before coming to this hospital. The claim was disallowed. He was hospitalized at Battle Mountain Sanatorium, Hot Springs, S. Dak., a short while before being sent to Fort Harrison, Mont. He has been fighting his claim since he has been here at Fort Harrison, and to people here who have seen the evidence he has on hand, it looks like enough to connect anyone, yet he is told by people who are helping him that he will need more evidence before he can win out and get service connected and draw compensation. He has numerous lay affidavits from people who worked with him in 1919, in which they state that he was spitting blood at that time and was unable to keep up his end of the work at places where they were employed with him, and that he showed all the common symptoms of tuberculosis. That was in 1919, mind you. He has also secured affidavits from doctors who diagnosed him and treated him for tuberculosis after that time but prior to January 1, 1925. Yet authorities on what it takes to prove a claim for compensation tell him that he still has insufficient evidence to connect his case with service. While he is here trying to be benefited by hospital treatment under the worry of being unsuccessful in proving his claim, his family is several hundred miles away trying to subsist on the $30 a month provided for them by charity.

Last Christmas time, Wheeler's fellow patients here in the tubercular ward of the hospital being well aware of his family's plight, took up a collection for him to send to his children, in order that they would not think than even Santa Claus had forgotten them.

About two weeks ago Wheeler was telling me that he wished spring would hurry and come so that he could go home and do something for his family, as he could not stay here much longer and let them continue to be in want. I asked him what he would expect to do when he got back and he said he would get a job of some kind. Having no skilled trade, he has spent most of his time either as a farmer on a small farm or working as a farm hand for others, doing work of the hardest kind in either case, and that is the kind of work he expects to go back to. Can you imagine how long he would last at that kind of work when his condition was such that the doctor and nurses here moved him from the second floor of the building to the ground floor because it was making his condition worse to be climbing up the stairs? After moving him downstairs he was kept in bed about two weeks, during which time he was spitting blood profusely. He has been out of bed three or four weeks.

At the present time Wheeler is at home with his family, which is now probably one less in number. He received a telegram from his wife four days ago, stating that their 3-year-old boy was dying and was expected to live only a few hours. This message found Wheeler without funds on which to make the trip to the bedside of his sick or dying child. After the regional manager of the Veterans' Bureau granted him a furlough of two weeks from the hospital and told him that the most the bureau could do for him in a financial way was to give him a request slip for the half-fare transportation that the railroads allow to patients on furlough, the patients of the T. B. ward again took up a collection among themselves, obtaining enough to pay Wheeler's expenses on the trip home and return. I will mention here that there are only 33 patients in the ward and 14 of them are not drawing compensation.

It has been said that for tuberculosis a contented mind is 90 per cent of a cure. Would any Member of the Congress of United States tell me how a man in Wheeler's position can be of a contented mind? With the natural worry about the circumstances he was compelled to leave his family in it is impossible for him to be of a contented mind. He is just one of many disabled World War veterans who for those same reasons are just laying in these hospitals worrying themselves closer to their graves instead of getting well, as many of them would be if they were not loaded down with worry about loved ones they were compelled to leave at home without support. It is for those many men that the Rankin bill, H. R. 7825, should be given precedence over other legislation and in due time enacted into law by the legislative body of the country for which these men were willing to lay down all they had, even to their lives at a time when there was no bickering over the cost. Success to you in your noble effort to secure common justice for us is my wish.

Respectfully.

WALTER J. DUMAS.

Mr. RANKIN. I submit that for printing in the RECORD, in the light of the charge made by the gentleman from South Dakota that I inspired this propaganda. As a matter of fact, that is a sample of the letters that I get from every veterans' hospital in the United States, and from many disabled men who are not in hospitals. Not one of these tubercular men will be taken care of under the Johnson bill.

I have in my hand the card of the commander of the American Legion in Pennsylvania. He called me to the door over there not 40 minutes ago and gave me this card bearing the name of Frank L. Pinola, State commander, Pennsylvania Legion, Wilkes-Barre, Pa. He was accompanied by Mr. Deighan, of Philadelphia, adjutant of Pennsylvania. He said, "We are 100 per cent for the Rankin bill or for the Rankin amendment to the Johnson bill."

As to the propaganda from Arkansas, the man who sent that telegram from Arkansas possibly never saw either the Johnson bill or the Rankin bill.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. PARKS. On what does the gentleman base that statement? Why did he do that?

Mr. RANKIN. If he had read these bills and had known of them, he would not have demanded the passage of this bill without amendment.

Mr. PARKS. Is the gentleman speaking of a telegram from the commander of the American Legion of Arkansas?

Mr. RANKIN. I refer to the one read on the Republican side.

Mr. PARKS. The telegram that I received from the commander advocated the passage of the bill, but not without amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Arkansas, but if the man who sent that telegram, I am sure, had read all these hearings and had read these bills, he would have been in favor of the Rankin amendment.

I would not have taken the floor had it not been for the wild and unreasonable statements made by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and his charges to the effect that I had inspired this propaganda. I do not like to answer letters any more than you gentlemen do. I want to say that this has been the worst Congress that I have ever gone through, because of the revelations which these letters, these petitions, and these telegrams have made. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I also yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, before going into the question of the Rankin bill or the Johnson bill I would like to speak for a few moments with reference to the remarks made by my colleague [Mr. RANKIN] on Tuesday on the question of the disabled emergency officers.

Before touching on that, I wish to say that I am heartily in favor of the veterans' legislation proposed by my colleague [Mr. RANKIN], but I do not agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in his reference to the disabled emergency officers.

Yesterday papers of the country carried big headlines praising former President Coolidge for his veto of the disabled emergency officers' bill and attacking disabled emergency officers because they were able to hold positions although retired.

I was not an officer during the World War. I enlisted as a private, and afterwards became color sergeant of my regiment.

I favored the disabled emergency officers' bill on the floor of the House and fought for it when it was passed by the House. I do not see any reason to-day to change my mind or my vote or my opinion on that legislation.

When Members of the House asked me at that time why I was in favor of that bill I told them it was because it was

going to do justice to the disabled emergency officers of the World War; not the men who sat with their feet upon the desks down in the Government departments in Washington, but the second and first lieutenants and captains who went over the top in France. Their disabilities came from their wounds.

I think it ill behooves anybody to stand on the floor of the House of Representatives and blame a man for being retired from battle casualties and wounds, and then accepting a position in the Veterans' Bureau, or any place else he can get work in the United States. The men of the Regular Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps have retirement, and they had retirement before this disabled emergency officers' retirement bill was passed; and very often they were retired at a much less rate of disability, in many cases, than the disabled emergency officers—10 per cent or 20 per cent. It requires 30 per cent disability for a disabled emergency officer of the World War to be retired.

My colleague [Mr. RANKIN] put in the RECORD the names of all of those officers who were working in the Veterans' Bureau. Why, in the name of heaven, should they not work for the bureau? Is it not following out the policy of the President of the United States and the Congress and the Director of the Veterans' Bureau to have the disabled men run the bureau? Would you rather have able-bodied men in there who could get work at something else, or would you rather have the disabled emergency officers and men? Do not make any mistake. We have the names of the officers who are working in the bureau, but there were no names put in the RECORD of the hundreds of disabled privates and sergeants of the World War who are working in the regional offices throughout the United States and in the Veterans' Bureau. Why! The assistant general counsel of the Veterans' Bureau, and, by the way, one of the brainiest men in the bureau, Joseph O. C. Roberts, was a buck private in the Seventy-ninth Combat Division during the war; and there are many, many other enlisted men whom I could mention.

I think it is an injustice to those men to place them before the country as being in the position of taking money from the United States Government which they do not deserve. [Applause.] If a man is 30 per cent disabled, and he was a surgeon before the war, or if he was a lawyer before the war, or if he drove an ice wagon before the war, and he can not do that work now, but can do paper work in the Veterans' Bureau, why should the Congress of the United States say, "We do not want you to do that; you are getting retirement pay."

Gentlemen, I saw those men go over the top in France. That is why I fought for them on the floor of this House. They did not fall off their horses down at Chaumont, like some of the Regular Army men. They did not get hurt over on the Fort Myer parade ground. They did not get hurt out in California or down in Texas while their buddies were over in France. They were wounded leading their men over the top. God bless them. That is all I can say. I saw them. I know what they did.

I do not think any man should stand on the floor of this House and blame those men for taking retirement, especially when it came from wounds received in battle.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. There are only one or two Members who have the temerity to stand on the floor of the House and attack them for taking these benefits.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. For the information of the members of the committee, if they will turn to page 26 of the hearings, they will find that General Hines testified as follows:

> It must be considered, however, when studying these statements—

Referring to seven or eight pages of names of service men in the bureau that was formerly introduced—

> that approximately 50 per cent of the male employees and 10 per cent of the female employees of the bureau are ex-service men and women.

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; and that is where they belong. The Government owes it to them.

There is a certain medical officer, a wonderful doctor, in the Veterans' Bureau who it was stated received $8,000 a year and retirement pay, which might bring him up to $10,000 a year. If that man were not disabled, he could go anywhere in private practice and make $25,000 a year. He is practically deaf as a result of his casualties in the World War. And then, we stand here in Congress and say, "No, no. You are a good man for the medical division; you are a good man for the head of the bureau, but we do not believe you should get any pay from the National Government. We believe in taking some outside man who had an easy time during the war and giving him this position, even though you are eminently qualified to fill it."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. As a matter of fact, that man is giving the Government $25,000 worth of service every year, is he not?

Mr. CONNERY. He is giving $50,000 worth of service. I want to stand here and defend these men, because they have been unjustly accused. I say that Congress did a fine thing when they passed the disabled emergency officers' bill, to take care of men who fought on the field of battle in France, by placing them on an equal plane with the Regular Army, Navy, and Marine Corps officers.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I suggest that if there is a man serving the United States Government who is giving $25,000 worth of service for $10,000, his name should go in the RECORD.

Mr. CONNERY. His name is Dr. Winthrop Adams, medical director of the Veterans' Bureau, and every Member who knows his work will bear me out when I say there could be chosen no better man in the country for that position. [Applause.]

Mr. CROWTHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. CROWTHER. I think a great many of us felt as the gentleman feels about the disabled emergency officers' bill, but the only thing which bothered me at the time I voted for that bill was the seeming unfairness between the award given to the officer, of whom the gentleman has spoken, who so bravely went over the top, and the buck privates who went over with him. The emergency officer has a very comfortable retirement salary, and the private soldier, after trying for months and perhaps years to prove his service disability, is finally awarded a pittance of perhaps $30 a month or even less. [Applause.]

Let me tell one instance, because I have one in mind. I have in mind a man who came back and finished his law course. He had a 30 per cent disability, or, at least, he was so rated. That disability prevented him from lifting his arm, perhaps, as high as this [indicating] in gesture. He receives now, as a retired emergency officer, $1,500 a year. Then there is a little buck private from the same town who is incapacitated to such an extent that he can not do his regular work, and he now receives but $47.50 a month. He went over the top with the captain and the lieutenant. If the captain and lieutenant had gone over alone they would not have taken many trenches. I have always been sorry that I voted for that bill without providing some sort of equalization for the private soldiers who acquitted themselves so splendidly in the face of great danger. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman from New York spoke the truth, and he need not be sorry at all, because we are going to give him a fine opportunity in the Rankin amendment of taking care of my buddies, who were privates and sergeants during the war. [Applause.] I will say to the gentleman that at the time we had under consideration the emergency officers' bill the distinguished Democratic leader Mr. Garrett of Tennessee, who was opposed to the bill, asked me this question:

> Do I understand it is the idea of the gentleman from Massachusetts to bring the private's compensation up to the same plane as these officers?

Evidently Mr. Garrett expected me to say no, because that would cost the United States millions of dollars. However, I said:

> The gentleman has me exactly right. That is what I want to do; to bring the privates and sergeants up to where the officers are.

But we had to put that disabled emergency officers' bill over—in behalf of men who went over the top—in order to put them on the same plane with officers of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. I will say to the gentleman that if they had put all of these officers of the Army, the Navy, and Marine Corps on the same footing, then I would say all right, but as they were on a different plane I wanted the emergency officers to be on the same level with them.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman from New York wants this equality which he talks about he had better introduce a bill to equalize the salaries of the officers and buck privates in times of peace.

Mr. RANKIN rose.

Mr. CONNERY. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to go on with my statement, and then I will be glad to yield a little later. I would like to discuss the Rankin bill, and I have not much time. However, I will yield if I can get additional time.

Mr. RANKIN. I will give the gentleman additional time. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there is not nearly as much difference between the officers and enlisted men in the Army as there is now between the compensation that is paid to these officers and enlisted men, because in the Army an enlisted man receives $30 a month and he is given his keep, board, and clothing, while an officer is not given his board and clothing. However, when they come out and are seeking a rating there is a difference made. I happen to know a boy in my town whose leg was shot off below the knee. He gets $50 a month, while here is one of these men in the Judge Advocate General's department getting $218.75 a month. Those are the inequalities. I am not criticizing the men who went over the top, whether they were officers or enlisted men, but half of the men whose names appear on this list of "retired emergency officers" never saw Europe. Read it and go over it. Send it to your districts and publish it. Half of them never went to Europe. Some of these officers are getting $200 or $300 a month, while many of these poor buck privates, some of whom I know, with battle wounds, are receiving only $30 a month. The American people will not stand for that kind of discrimination as to their soldiers. [Applause.]

Mr. CROWTHER. I do not quite agree with the gentleman from Mississippi nor with the gentleman from Massachusetts, for that matter. I do not believe they ought to criticize a man who was in the Judge Advocate General's office or a man who happened to be in a training camp. War requires men in many services and they could not all be in the front-line trenches. Hundreds of splendid, loyal, and deserving boys died in camp from "flu" and thousands more never had a chance to go to France. If they had been given the chance, they would have been willing to go and would have served with honor to themselves and their country.

Mr. CONNERY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CROWTHER. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Does the gentleman mean to tell me that by the Rankin amendment you are going to bring all of these buck privates up to the level of these retired emergency officers?

Mr. CONNERY. This is a move in the right direction. You would never be able to get that through the Congress. We have been fighting for it for eight years but have never been able to do it.

Mr. CROWTHER. I thought the gentleman said the Rankin amendment was going to bring them up to the same level?

Mr. CONNERY. It would be a step in the right direction; a long step in the right direction.

Mr. CROWTHER. And it will only cost $44,000,000 a year?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes. It is a step in the right direction. Now, to get back to the discussion.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that the Rankin bill will cost just the price of one battleship.

Mr. CONNERY. I will say to the gentleman from New York and to the committee that this legislation is long delayed. Seven years ago the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROWNING] was accustomed to offer this legislation about every two weeks in the Veterans' Committee, but he never could get a vote on it. I do not refer to the Rankin amendment alone now, but I refer to the Johnson bill as well. The chairman of the committee knows; Mr. RANKIN knows; Mr. PERKINS and the other members of the committee know that the vote was something like 18 to 3, or 17 to 4, or something like that, against us every time Mr. BROWNING and I would fight to get this opened, so we could get on the floor of the House and get these men taken in who had other diseases besides tuberculosis.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Does the gentleman recall the attitude of the gentleman from Mississippi when that legislation was before the committee?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; but let the gentleman from Mississippi answer that question himself, if he would like to do so, in my time. The gentleman from South Dakota has asked what your attitude was when Mr. BROWNING and I used to offer these amendments to take care of these other diseases.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from South Dakota that I will give him this information, although he does not want any information and probably would not handle it if he had it. He knows that when this proposition first came up I opposed it. I thought we were going too fast until I looked around and saw the number of men affected. As I say, I was opposed to the proposition until I found out what conditions were and then I took up their cases, and I am going to keep up the fight until they are relieved.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I am sure that inasmuch as the gentleman from Mississippi has so ardently advocated this bill he will be glad to inform the House when he had the change of heart?

Mr. RANKIN. It was not a change of heart, but a change of mind which came about because of the information I received showing me the real conditions.

Mr. PERKINS. When did the change of heart take place?

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey that it took place long before he became converted to the Johnson bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNERY. I congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi for coming around to our point of view. Has not some one said that consistency is after all an attribute of small minds? I congratulate my colleague for being big enough to change his mind.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. What does the gentleman really think caused this change of heart in the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman from Mississippi stated that himself. He said that the veterans of the United States in hospitals asked him to introduce this bill, and I believe the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman does not think any senatorial race in Mississippi had anything to do with it?

Mr. CONNERY. I have not the slightest idea whether the gentleman is interested in any senatorial race in Mississippi or not.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from South Dakota, who does not seem to have any ideas except political ones, that I have never even intimated that I would ever be a candidate for the Senate. I am a candidate for reelection and I hope to be reelected without opposition. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNERY. I will say to the gentleman from South Dakota that I am pleased the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is going to stand for reelection and will be back on the Veterans' Committee, and I may say that if he did run for the Senate no man would make a better Senator from the State of Mississippi than the gentleman from Mississippi. [Applause.]

Mr. PERKINS. While the members of the Veterans' Committee are exchanging these pleasantries, may I say it would be a great loss to the House to have the gentleman from Mississippi in the Senate. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN. Would the gentleman from New Jersey like for me to yield him some more time? [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNERY. It would, indeed, be a loss.

Now, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, eight years ago, when the Veterans' Committee was formed and started to function, every time we would bring out veterans' legislation we would be informed it was wise for the Veterans' Committee to report this legislation and have the chairman bring it in under suspension of the rules. This I always opposed.

I heard two versions of this. One version was that if we brought any veterans' legislation onto the floor of the House every Member would stand up and offer an amendment, and if the bill called for $40,000,000 everyone would offer an amendment to bring it up to $60,000,000 or $80,000,000 or $100,000,000, and before we got through the bill would be loaded down to about $800,000,000. Then it would go to the Senate, and they would add on some more in the Senate, and then it would go to the President and be vetoed, and we would get no veterans' legislation. This was one version. Another version that I got, that sort of percolated from the inside or from different sources of information I had, was that certain members of the Republican Party on the floor of the House of Representatives were absolutely against any veterans' legislation, and they wanted to be relieved of the burden of voting for any bill that might cost $40,000,000, or twenty or ten, and, therefore, this was to be a nice little scheme to bring it in under suspension of the rules, so they could vote for a $6,000,000 or a $9,000,000 bill, and then go to the country and say: "See what we did for the service men."

Now, I want to say to you gentlemen that I do not believe either of these versions is right. I have always believed that the House of Representatives is well able to legislate for itself and that it does not need to have a bill brought in under suspension of the rules in order to be relieved of any responsibility, and I do not believe the House of Representatives is going to overload any veterans' bill so that it will receive a presidential veto.

Now, we had this particular incident occur, and here is an example of what has happened in the years gone by.

General Hines came before our committee and Watson Miller and Eddie Lewis, of the American Legion; Tom Kirby and Cap-

tain Bettelheim, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans, about four years ago, and at that time the Johnson bill was going to be introduced. The bill, upon the recommendation of the Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and General Hines, called for an expenditure of $39,000,000 for that year, and at the hearings General Hines said that this $39,000,000 was the least that should be expended in order to care properly for the disabled veterans of the country.

So the bill was reported under suspension of the rules, as usual, and went on the calendar. It stayed on the calendar for about 10 weeks, and then we were called into session by the chairman and were informed that he had been told that unless we took $20,000,000 off of the bill it would never see the floor of the House of Representatives. Then the committee voted—not with my sanction, because I would not vote to take a nickel off the bill—to bring in the bill with the $20,000,000 cut. Then we waited awhile and the bill went on the calendar again, and then we were called into session about four weeks later and told by the chairman that he had been informed that unless another $10,000,000 was cut off the bill it would never see the floor of the House. So the committee, obligingly, cut another $10,000,000 off the bill, and it came to the floor under suspension of the rules calling for $9,000,000.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Was that the hospitalization bill?

Mr. CONNERY. No; that was for the disabled men of the country. That was the legislation that was needed that year. As my colleague has called to your attention, remember that this was not for able-bodied men, but was to care for the disabled men of the United States whose disabilities were connected with the service, and yet that bill was brought in here cut down from $39,000,000 to $9,000,000 after General Hines, the Director of the Veterans' Bureau, had said that the least that should be expended was $39,000,000.

So I congratulate the chairman of the Veterans' Committee and I congratulate the House of Representatives to-day on having the first opportunity since the Veterans' Committee was formed to legislate for the disabled veterans of the United States. I never expected to see the day come.

I remember the bill used to come over from the Senate about the day before we adjourned, and every two years since I have been in Congress the last thing I did in every session was to stand up here and protest against veterans' legislation being brought in under suspension of the rules. So I congratulate you to-day. You are going to have a chance to do something for the veterans of the United States.

I have confidence in this body. I do not think any committee of Congress can legislate any better than you can. I do not believe the Members of this House are going to overload this bill. You will discuss it, you will think it over, you will vote on the amendments, and you will decide what is the best thing for the service men.

The Johnson bill is a good bill. Do not mistake me by thinking that I am of the opinion that that bill is without its good points. It has some wonderful provisions in it, but to my mind the Rankin bill is a better bill, because it brings the time up to January 1, 1930.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. But the Rankin bill restricts the diseases, so that it does not reach men equally suffering and equally sick in the same way.

Mr. CONNERY. It does not cover all the diseases.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman does not think it is fair to discriminate with respect to the different diseases?

Mr. CONNERY. I am following along the lines of our chairman, who has said that if we bring in any bill that is going to cost over $110,000,000 it is sure to be vetoed by the President.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman will admit that the Johnson bill will treat them all alike up to 1925?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. And the gentleman will admit that the Rankin bill will not treat them all alike up to 1930?

Mr. CONNERY. It will not take in the fellow that stubs his toe, but it will take care of the tuberculous, neuropsychiatric, and the constitutional diseases, and it will take care of 70 per cent of those that are in your bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. And leave 30 per cent equally sick out in the cold.

Mr. CONNERY. No, not equally sick; the man who stubs his toe and the fellow who falls off a wagon are not equally sick.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It would leave out some war casualties, would it not?

Mr. CONNERY. No. It would not.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. We do not disturb that portion of the bill at all.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. It seems to be admitted that the Johnson bill will cost $100,000,000 and the Rankin bill will cost $44,000,000.

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman kindly explain how you are going to distribute $44,000,000 and do a better job than can be done with $100,000,000?

Mr. CONNERY. If I could get what I want I would like to take the Johnson bill from 1925 and bring it up to 1930. We are using a legislative expediency and trying to get something through. If you would take what I want it is the Johnson bill up to 1930. Will the gentleman offer an amendment to that effect?

Mr. PERKINS. No; I will not do any such thing. But I would like to have the gentleman explain how with $44,000,000 you are going to do a better job by the Rankin bill than in the Johnson bill with $100,000,000?

Mr. CONNERY. You are going to take care of the tubercular men——

Mr. PERKINS. The Johnson bill brings all of these diseases up to 1925.

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Is it not better to bring all up to 1925 instead of 70 per cent up to 1930?

Mr. CONNERY. That is what I am saying. I would like to bring them all up to 1930.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman from Mississippi says that his bill will cost $44,000,000, and the gentleman from Massachusetts agrees with that. My bill will cost $100,000,000, and the gentleman agrees to that. He wants to liberalize he says, and how are you going to liberalize by cutting $56,000,000 off my bill and supporting the Rankin bill?

Mr. CONNERY. Well, I would like to amend it and bring the Johnson bill up to 1930. Will the gentleman support it?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. No; I will not support it.

Mr. CONNERY. I am trying to go along with the gentleman from South Dakota, but he says that the President will veto a large amount.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I am trying to get $100,000,000 for everybody.

Mr. PERKINS. We all know that the heart of the gentleman from Massachusetts is right, but we have our doubts as to his head.

Mr. CONNERY. My head feels fine. Thank you.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I will tell the gentleman from New Jersey and the House why the Rankin bill will do more good, because it will take care of men suffering from tuberculosis and from neuropsychiatric troubles and mental troubles who are now helpless. The Johnson bill takes in many minor disabilities and increases the load, while ours narrows it, but it takes all up to 1930 who are seriously affected and in serious need of help.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. As a matter of fact, the gentleman and I both know that the reason he is for the $44,000,000 bill is that he knows that it will cost $300,000,000.

Mr. CONNERY. No; I would not say that; but I say to the gentleman that that would not worry me an awful lot. As a member of that committee, the gentleman remembers I offered an amendment calling for $50 a month for men with arrested tuberculosis, which afterwards was adopted. Before that was adopted I asked what it would cost, and the estimate they gave me was that it would cost $76,000,000 and eventually cost the Government $900,000,000. The gentleman also remembers that in the last session of the hearings we had before this committee I asked General Hines how much it had actually cost last year—for the amendment finally passed—and he said that it cost

$18,000,000. Then I remember Mr. Mellon, the "greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Alexander Hamilton," I think it is said——

Mr. PERKINS. Concededly so.

Mr. CONNERY. "The greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Alexander Hamilton," as he was termed by the newspapers, not by me—I wish to make that plain—the man who made a billion dollar mistake when the soldiers' bonus was up, the man who said that if we passed the soldiers' bonus that year there would be a deficit in the United States Treasury of $300,000,000. We did pass the soldiers' bonus, and it then developed that there was a surplus in the Treasury of $500,000,000. I am getting used to these great big figures of Mr. Mellon and the bureau, and all that, and when you get them you had better reduce them by about 60 per cent and you will be closer to the right figure.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I do not think the gentleman wants to leave the impression with this House that he would be satisfied with $44,000,000——

Mr. CONNERY. If I could get $140,000,000, I would want that.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Then we have to concede that the Rankin bill will cost about $300,000,000.

Mr. CONNERY. Oh, no; because General Hines says it would cost $44,250,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

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

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman's admiration for the Secretary of the Treasury led him to make a rather extravagant statement a while ago.

Mr. CONNERY. I do not think so.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Mellon stated that if we paid the soldiers' bonus in cash there would be a deficit.

Mr. CONNERY. Not at that time.

Mr. KNUTSON. I beg the gentleman's pardon; yes.

Mr. CONNERY. Oh, no.

Mr. KNUTSON. How could you have a deficit when you did not pay any of it out?

Mr. CONNERY. I am going to ask the gentleman seriously to think over what he himself just said. The soldiers' bonus is going to cost $3,000,000,000, isn't it? How could he say if you paid $3,000,000,000 in cash you would have a $300,000,000 deficit in the United States Treasury?

Mr. KNUTSON. How could you have a deficit when you are not paying it out in money?

Mr. CONNERY. If they had paid the soldiers' bonus in cash, it would have cost $3,000,000,000. We did not say cash.

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

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is not a little hazy in his recollection, and whether it is not the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury had warned President Harding at the time that if the bonus bill was passed, which had then been passed, and its form determined, and not vetoed by the President, we were in danger of having not a deficit of $300,000,000 but of over $400,000,000, and also if afterwards, on the floor of the House, a former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, now a Member of this House, did not analyze the statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury, the estimate, and show that there was not a mistake of a billion dollars but of more than a billion dollars in the estimate, and is not that part of the record?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; the gentleman made such a statement, and it is a part of the record of the House.

Mr. PERKINS. If we might get down from those figures for a moment, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. On page 70 of the hearings, General Hines testified that the Rankin bill would bring in 77,744 cases, and that that would leave over 500,000 additional cases to be reviewed. Does not the gentleman think that it would be better to bring in more of these cases—men who are just as sick as the tubercular cases, but who at the present time have no advantage whatever except by showing actual service-connected disability?

Mr. CONNERY. I will put my cards on the table to the gentleman and say that if you can bring the Johnson bill up to 1930, which is going to take care of all the men he refers to, and will take care of all the men he refers to, and will take care of all diseases, I shall only be too happy to go along; but in the place of that I am taking my choice between the men in the last five years, tubercular men who can not be cared for in this bill. I know it is a choice between the devil and the deep blue sea, but I prefer the Rankin amendment, from 1925 to 1930, when we can not get 1930 on all diseases.

Mr. DUNBAR. If the Rankin amendment is adopted, will all of the provisions of the Johnson bill stand until 1925, and then in addition to that will we have the benefit of the Rankin amendment?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; it will take care of all the provisions of the Johnson bill, insurance provisions and everything else, and then you will give your tubercular men and those other 70 per cent an opportunity to come in from 1925 to 1930.

Mr. DUNBAR. And the adoption of the Rankin amendment will not take one thing away from the veterans as provided for in the Johnson bill?

Mr. CONNERY. No.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Then the gentleman is desirous of voting for the Rankin bill, which will provide for about $40,000,000 additional benefits, and give his vote for that bill instead of the Johnson bill, which he admits will provide more than double the amount, on the ground that you are going to extend the presumptive sections on a few specific cases five years beyond the present time, notwithstanding the fact that they now have a big advantage as against a great percentage of veterans under the present law, and you are willing to increase that advantage and leave those other fellows out, so far as the presumptive feature is concerned?

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman must not forget that it is not a few cases only. It is 70 per cent of those in the Johnson bill.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. You propose to turn down that 30 per cent who will be taken care of under the Johnson bill in your endeavor to increase the presumption of the 70 per cent who for years have had this presumptive period in their favor.

Mr. CONNERY. Will you support my amendment to the Johnson bill to bring it up to 1930, to take care of all diseases?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I will vote for the Johnson bill. I will not vote for the Rankin bill as a substitute. If you take the Rankin bill in its entirety and the Johnson bill in its entirety, you will find that the Johnson bill is more liberal for the veterans, the propaganda in favor of the Rankin bill to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. CONNERY. I am getting a neat cross section of the sentiment of the House, and I am going to offer an amendment at the proper time to strike out 1925 and substitute 1930 and see how the gentleman will feel.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. You already know how I feel. I have made no secret about it. I shall vote for that amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. We are all very frank to-day, and I am free to say that I shall vote against that amendment on the ground that there is no medical testimony that will warrant even to the slightest degree an assumption of service connection with a disability incurred since 1925.

Mr. CONNERY. Do you believe that the men who served 19 months on the battle fields of France are to-day as good men as they were before they entered the war? Do you believe you are yourself as good a man as you were 20 years ago? [Laughter.]

Mr. PERKINS. I ought to be better.

Mr. CONNERY. I mean physically. [Laughter.] I am sure the gentleman ought to be better.

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

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. LUCE. If it be true that the gentleman's argument is sound, on the ground that men were weakened by their war service, then it follows that every case of illness now developing in a veteran could be traced to the war?

Mr. CONNERY. Logically, I suppose.

Mr. LUCE. Logically. If the gentleman offers his amendment, will he accept an amendment to his amendment to the effect that this shall be extended to all cases of disease?

Mr. CONNERY. It is in the Johnson bill now, covering all cases of disease.

Mr. LUCE. On the contrary——

Mr. CONNERY. He takes care of all diseases up to 1925.

Mr. LUCE. And will it take in also what the Johnson bill in effect excludes—accidents?

Mr. CONNERY. My proposed amendment will amend the Johnson bill as it now stands.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman accept an amendment including accidents?

Mr. CONNERY. Why do you want to include accidents?

Mr. LUCE. Well, it has been said that a man who now suffers from an accident, having had his nerves disarranged by the war, undoubtedly could not have met with that accident if it had not been for the war. Is not that a matter of record in the report of hearings, possibly coming from the gentleman?

Mr. CONNERY. I have a pretty good memory, but I never said that?

Mr. LUCE. The argument as advanced by somebody is a matter of record in the stenographic report of some hearing I attended.

Mr. CONNERY. The chairman of the committee says there is only one man in the committee who speaks as I do and that's myself.

Mr. LUCE. The gentleman has not answered my question. Will the gentleman extend the disability so as to include accidents?

Mr. CONNERY. No. I want to extend the time from 1925 to 1930.

Mr. LUCE. Permit me to express my gratification that I have at last found out the limit beyond which my colleague will not go. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield the gentleman 10 more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In his amendment extending the presumptive period from January 1, 1925, to January 1, 1930, will the gentleman recognize a provision which will exclude diseases and disabilities incurred in the battle of Paris and similar battles, five or six years after the World War ended?

Mr. CONNERY. Not having been in a division which had a chance to get into any of those battles, I do not know much about them. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I particularly refer to the so-called misconduct disabilities. Why service-connect a misconduct disability which was perhaps incurred 10 years after the discharge of the veteran and pay $100 a month compensation as long as he lives, if the gentleman is desirous of taking care of veterans who received disabilities due to their war service?

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman does not want to get into a discussion of the misconduct clause that we discussed in committee, does he? If he does, I will say that I would vote to take care of every man who was in France, regardless of misconduct. The American Expeditionary Force were a pretty good bunch of men. They were not all angels, and nobody expected them to be angels.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. They are not included in the Johnson bill?

Mr. CONNERY. No; they are not.

Mr. RANKIN. And the extension of time up to 1930 still would not include them?

Mr. CONNERY. No; it would not include them.

Mr. RANKIN. So the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] evidently has not read the bill.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is in error, because there is a provision in the Johnson bill that shall not deny compensation in misconduct cases where the veteran has reached a stage of paralysis, paresis, blindness, helplessness, or is bedridden. If you extend the period of presumption to January 1, 1930, for all of these disabilities, including misconduct disabilities, you are going to pay $100 a month, perhaps, in many cases where the misconduct disability was not incurred in war service but perhaps 5 or 10 years after discharge.

Mr. CONNERY. If the gentleman can segregate those cases and find out which were connected service cases and which were not, I will be glad to support the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] may not know it, but the section which the gentleman quoted from the Johnson bill is in the present law. That is the only thing the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and I agree on, I think. It is in the present law; but, while we are on that point, I want to say that I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY]. As far as I am concerned, I would repeal that brutal provision of the law that prevents these men from receiving compensation on the ground that their disabilities were caused by their own misconduct. If they had received their disabilities from drinking beer, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] would have favored putting them on the roll and paying them a bonus. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. LOZIER. The philosophy or reason for the presumptive clause is based upon the well-recognized theory in medicine, as well as in fact, that service, while it may not at the time incapacitate the soldier, and there may be no present evidence of disability resulting from service, frequently it will reduce the power of resistance in the individual and furnish soil for the incubation of the disease later on when conditions are favorable for the development of the disease; and for that reason the medical profession realizes that anything which reduces the power or resistance of the individual may be attributable to the service, although there may be no manifestations of that disease for years afterwards.

Mr. CONNERY. I think the gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. CROWTHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. CROWTHER. The first presumptive period was two years. In 1922, on Washington's birthday, I suggested that I was going to offer an amendment to the committee which was considering the revision of the so-called Sweet bill, asking to make that period three years; and I read a letter into the RECORD from the Veterans' Bureau regarding a man by the name of George Washington Wills, who had just overridden the presumptive period by four or five days. They wrote that he was ineligible and he did not have a case. The best medical authorities at that time stated that the probable peak presumptive period would be five years. The gentleman will find that in the RECORD at that time. That was agreed to by the best medical authorities, but the committee was very generous at that time and made the period six years when they revised the bill. Now it has crept up until we are going to make it 12 years or more—1918 to 1930. That is more than double what the expert medical men of the country stated at that time the peak period would be, namely, five years, for the development of bronchial and lung troubles as a result of being gassed.

Mr. CONNERY. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] for his courage in voting for the soldiers' cash bonus when that proposition was before the Ways and Means Committee. The gentleman knows that two medical experts can testify in court, and one expert will testify to one proposition and the opposition expert will testify to something else. Medical men are not infallible. I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] has men coming into his office who tell him that they know this man or that man or the other man who was in the service has suddenly gone insane and put in a hospital.

Mr. CROWTHER. I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] and say that I am reminded of a very distinguished Member of this House who came from the same district as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] Private John Allen. He said to Governor Shaw one day in a little discussion about some legislation: "Governor, it is a darned sight easier to vote wrong than it is to vote right and go home and explain it."

I hope I shall always vote right even if it necessitates explanation.

Mr. CONNERY. I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] will never have to do any explaining on that proposition in his district.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Is it not a fact that whatever bill is passed, whether the Johnson bill or the Rankin bill, will be only a temporary measure?

Mr. CONNERY. I will say to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts that I believe that with this discussion that is coming, a study of all veterans' legislation with the idea of ultimate pensions, this is only temporary legislation, and it can not do any harm, no matter how much we spend on it.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that the final and definite conclusion of this is the passage of a pension law?

Mr. CONNERY. Eventually; yes.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman any views as to its passage at the present time?

Mr. CONNERY. General Hines was asked, when he came before the committee with reference to that matter, and he suggested that we have a committee to study all veteran legislation with the idea that pensions were coming, so that they would be able to discuss the matter intelligently and bring in some program for the House to take action on. I am inclined

to think that the day is coming soon when it will be pension legislation, and I suppose I will favor that, as long as it does justice to all service men.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. HOWARD. I would not wish to quote Mr. Hines incorrectly, but my impression is that in his testimony he felt that a pension measure might be proposed within the 3-year period following the passage of this legislation. I do not want to quote him certainly, but that is my recollection of his testimony.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. There is a resolution now pending before the Rules Committee to appoint a joint committee of the House and Senate to investigate this subject, looking to bringing about some legislation to equalize and take care of the disabled men, between now and the expiration of this bill if it becomes law.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. PALMER. What is the estimated cost for the extension of the presumptive period to January 1, 1930, of the Johnson bill?

Mr. CONNERY. I do not have the figures with me. I think the chairman of the committee could give some information on that.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Four hundred million dollars.

Mr. CONNERY. It would not be as much as that, would it?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It would be that much for five years.

Mr. PALMER. That is all right. They are entitled to it.

Mr. CONNERY. That is what I think. We gave back $780,000,000 to the railroads without any great outcry in the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman I would like to have five additional minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. CONNERY. I do not want to take much more time of the House, but I do want to say this: We have reduced taxes over a billion dollars since the close of the war. Every time a tax bill came up you did not hear anybody stand up on the floor of the House and say, "We must not reduce taxes over $100,000,000."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; you did. I have.

Mr. CONNERY. Well, with rare exceptions. The gentleman from New York says he does. But very seldom do we hear anyone object to reducing taxes in the United States, because those taxes are being taken off of whom? They are being taken off of your big corporations, your big-moneyed men in the United States. They do not affect soldiers; they do not affect the sailors and marines, the men who saved these billions of dollars for them during the war. They affect the big corporations. As I say, we hear no objection to a reduction of those taxes, but when we come in and say we are going to expend $400,000,000 for the purpose of taking care of men who went on the field of battle and saved their billions for them and gave them a chance to live in peace and prosperity in the United States, then what do we hear? Good gracious! We must not allow this, why Congress is going to take $400,000,000 out of the United States Treasury for the purpose of caring for men racked with pain, dying, men suffering in beds in the hospitals, men who have lost their chance for a livelihood, men whose families are in want. When we say we are going to give them $400,000,000 we hear that great outcry of economy, economy. God save the mark on that kind of economy.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to correct a misapprehension which may arise by reason of the gentleman's statement that taxes do not rest on the shoulders of everybody. It is not just the first payer who pays the taxes but it goes right down to every producer.

Mr. CONNERY. Oh, yes; it may mean 2 cents on the shoulders of workers in the mills of Lawrence or in the shoe factories in Lynn, but the reduction in billions is given to the big corporations and the moneyed men of the United States.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There is a great deal of medical discussion as to the period of time in which service connection must be shown. It took the Treasury Department 10 years to evolve the theory of valuations upon which millions are refunded.

Mr. CONNERY. That is correct. The gentleman remembers, and I remember, that when we stood on the floor of the House and fought for that pitiful little bonus or adjusted compensation—the undertaker's bill—which gives a man $1,500 after 20 years, if he lives, that we received letters from all over the United States saying, "Pass the Mellon tax reduction bill but do not pay a soldiers' bonus." I have no sympathy with these profiteers, these one-dollar-a-year men who made millions of dollars during the war while other men were fighting for them on the field of battle; but I have the greatest sympathy for disabled men, men who are in the hospitals suffering from tuberculosis and going insane. I ask you to remember that we appropriated $15,000,000 for hospitals last year in one appropriation, and that three-fourths of those hospitals were for the insane. They say the presumptive period is too long when it is made 10 years after the war or 12 years. But these men are going insane daily, and certainly they are not going insane from anything except from direct connection with their service.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has spoken about taxes. I desire to call his attention to the fact that the record shows that there are 206 more people in the United States with incomes of over $1,000,000 a year than there were a year ago.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. When you extend the period of presumption to January 1, 1930, you are extending it to cases where they entered the war after the armistice, and to cases where they served 10 or 12 days in a camp. There are many cases in the Veterans' Bureau now where men are getting $100 a month and the service rendered was but 12 days in camp. Cases in which the disability did not show up until five or six years after discharge.

Mr. CONNERY. If the gentleman wants to offer an amendment to make it 90 days or 60, I will be glad to support it.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CONNERY. I do not wish to take up any further time of the committee. I am deeply interested in this, as every Member of the House is. I am going to offer an amendment to bring the Johnson bill up to 1930. If it adds the cost of $400,000,000 on the United States Treasury, I feel the Treasury can stand it. They did it for the profiteers, why not the disabled service man?

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Why does the gentleman stop at 1930?

Mr. CONNERY. Well, we have come up to 1930.

Mr. DENISON. These men are going to have tuberculosis and these other nervous diseases after 1930.

Mr. CONNERY. But we have had General Hines come before the committee and say it is the intention to have a general study made of the whole situation, and I am willing to go along with 1930.

Now, if you do take $400,000,000 out of the United States Treasury, you are not going to bankrupt the Government.

I have heard another rumor to the effect that if we pass any bill that would go to the President calling for an expenditure of $400,000,000, he would veto it. I do not believe he would veto it, and if he did, I believe the House of Representatives and the Senate would pass it over his veto. Later I shall offer my amendment. I hope the House will consider it very carefully and if you decide that you want to take care of all the men who served their country and who have contracted these diseases up to 1930, you will vote for the amendment. I thank the House for its courtesy in listening so patiently. [Applause.]

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is with a great deal of hesitancy that I venture to discuss this bill. After having listened to the various members of the Veterans' Committee, several of whom have seen service themselves in combat divisions, and have made a special study of the subject and have discussed it here with great illumination, I hesitate to even attempt a discussion of the bill. But while these gentlemen know more about the subject, of course, than I do, none of them has any more interest in doing what I think is the Government's duty toward the ex-service men than I have. I do not think any of them have done more in a humble way in connection with the consideration of legislation for their benefit than I have.

I voted for the war, I voted for the draft law, and when I did so I decided I would not deny the men who went into the service anything that was reasonable and that they ought to have, and I never have. I have voted for every bill that has been brought before the House for consideration that would confer benefits upon the ex-service men and their dependents, and I intend to continue to do so.

We all have our responsibilities here as Members, and I am going to take this occasion to state my views with reference to the proposed amendment that is going to be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY], who has just spoken, and the amendment that is going to be offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

I had prepared some remarks, giving an analysis of this bill and telling somewhat in detail what it will do and what Congress has already done for the ex-service men and their dependents, but since I came into the Chamber this morning I have decided that I am not going to read them or even insert them in the RECORD.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the committee, made such a forceful and clear analysis and explanation of the bill and of what the Congress has done for the ex-service men that I am going to ask of him the privilege, which I am sure he will grant, of allowing me to send along with my own remarks the speech which he has made to the veterans of my district; because it will give them an understanding of this bill and of the legislation which has already been passed better than any remarks I might make here or any speech I might prepare and insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. So I am going to make my remarks here quite short.

I think the Members of the House ought to keep in mind the distinction between a pension and compensation, and in the discussion that has been going on this morning it seems to me the distinction between those two terms has been entirely overlooked.

I think Congress ought to provide liberal compensation for every man who served in our forces and either suffered a wound in the service or contracted any disease connected with the service. We ought to be liberal in this respect, but we ought not to grant pensions upon the basis of compensation; and I am unwilling to vote for a permanent policy that will give any man in the late war a pension of $200 or $225 a month as a pension so long as we are only giving pensions to the aged veterans who helped save this Union not exceeding $90 a month in the most destitute circumstances. They, too, answered their country's call, and they saved the Union when its dissolution was threatened.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; I will yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Did the gentleman vote for the emergency officers' retirement act?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Can the gentleman consistently do that and at the same time not vote to take care of these men?

Mr. DENISON. I am not voting not to take care of these men. We passed retirement legislation years ago for disabled officers of the Regular Army, and I voted for that act because I thought that we ought to extend similar privileges to the emergency officers when they were disabled in line of duty, and I think so now.

I think, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, it is very important we pass the resolution that is now pending before the Rules Committee, providing for the appointment of a commission to make a study of legislation for the soldiers of all our wars, and I believe we ought to treat them all substantially alike. I do not think there is any justification for our making a distinction in benefits conferred because there is a difference in their numbers and political power.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. How can the gentleman reconcile his statement that he believes in treating them all alike and favors the creation of a commission to equalize pensions and compensations and then urge the enactment of this legislation before a study can be made of the whole proposition?

Mr. DENISON. Because I think it is important that we grant relief to the men and women who need relief immediately, and this is not permanent legislation. This is merely taking care of the situation until we can pass legislation that will correct the evils of inequality in the existing laws.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. DENISON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I appreciate the gentleman's attitude, and let me call his attention to the fact that while the Johnson bill spreads out and takes in everybody the Rankin bill takes in men afflicted with those maladies which the Veterans' Bureau has said are probably traceable to their service in the World War.

Mr. DENISON. My information is there has not been found any medical testimony at all to show that you can legitimately extend the presumption of service connection as far ahead as 1930. Now, in view of that situation, it amounts to a nonservice connected disability pension; it is compensation by fiction only; and it seems to me we ought not to do that.

Now, I will tell you what I think we ought to do. I think we ought to give liberal compensation for injuries or disabilities on a compensation basis to every man who can trace his injury or his disease to the service, and for those who can not trace them to the service we ought to provide a liberal pension, and I am ready to do that right now. [Applause.]

I think we ought to treat all the men who have served in our wars substantially alike. It is wrong to make a distinction and treat one class of veterans one way and another another way. That is another reason why I shall vote for the Johnson bill, because it will help to remove the inequitable distinction that is allowed under existing laws between men who are suffering or disabled by different kinds of diseases. We can not justify such a distinction.

I had a man come to me a few days ago suffering from a disease not included in those enumerated in the Rankin bill; I have been trying to get him compensation, and I could not do it. The Rankin bill would not help him or thousands of others like him. There are a lot of those men, and they are entitled to the same treatment as the man who has tuberculosis or some other nervous disease.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. In support of what the gentleman has just said, will he allow me to read from page 22 of the hearings in the testimony of Doctor McDermott. He was asked:

> As I understand the medical testimony before our committee, it is that those diseases which are service connected by this bill from the 1st of January, 1925, to the 1st of January, 1930, that had their origin in that period—there is no medical reason to believe that any of them were service connected?

And Doctor McDermott replied:

> No, sir; there is no scientific basis to show that they were service incurred.

Mr. DENISON. I think that is correct. Now, my view of our duty is that we ought to remove the injustice to certain classes of veterans that results from the existing law, which singles out certain classes of diseases and gives preference to them by granting them a presumptive service connection, and does not allow the same presumptive service connection to other diseases that may be just as serious. I think that is wrong. I think that we ought to remove that injustice, and the Johnson bill will do that by allowing the presumption in favor of other diseases.

Another thing, I do not think that we ought to extend the presumption of service connection any further than 1925, because it is purely a presumption. There is no possible medical testimony justifying it, and we ought not to resort to such a presumption to extend the benefits of compensation. Let us be fair and frank and provide pensions for those whose disabilities arise after 1925.

I am in favor of equalizing the law, removing the injustice that results from this classification of diseases, and then pass legislation that will grant a liberal pension to those veterans of the World War who are suffering from disabilities resulting from diseases contracted or becoming apparent since 1925, and which they can not prove were due to their military service.

When we come to granting them pensions we ought to have some consideration for the pensions of the soldiers of other wars. I think the men who volunteered to fight for our country in the Spanish-American War and in the Civil War are entitled to a fair consideration, too, when we come to the further consideration of pension legislation. I see no reason why we should grant large pensions to the soldiers of one war and not to the soldiers of another war, who may have performed equally meritorious service.

I want to say that I am supporting the Johnson bill and I am voting against the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] and against the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

I will ask the Clerk to read in my time a letter I received from the head of the Legion in Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
*Springfield, Ill., April 1, 1930.*

Hon. EDWARD E. DENISON,
*Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Department of Illinois American Legion is very anxious that the Johnson bill (H. R. 10381) be made a law at this session of Congress, and we urgently ask that you agree to suspend the rules in this connection and vote for the measure when it comes on the floor.

The passage of this act, as I regard it, is an act of mercy in that many of the men who will be benefited by it are mental wrecks and are unable to give a lucid statement of their service. There are also many who will be benefited by it who have for the past 12 years been unable to follow gainful employment because of disabilities acquired, and for which they have been unable to gain recognition from the Veterans' Bureau.

I know of no piece of legislation proposed by the American Legion within recent years that is so meritorious and that will gain for you the undying gratitude of a lot of sick men, who served their country and are now being ignored, as this bill.

I might add in conclusion that we expect your support as in the past.

Sincerely,

P. JOSEPH TRABAND,
*Chairman Legislative Committee, American Legion, Department of Illinois.*

Mr. DENISON. That represents the views of the State organization of Legionnaires in the State of Illinois, and I am going along with them. This letter came without any solicitation on my part.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That communication does not say that the Legion is against the Rankin bill?

Mr. DENISON. I do not think there is any force in the question the gentleman from Oklahoma asks. The letter states that they are in favor of the Johnson bill and it does not discuss any other bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. DENISON. I am sorry, but my time is almost up.

Mr. RANKIN. I will yield the gentleman further time.

Mr. DENISON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say that we have letters from disabled men, members of the Legion, who are writing us to pass the Rankin bill.

Mr. DENISON. Well, I can not comment upon them for I know nothing about them. I have received nothing of the kind. I have received a few letters from men in different parts of the country asking me to support the Rankin bill. But many of these letters, as we all know, are the result of agitation and propaganda. Many of those who write them know nothing of the provisions of the Johnson bill or the effects of the Rankin amendment. Why, how could they? There are many Members of this House who do not fully understand what the pending bill will do, or what the Rankin amendment would do. How can the disabled veterans be familiar with the bills?

Let me say this to the gentleman from Mississippi: If we are going to pass this legislation extending the presumption of service connection up to 1930, there is not a single reason under heaven why we should not extend it to 1932 or 1935.

Mr. RANKIN. Is the gentleman directing that question to me?

Mr. DENISON. I am not asking any question, but I am directing my remarks to the gentleman as well as to the other Members of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. When we reach that time, if these men are suffering from tuberculosis as they are now, I am in favor of it.

Mr. DENISON. But while we have this under discussion, if you want to be logical, if you are going to pass legislation based on mere presumption, and grant men pensions on the basis of compensation, why do you stop at 1930?

Mr. RANKIN. Why do you stop at 1925?

Mr. DENISON. Because the present law does that with respect to certain diseases, and I think we ought to equalize it by allowing the same presumption with respect to other diseases. There is one other reason and that is because in my desire to be absolutely fair and give the service men the benefit of all doubt I would be willing to allow the presumption of service connection as far as 1925—what the Congress partly did several years ago—but I think that is as far as we ought to go in indulging a legal presumtion; and I can not help but believe that when the gentleman from Mississippi gives sober thought to the matter he will agree with me, and he will agree with me that after 1925, if the veterans can not show service connection, we ought to give them a disability pension and not pretend to give them compensation.

Mr. Chairman, I referred in the beginning of my remarks to my attitude toward legislation conferring benefits upon veterans of the World War and their dependents. I have voted, as I said, for every bill that has been considered by the House of Representatives conferring benefits upon the veterans. I have voted for every bill, so far as I know, that has been urged by the American Legion as an organization. I was on the committee that reported the original Sweet bill, which first gave splendid recognition to the services of our soldiers in the World War. I voted for the adjusted compensation law, the disabled emergency officers' retirement law, the World War veterans' act of 1924, and the gold star mothers' act. As a member of the steering committee I have urged early consideration of the Johnson bill. I have voted for every law giving preferential rights and privileges to veterans of the World War. If I have failed to vote for any bill conferring benefits upon them, it has been because I was unable to be present on account of illness or for some unavoidable reasons. And since the beginning of the World War I have devoted a good part of my time and the time of my office to assisting veterans and their dependents in the adjustment of their claims with the Veterans' Bureau. Year after year I have invited those who could not obtain speedy consideration of their claims to call upon me for assistance, and my office has never been closed to such work.

Since the laws have been passed by Congress giving preferential rights to veterans in appointments to office, I have followed the spirit and the letter of the law in making such appointments. Recently it became my duty and privilege to make recommendations of enumerators to take the census in the district I represent. As a matter of course, I could not personally select and recommend suitable persons in every precinct in the eight counties of my district. I called upon the Republican county organization of each of my counties to suggest suitable persons to me for census enumerators. I addressed identical letters to the chairman of the county central committee of each county asking them to confer with the precinct committeemen and other public citizens and select persons competent to take the census, telling them that whoever should be selected would have to pass certain tests and be found qualified by the Census Bureau. I wish to quote here the following paragraph from my letters upon this subject:

> The persons selected should be competent to take an accurate census. Ex-service men are entitled by law to preference in making such appointments, and I desire to carry out the spirit as well as the letter of the law. If there are persons who have the other necessary qualifications and who desire the appointments, and who are ex-service men, or the wives of ex-service men, I shall be glad to give them preference wherever it can be done. Women are eligible if they have the necessary qualifications.

I am informed that in many instances these appointments were offered to as many as four ex-service men in succession but were refused because of their disabilities, or because they did not feel competent to do the work. I think I can safely say that practically half of the appointments of census enumerators in my district were either given to ex-service men or members of their family, or Spanish-American War veterans or their families, or were offered to such persons and were declined. I have followed the same policy in appointing rural carriers and in making other similar appointments. I am sure most of the Members of the House have followed the same policy, because I have found that there is a common desire among the Members of the House to extend to the ex-service men and their families every possible benefit that has been authorized by law.

I will not review here the various acts of Congress that have been passed in harmony with our policy to fulfill as far as possible the duty which the country owes to those who served in our forces, and to their dependents. The gentleman from South Dakota has done that in his address to the House day before yesterday, and for the information of the ex-service men of my district I expect to send them his splendid address.

In voting upon this Johnson bill, and the amendments which are to be presented by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and others, very serious problems will be presented to each one of us; questions involving economic policy, our duty to those who have served the country, and our duty to those who will have to pay the bills by taxes. I have in mind as I address you an old soldier now living at Creal Springs in my district, a veteran of the Civil War. He has no property save his home; he is totally helpless and bed-ridden; he fought three years to help preserve the Union; he has a wife dependent upon him. The very most that he can get from his Government is $90 a month.

I have in mind another veteran living in Franklin County in my district who fought bravely in the Spanish-American War, was wounded, and is now totally helpless with a wife and family dependent upon him; the most that he can get from the Government, I think, is $72 per month.

I have in mind a veteran of the World War now living in my district whose case is very distressing and who has caused me a great deal of worry; he is afflicted with some kind of throat trouble which has affected his heart, and he is totally disabled. His disability has come upon him largely since 1925. There is no hospital record or medical testimony available to prove that his disability is of service origin. I doubt if he can find any evidence to connect his trouble with his military service. We have provided by law for his hospitalization and treatment, and the Johnson bill will allow his wife and children $60 a month so long as he is in the hospital.

If it costs $120 a month to hospitalize an ex-service man, he will be receiving the equivalent of $180 a month from his Government if the Johnson bill becomes a law. Now, if the Rankin amendment is approved by Congress and the President, this veteran will be allowed the equivalent of $280 or $285 a month as a pension. It will not be compensation because he can not prove that it is service-connected; it will be a disability pension, and the question confronting me is, Should I vote for a law that will grant this veteran and thousands of others like him such a pension when we are allowing such meager benefits, in comparison, to the veterans of our other wars? I am not yet willing to do so, and I venture the assertion that if this proposition were understood by the ex-service men and the members of the American Legion they would not approve it nor urge it. I have confidence in the sober judgment and patriotic purpose of the ex-service men when they have had time and opportunity to consider great economic questions of this kind. The Legion of the State of Illinois is satisfied with the provisions of the Johnson bill, and I shall support it as it is.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Mississippi knows that it is all a pension now.

I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I agree with much that has been said on the floor this afternoon. I am almost in full accord with everything that has been said by the proponents of the Johnson bill against the proposition to be advanced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and I am also in accord with what the proponents of the Rankin proposition have to say against the Johnson bill. I believe that before we get through with the study of this thing, which is going to involve us in the payment of several billion dollars, the House is going to recommit the measure and ask the committee to bring out something else.

At the outset, Mr. Chairman, I ask to have read from the Clerk's desk a communication which I received this morning from a high official in the Veterans' Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

I have been watching with a great deal of interest the debates in Congress on the proposed consolidation of the three veterans' agencies. I have read every page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD covering the debates. In the vernacular of the times, I think you are "all wet." Let me make you this suggestion: That you introduce a new bill to dismember the Veterans' Bureau, send compensation to the Bureau of Pensions, insurance to the Department of Commerce, hospitals and hospitalization to the Public Health Service, where the hospitals rightfully belong, and where they should have remained, and create a section in the Department of Justice to replace the legal division of the Veterans' Bureau. The guardianship division could, and should be, handled by the State courts.

Mr. KNUTSON. That communication came from a high official in the Veterans' Bureau in the morning's mail, and I commend it to the careful study of the House because I feel that there is food for thought in it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman is certain that that is not one of the neuropsychiatric cases down there.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not know how many neuropsychiatric cases are administering the affairs of the Veterans' Bureau. Perhaps the gentleman could give some information on that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I notice there are a good many appointees from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. That may be. I do not know of any one from Minnesota who is holding any responsible position in the Veterans' Bureau, but if they are I hold no brief for them.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Should we not have the gentleman's name, if he is going to be used as a witness?

Mr. KNUTSON. No. I will not give his name, because he holds an important position in the Veterans' Bureau, but I would be very glad to let the gentleman from South Dakota read the original letter, if he will come down to my office, and I will ask him to come in there along about 5.30 o'clock.

I am in full accord with the point made by the gentleman from New York, Doctor CROWTHER. I believe Doctor CROWTHER placed his finger on the weak points in this proposed legislation, which at best is only palliative and temporary in its relief, for the reason that if you pass this legislation, you will be called upon in the next Congress to take care of those who have disabilities which are not service connected, and also the widows and orphans of those veterans who have died since being discharged from the service, and whose death is not attributable to the service.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is a mathematician of considerable note in the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman kindly give us the quod erat demonstrandum on how you can use $44,000,000 and do more with it than you can with $100,000,000?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. I might answer the gentleman by asking him another question, How old is Ann?

Mr. PERKINS. I notice that I did not get an invitation to be at your office at half past 5.

Mr. KNUTSON. Come down and read the letter, but if you wish, I will send you a photostatic copy of it. There are a number of objections to this legislation, and one of them is that it does not make any provision for the poor chap who suffers from disabilities that are in no way service connected. Neither does it make any provision for the widows and the orphans of such cases. Let me say to you, my friends, that if you enact this legislation you will be called upon at a subsequent time, probably in the next session, to take care of the widows and orphans at an additional cost of from $45,000,000 to $70,000,000. The gentleman who preceded me, Mr. DENISON, is absolutely right. Why extend these presumptive periods? That is not the straightforward way of doing business.

When you say that something that happened six years after the armistice is due to a man's former military service you are engaging in parliamentary chicanery. Why not face the situation courageously? Why not place those veterans who can not be covered and are not now covered by the presumptive clause in the existing law, on the pension roll, and call it a pension? We have been using the pension system for a hundred years and more, and we have yet to find a method in dealing with veterans of wars that is more satisfactory. According to the letter that was read from General Hines to-day we have expended over $5,000,000,000 on the veterans of the World War, almost as much as we have expended to date on those who saved the Union.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my friend.

Mr. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has before his committee many meritorious pension bills for widows of the Spanish War and minor children. Can the gentleman offer one of those bills as a substitute for the bill now under consideration?

Mr. KNUTSON. No; I will say to the gentleman that the parliamentary situation is such that the Speaker would hold any substitute pension bill as not germane.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. In view of the gentleman's argument, I will ask him if it is not a fact that in addition to the $5,000,000,000 already expended, between now and the year 1940 we are committed by present law to expend $6,000,000,000 more?

Mr. KNUTSON. That is under the present law?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes; under the present law.

Mr. KNUTSON. And we should bear in mind that we have expended $300,000,000 for rehabilitation, and it is estimated that only 10 per cent of them have been rehabilitated.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Has not the gentleman demonstrated that what is needed here is a general survey of all veterans' legislation, and that we should include in the Johnson bill a 3-year limitation, and within the 3-year limitation we shall take care of the survivors and widows and dependents of all wars up to the present time?

Mr. KNUTSON. Perhaps, but if we had legislation bringing the survivors and widows and dependents of preceding wars up to the level of the late war we would bankrupt the Government, and that, I am sure, the gentleman would not want to do.

Mr MICHENER. The arguments advanced to-day have accentuated that situation. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] said he would be willing to bring all these veterans up to the level of a retirement pension status. Some of his arguments are really astonishing.

Mr. KNUTSON. It goes to prove that we should have a rule prohibiting this kind of legislation in an election year. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me suggest that the evidence before the Veterans' Committee is to the effect that at the present time under existing law this Government is expending on ex-service men an amount equivalent to 37 per cent of the entire income tax received by the Government.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not doubt it.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. YON. Does not the gentleman think, with the chairman of the committee, that it would be a good thing at the present time to not extend the work of the Veterans' Bureau, but let them take care of what they have now—just compensation and officers' retirement and war-risk insurance and veterans' hospitals—and then pass a pension bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. The Veterans' Bureau is very similar to what is called "Johnson" grass down South and "quack" grass up North. It should not be extended; it should be weeded out.

Now, I want to call the attention of the House to a bill which has received considerable attention from the Pension Committee of this body. I refer to H. R. 6897, known as the Swick bill, which is a pension bill pure and simple and is based on the act of May 1, 1926, which I believe every veteran of the Spanish-American War will agree is the best pension bill that has ever been passed by an American Congress. The Johnson bill will take care of 177,000 veterans.

Mr. YON. Additional?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; additional, at an average cost of $47 per month. That is what was figured out day before yesterday by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PERKINS]. But you are making no provision for the indigent and disabled veterans who can not prove their disabilities to have service connection, neither are you making any provision for their widows and orphans. The Swick bill will take care of 600,000 veterans, no matter how their disabilities were incurred; it will take care of 111,000 widows and 50,000 orphans. The Johnson bill will cost anywhere up to $200,000,000. Do not be surprised, ladies and gentlemen of the House, if the Johnson bill surpasses the figure $200,000,000 before we get through with it.

We can only spend so much money for veteran relief. Is it not better to pass a bill that will take care of 600,000 disabled veterans, 111,000 widows and 50,000 little children as against the 177,000 veterans which the measure now pending provides for. Let me ask you men and women, what is your answer going to be to the unfortunate 423,000 veterans whom you leave out in the cold, to the 111,000 widows and 50,000 kiddies whom you fail to provide for? What will you tell them? What can you tell them?

Let me ask you if the Johnson or Rankin bills fulfill the duties we owe to the widows and orphans of deceased veterans whose death is not traceable to service? I would like to know why here worthy ones have been overlooked. The Swick bill takes care of them as I shall show later in my discussion of the pending legislation.

Another objection that I have to this legislation is that it obliges disabled veterans to seek hospitalization in order to draw compensation for their dependents. This will necessitate a greatly increased expansion in our hospital building program. What will that cost? No one knows. Under the Swick bill a disabled veteran will not be compelled to leave his home and family in order to draw a pension.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Will you give us an estimate of what the Rankin bill will cost?

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, let us get to something more pleasant.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has just said that the Johnson bill will put 177,000 additional veterans on the roll and the Rankin bill will put 77,744 on the roll. Then how can the gentleman get the idea that my bill will cost more than the Johnson bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. I have been led to believe that it would. I wish to say to my friend, for whom I have the highest regard, that I wish to thank him right now for having yielded me time.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has been in bad company.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield for an answer to that inquiry?

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield me some more time?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Then I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. General Hines said in his testimony before the Veterans' Committee that the 77,000 men that he mentioned were men who had already filed claims, but it does not include the number of persons who might file claims hereafter.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. DUNBAR. I have heard the gentleman from New Jersey make that remark often. Why can he not give us some definite information as to the amount of additional cost to pension these men under the Rankin amendment?

Mr. PERKINS. I will be glad to answer the question.

Mr. KNUTSON. I suggest that the gentleman answer it in his own time, but I will be here to get it.

Mr. DUNBAR. The next time the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PERKINS] rises to ask that question I would respectfully ask him to give us his idea of the information he possesses.

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey to allow him to answer.

Mr. PERKINS. We had information from the Veterans' Bureau that the pension bill would cost three or four hundred million dollars per year.

Mr. DUNBAR. Who made that statement?

Mr. PERKINS. That was a statistician in the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. KNUTSON. That a pension bill would cost that much?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. How high did you expect to start, or how low? Of course we could pass one that would cost $10,000,000,000, but the gentleman is not speaking of the Swick bill?

Mr. PERKINS. No.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is speaking of some mythical pension bill.

Mr. PERKINS. No. The Rankin bill, treated as a pension bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. You are free to throw as many brickbats at each other as you please.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman from New Jersey give some definite information and the source of his information as to the amount of increase to the Government of the expense, under the Rankin bill?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota to give that answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. This came from a table prepared by the Veterans' Bureau, based on the experience of the veterans of other wars, in the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. KNUTSON. That a pension bill would cost $200,000,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. No; the Rankin bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] wish to make any comment upon that? The gentleman from Mississippi has been charged with extortion. Does he wish to reply to that? If so, I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Have I wrung the truth from somebody? What is it? What is the charge?

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman from South Dakota kindly repeat his statement?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will say that I was talking to the gentleman from Iowa, and I did not hear the outrageous remark of the gentleman from Mississippi. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, let us see what the Swick bill will do. I have told you that it will take care of 600,000 veterans of the World War, regardless of where the disabilities were incurred or how incurred.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Or how much money per year?

Mr. KNUTSON. It will take care of 111,000 widows and 50,000 orphans, as against 177,000 veterans under the Johnson bill. The cost of the Swick bill, from figures based upon a compilation furnished by the Pension Bureau, will be $23,000,000 the first year, $80,000,000 the second year, $137,000,000 the third year, making an average of $80,000,000 for the 3-year period.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] think we should pay a pension and compensation at the same time to a veteran of the same war?

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman mean to them as a class or as individuals?

Mr. MICHENER. No. As a class. In other words, should we not either pay compensation according to present law, or should we not adopt a pension system entirely, as to the soldiers of a given war?

Mr. KNUTSON. If we pass either the Johnson bill or the Rankin bill we will perpetuate the Veterans' Bureau. If we cut it off right here and confine them to compensation cases already established it is only a question of a few years until we can combine the Veterans' Bureau with the Pension Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. I yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I also yield five minutes to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me say to the gentleman from South Dakota that the average cost of the Swick bill for three years is $80,000,000. I want to reiterate that that takes care of 600,000 veterans, 111,000 widows, and 50,000 orphans.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. In other words, if $80,000,000 is going to provide for 761,000 people, they will get $15 a month.

Mr. KNUTSON. I said that the rates are in proportion to what we are paying veterans of other wars. The gentleman from South Dakota knows as well as I that the veterans of no war have heretofore been pensioned inside of 20 years after the signing of the treaty of peace under a general law. We are moving that rule up something like 10 years to benefit the veterans of the World War. Under the past policy of Congress the veterans of the World War would not be entitled to a pension until 1941.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. HUDSON. What does the widow of a Spanish-American War veteran receive to-day?

Mr. KNUTSON. Thirty dollars a month. I want the gentlemen of the House to have all of this information, because if the Johnson bill is not passed and the Rankin bill is not passed we are going to give you a chance to vote on the Swick bill. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDRESEN. Give us a chance anyway.

Mr. KNUTSON. You can not have your cake and eat it, too. Let me read what the Swick bill says in regard to widows:

The widow of any officer or enlisted man who entered the service prior to November 11, 1918, and served 90 days or more in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the World War, and was honorably discharged from such service, or, regardless of the length of service, was discharged for or died in service of a disability incurred in the service in line of duty, such widow, having married such soldier, sailor, or marine prior to the passage of this act, shall upon due proof of her husband's death, without proving his death to be the result of his service, be placed upon the pension roll at a pension of $20 per month.

Any widow mentioned in this section shall also be paid $6 per month for each child under 16 years of age of such soldier, sailor, or marine.

The gentleman from South Dakota raised the question of rates carried in the Swick bill. The Swick bill carries rates from $10 to $50 per month. Fifty dollars is for total disability. It must be remembered that that is a pension for disabilities that can not be proved to be service connected.

I wish to say to the membership of the House that if the rank and file of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars and all the others who served in the late World War knew of the liberal provisions of this act, this Congress would be flooded with petitions and telegrams and communications asking us to pass it forthwith. I make that statement, ladies and gentlemen of the House, in the light of my experience of 13 years on the Pensions Committee. It is one of the most liberal pension acts, considering the short time that has elapsed since the signing of the armistice, that has ever been introduced and seriously considered by any committee of this House of which I am aware.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDRESEN. And that takes care of the men, women, and children who will never be taken care of through the Veterans' Bureau?

Mr. KNUTSON. Absolutely. Men, women, and children who, if we do not do something for them, may become public charges on the community where they have their residence.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. YON. And it will be simple of administration, will it not?

Mr. KNUTSON. Perfectly simple. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] boasts of the fact that they have files that thick [indicating] at the Veterans' Bureau. A file that thick [indicating] is an exceptionally thick file down at the Pension Bureau.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. That is one of the reasons it does not cost much to run the Pension Bureau. If the pension law were administered in the Veterans' Bureau, it would be administered just as cheaply as in the Pension Bureau.

Mr. KNUTSON. I will tell you gentlemen why doing business with the Pension Bureau is so satisfactory. It is because they are not tied up with a lot of red tape, because they have mature men administering the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Because there is no service connection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me say to the gentleman that I have been trying for a year to get the Veterans' Bureau to pay the insurance on the life of a man who disappeared from a ship in some port up in Alaska without his clothes. That was two years ago, and the Veterans' Bureau fears he may be wandering around in the woods up there without any clothing. The old-line insurance companies have paid insurance that was carried in their companies long ago, but the Veterans' Bureau wants to be sure the man is not dead.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. That is the law. He must be absent seven years.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, well; it is mostly regulation.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. If that is the law, as just mentioned by the gentleman from South Dakota, it seems to me it would be very simple for the Director of the Veterans' Bureau to come before the World War Veterans' Committee and ask to simplify and codify those laws.

Mr. KNUTSON. Absolutely. Of course, if they made it too simple they would have a hard time in finding work for the 24,000 clerks they have on the pay roll. The Pension Bureau has only 600 clerks.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The gentleman gave the cost of the Swick bill during the first three years. What would be the cost in succeeding years?

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me say to the gentleman it will be about $120,000,000 a year.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The gentleman means that would be a continuing figure?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; that would be a continuing figure. After the third year it would average about $120,000,000, based upon the number who have applied for compensation and been turned down.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. I would like to ask if the Johnson bill would take care of a case of this sort: A veteran of the World War, with a service-connected disability, died December 6, 1925, leaving a widow and three children. He happened to die of a disease which was not service connected, and there is no way under the present law of having any compensation granted to his widow or children. Would the Johnson bill take care of a case of that kind?

Mr. KNUTSON. No. She will still have to keep on applying to the Associated Charities for relief.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. That is just what she is doing.

Mr. KNUTSON. And that is what she will have to continue to do under the Johnson bill, but under the Swick bill she will get $20, plus $18, if the children are under 16 years of age, or a total of $38 per month.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Where does the gentleman get the facts for the extravagant statement, that she would have to continue to rely on charity, without knowing the nature of the disability which caused the veteran's death, so as to determine whether that disability is included in the presumptive section of the Johnson bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. I suggest that the gentleman from Wisconsin wake up. Breakfast is about to be served. [Laughter.]

Let me say in closing that this is a very serious matter. I am sorry I replied to the gentleman from Wisconsin in that way.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. When the gentleman has no facts on which to base a reply, of course, he can fall back on a facetious reply. I appreciate the gentleman's inability to reply to a pertinent question.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am profoundly grateful for the gentleman's forgiveness. [Laughter.] Let me say to this committee that this is only the first of a series of bills that you will be called upon to pass for the relief of the disabled of the World War, and before you get through it is going to run up into billions and billions. You might as well face and solve the situation now and put those who are not service connected on the pension roll. If you will defeat the two measures that have been proposed to you, the Johnson bill and the Rankin bill, I will promise that you will be given an opportunity to vote for the Swick bill. That measure, gentlemen, will take care of everybody who suffered from any disability and the widows and orphans of those who have died.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] for the purpose of making a statement.

HON. JEREMIAH E. O'CONNELL

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, as the ranking Democratic Member of New England in the House, it is my great pleasure to announce to the House of Representatives that Hon. JEREMIAH E. O'CONNELL, of the State of Rhode Island, has just been appointed by the Governor of Rhode Island, and unanimously confirmed by the Senate of Rhode Island, to the position of associate justice of the Superior Court of Rhode Island, with life tenure. [Applause.]

WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD]. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, those who have followed the debate, I believe, are convinced that both the Johnson bill and the Rankin bill are in the nature of pension legislation and that with either of these bills, or one amended with the other, we are crossing the line between compensation and pension.

I doubt if any of us who have given this matter serious attention would oppose the investigation and study of the whole question which has been suggested as a proper thing for this Congress to undertake.

I address the Committee of the Whole at this time because I intend to offer an amendment to the Johnson bill. I am in favor of the Johnson bill. I am not opposed to the Rankin bill. But I believe this House should realize each step it is taking, and I say to you, my friends, it will be a terrible time if in this House of Representatives we should come to the point where we will have to take back any of the compensation or pensions we are promising to the soldiers of our wars. Therefore I ask those of you who can envisage the possibilities of such a condition to give some heed to what we are about to do in enacting the present legislation.

At this point I will insert my proposed amendment, which is a substitute for section 10 of the bill. I will not attempt to read it, but I will explain the three things it is designed to accomplish.

The amendment referred to follows:

Amendment to be offered by Mr. FITZGERALD: That section 10, beginning on line 19, page 12, of H. R. 10381 be stricken out and that there be substituted for said section 10 the following:

"SEC. 200. For death or disability resulting from personal injury suffered or disease contracted in the military or naval service on or after April 6, 1917, and before July 2, 1921, or for an aggravation or recurrence of a disability existing prior to examination, acceptance, and enrollment for service, when such aggravation was suffered or contracted in, or such recurrence was caused by, the military or naval service on or after April 6, 1917, and before July 2, 1921, by any commissioned officer or enlisted man, or by any member of the Army Nurse Corps (female), or of the Navy Nurse Corps (female), when employed in the active service under the War Department or Navy Department, the United States shall pay to such commissioned officer or enlisted man, member of the Army Nurse Corps (female), or of the Navy Nurse Corps (female), or women citizens of the United States who were taken from the United States by the United States Government and who served in base hospitals overseas, or, in the discretion of the director, separately to his or her dependents, compensation as hereinafter provided; but no compensation shall be paid if the injury, disease, aggravation, or recurrence has been caused by his own willful misconduct: *Provided,* That no person suffering from paralysis, paresis, or blindness shall be denied compensation by reason of willful misconduct, nor shall any person who is helpless or bedridden as a result of any disability be denied compensation by reason of willful misconduct. That for the purposes of this act every such officer, enlisted man, or other member employed in the active service under the War Department or Navy Department who was discharged or who resigned prior to July 2, 1921, and every such officer, enlisted man, or other member employed in the active service under the War Department or Navy Department on or before November 11, 1918, who on or after July 2, 1921, is discharged or resigns, shall be conclusively held and taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service, except as to defects, disorders, or infirmities made of record in any manner by proper authorities of the United States at the time of, or prior to, inception of active service, to the extent to which any such defect, disorder, or infirmity was so made of record: *Provided,* That an ex-service man who is shown to have or, if deceased, to have had prior to January 1, 1930, an active tuberculous disease, or prior to January 1, 1925, a disability of any character developing a 10 per cent degree or more in accordance with the provisions of subdivision (4) of section 202 of this act shall be presumed to have acquired his disability in such service between April 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921, or to have suffered an aggravation of a preexisting disability in such service between said dates, and said presumption shall be conclusive in cases of tuberculosis, paralysis, paresis, blindness, those permanently helpless or permanently bedridden, and spinal meningitis, but in all other cases said presumption shall be rebuttable by clear and convincing evidence; but nothing in this proviso shall be construed to prevent a claimant from receiving the benefits of compensation and medical care and treatment for a disability of more than 10 per cent degree (in accordance with the provisions of subdivision (4) of section 202 of this act) on or subsequent to January 1, 1925, if the facts in the case substantiate his claim: *Provided further,* That in any case where service connection is granted solely on the basis of a new presumption created by this amendatory act, no compensation shall be paid for any period prior to the approval of this act, nor for more than three years after such approval pending a further study of veterans' relief by the Congress, and the rate of compensation in such cases shall be 60 per cent of the compensation hereinafter provided: *Provided further,* That from and after the date of this amendment any veteran who is entitled to receive compensation for a disability resulting from injury incurred in action involving actual conflict with the enemy shall be paid an additional allowance in an amount equal to 10 per cent of the compensation otherwise payable."

Mr. FITZGERALD. It has been suggested that we are losing our sense of discrimination, our sense of proportion in regard to veteran legislation, and the admirable address of the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, which we have just heard, again emphasizes this. I listened to what was said very wisely by the gentleman from Illinois. We are losing our sense of proportion. We are not treating our soldiers of the Civil War and our soldiers of the Spanish War on the same basis we are treating the soldiers of the World War. Now, I for one do not want to detract one cent from anything that has been given or that may be given to the soldiers of the World War or any other war, but I do believe that in the interest of fair dealing and in the interest of the security of this country in the future, we should endeavor to treat all fairly and justly and with such discriminations only as rest upon sound and logical bases.

The first thing that my amendment does is to pay an additional 10 per cent compensation to those veterans receiving compensation whose disabilities are due to actual battle casualties in conflict with the enemy.

It is a trifle, but it sets up a distinction which I believe is wise and one which we should keep in mind as we proceed with pension legislation.

The next proposition extends the presumptive date of service connection for tuberculosis alone to January 1, 1930.

This is the most appealing part of the bill presented by my good friend from Mississippi. It is the thing that is most needed, and most needed, I fear, because of the administrative conditions in the Veterans' Bureau.

A great tribute—and a very deserved tribute—has been paid to the Director of the Veterans' Bureau, General Hines, by the chairman of the committee; but that bureau under General Hines, with all his wisdom and all his kindness and all his great military experience, has a regulation known as Regulation 73. I wish that every Member of this House could have been present in the Veterans' Committee when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], now on the floor of this House, showed how a veteran of this war, enlisting in full health, the finest physical specimen in the family of several soldier brothers, had come back shattered and with every evidence of tuberculosis, yet the circumstances were such that there was not a diagnosis made in accordance with Regulation 73 of the Veterans' Bureau, although it was evident to every member of the committee who heard the testimony presented by our colleague from Alabama

that this man not only has tuberculosis but had contracted it in the service. Compensation had been refused on the ground that the arbitrary requirements of Regulation No. 73 had not been met and the activity of the disease before January 1, 1925, demonstrated, according to the harsh and unreasonable provisions of Regulation 73.

This is a sample of many, many cases which Members on this floor have interested themselves in from time to time. The most pitiable cases before the Veterans' Bureau are these cases of tuberculosis, and especially tuberculosis of the lungs. I believe if there is to be an extension of the presumption of service connection it should be extended to those suffering from tuberculosis, a most insidious disease, a disease where the man afflicted wants to deny it up to the last moment, a disease which is sometimes so slow in its progress and so difficult to diagnose that we may with some degree of truth suggest that a man could have incurred it in the service and still not be able to demonstrate it, in its active form, before the 1st of January, 1930.

So this amendment of mine incorporates this very appealing portion of the bill of my friend from Mississippi and provides that there shall be a compensation for this disability from tuberculosis where there has been an active condition before the 1st of January, 1930.

Then, third, and this is quite a different view on the bill, it provides that to make and carry on the distinctions between these classes whom we want to relieve, where those whose cases under this bill rest upon presumption alone, they shall be paid at the rate of 60 per cent only of the present rates of compensation.

Now, suggesting that 77,000 are known to be entitled to compensation under the bill which we know as the Johnson bill, and which we are now debating, there must be more than double that number who will make application and whose cases must be considered. We can not shut our eyes to the fact, no matter how sympathetic we may be, that the great bulk of these men are men who did not incur any disability whatever by reason of their military or naval service in the war. It is true, in a general way, that we must look after the helpless and the disabled in this country in some form or other, and for this reason I can well reconcile myself to many propositions put forth in our pension and compensation measures; but to keep the proper perspective it seems to me we must make a distinction in favor of those who actually suffered because of their service. There were men just as brave, just as loyal to their country, as those who stayed at home. There were courageous, noble, and patriotic men and women who never had an opportunity to serve in the armed forces. Our national policy is to assume a responsibility for those who serve the country in the most dangerous way in our emergencies. We should assume an especial responsibility to those who actually suffered and are handicapped by reason of their service. I advocate a slight discrimination for those who were actually shot down, gassed, or otherwise wounded on the battle field, and then be as liberal as the resources of the Nation permit toward those who suffered and still suffer by reason of their service to the country in the Army or Navy during the war. They are entitled to all the liberal treatment and care which this great and prosperous and wealthy Nation can give.

If now we do not distinguish between these unfortunate soldiers who are disabled because of their service and those who since the war have developed disabilities which only by the use of the most arbitrary presumptive provision of law can be connected with the military or naval service, then we do not use good judgment nor wise discrimination. These three things are present in the amendment or substitute for Article 10, which I present.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I could not hear the gentleman plainly, but I understand that he desires to extend the tubercular patients up to 1930, and that was his attitude before the committee.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman include neuropsychiatric patients?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not included them; I will say that I followed the agreement that was entered into between us in the committee. The amendment I shall offer was drafted by the Veterans' Bureau. The gentleman will remember that on that the committee stood 9 and 9 on our agreed amendment to the Johnson bill. This amendment I propose embodies our agreement.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio a further question: Is it not a fact that the strongest appeal for any legislation at all comes with reference to the tubercular men?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; I think that I have already stated that.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not hear it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is my reason for extending the amendment to the tubercular men alone, which provides that the rate of compensation for all cases to be given compensation by reason of this bill shall be 60 per cent of the present rate, when the service connection rests upon presumption alone.

This discrimination ought to be made in the very beginning. Just the moment we attempt any legislation which seeks to give relief to disabled veterans whose disabilities are in no way the result of their service, so soon should we make a distinction in the amount of the relief. It should not make a difference that the service pension is given in the guise of compensation. To do otherwise would be calculated to arouse resentment on the part of Civil War and our Spanish War veterans and their friends. If we adopt my amendment and pay these new presumptive cases on the basis of 60 per cent of the present rates, still we are treating World War veterans more liberally than those of any other war.

Sixty per cent will be gladly received by those who now get nothing, but how serious must be the problem if ever, on an attempt to adjust and harmonize our veteran relief legislation, we would seek to cut down the rate of a pension once granted.

Mr. EVANS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of California. Has the gentleman any information as to how many of these tubercular cases will be included in his amendment?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not the figures, I have an estimate of the expense given by General Hines, in which he said the cost would be $8,700,000 for advancing the presumptive date to January 1, 1930, for tubercular cases alone. With reference to paying the additional 10 per cent to those who have disabilities caused by conflict with the enemy in battle, the expense would be $2,800,000 a year. The extras therefore carried in the amendment, as I have prepared it, would total $11,500,000, and so there would be a saving over the Johnson bill as it now stands of $18,900,000, at least.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I was not aware when I interrupted the gentleman that he proposed to incorporate his amendment in the RECORD, so that we would know exactly what he has suggested.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My proposed amendment will be printed in the RECORD. As my amendment restates the entire section 10, I thought it more easy of comprehension if I would explain the three features. The 10 per cent extra for those actually wounded and disabled in battle may be considered sentimental and not especially called for, but it forms the basis for the differentiation in treatment between those who have contributed in different measure to the preservation and advancement of this wonderful country which we are enjoying to-day.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman has made an informing and interesting statement, which, I am sure, every Member of the House will read with profit, and I ask in that connection that the gentleman call attention to the letter written by General Hines to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, which also contains constructive comments and suggestions. I appreciate the spirit in which the gentleman has discussed this legislation, as, I am sure, do other Members of the House. It has not been in criticism of either the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] or the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], both of whom I feel wish to do the right thing for the veterans.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I thank the gentleman from Alabama very much. It was his appearance before the Veterans' Committee and the splendid presentation of the wrongs that have been endured by veterans because of the arbitrary regulation 73 that impelled me to go as far as I have with reference to these cases of tuberculosis. I stand here in a very peculiar attitude in seeking to amend this bill in a way which will actually save $18,700,000 a year, and yet I do it feeling it should be done before we go further with legislation which is certainly of a pension nature.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman's amendment make any provision for those veterans who are totally and permanently disabled regardless of the source or the time of their disability?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. By my amendment I take the Johnson bill as I find it. It is broader and more liberal than the Rankin bill, because it includes all cases of disability of all diseases up to the 1st of January, 1925. Then my amendment goes further, and takes the liberal provision of the bill sug-

gested by Mr. RANKIN, extending the period for the presumption of service connection for tuberculosis cases to the 1st of January, 1930, but it does not take care of the soldiers who may be totally disabled, whose disability arises after the 1st of January, 1925, and has no connection with their service.

Mr. HARE. Does not the gentleman think that we have quite a large number of veterans who are totally and permanently disabled, who are unable to connect their disability with the service, and who are now objects of charity, who ought to be cared for in this bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Absolutely. The gentleman can readily see that it would be an extraordinary case that would not develop before the 1st of January, 1925, when the war was really over in 1919.

Mr. HARE. I just had a report from the Veterans' Bureau which says that there are 2,974 veterans who are totally disabled at the present time, who are permanently disabled, and yet they are unable to connect their disability with the service. I know that in my district, and the gentleman knows that in his district, there are one or two or more who are objects of charity and who have been objects of charity for 8 or 10 years, and I feel that there ought to be some provision in this bill to take care of these deserving soldiers.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My colleague puts this sympathetically, but the gentleman realizes that there are so many of these cases in which he and I rush to the Veterans' Bureau and find that the man, perhaps, has been sent down to Camp Sherman and had been there for three days and had been sent back because they found that he had this particular disability and could not be of service, and then when that man comes and asks for my help my enthusiasm sometimes wanes a little when I think of real soldiers disabled and in misery who really deserve and by their service have merited relief.

I add a copy of the letter General Hines referred to, with a statement of costs involved and showing a saving of $18,900,000 a year over the Johnson bill as it now stands:

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU,
*Washington, March 12, 1930.*

Hon. ROY G. FITZGERALD,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: This is in further reference to your letter of March 3, 1930, requesting an estimate of the cost for certain provisions contained in H. R. 10381 in the event certain changes were made therein.

In reply to the first inquiry as to the estimate of decreased cost if a provision were inserted to limit the amount of compensation to be paid on claims resting solely upon the new presumption of service connection authorized and directed by this bill, you are advised that if the rates provided by law at the present time were reduced 60 per cent the cost would be $45,600,000 annually. The present estimated cost of this amended section is $76,000,000, assuming that the present rates would be effective.

In reply to your inquiry as to the increased cost involved by extending the present date for presumption of service connection to January 1, 1930, only in cases of tuberculosis and limiting the compensation payable therefor to 60 per cent of the present rates, you are advised that such a provision would entail an additional cost of $8,700,000 annually.

Regarding the third question contained in your letter as to the increased cost in the event 10 per cent were added to compensation paid to veterans whose disabilities are results of battle casualty, or actual conflict with the enemy, you are advised that the additional expenditure occasioned thereby would be approximately $2,800,000 annually.

I trust this is the information you desire.

A copy of this letter is inclosed for your use.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, *Director.*

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the debate this afternoon in connection with the pending bill to liberalize the World War veterans' act. I think a majority of the Members of this House, and I am sure all the disabled ex-service men of the country, will agree that the veterans' act needs far more liberalizing than is proposed or contemplated in the pending committee measure. The present law, written to cope with the situation in 1924, is entirely out of date in 1930. The pending bill does not give the relief that I had confidently expected, but it will correct some of the evils of the old law, slash the red tape in thousands of claims, and be a forward step in meeting the Nation's obligations to her disabled soldiers. I am going to support it, because I feel that it is much better than no legislation at all. To say, however, that your bill meets the demands of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other service men's organizations is preposterous. To urge that this bill will relieve anything like all worthy claims of our disabled veterans is not in keeping with the facts. But even if this committee bill does not do much more than skim the surface as far as the urgent needs are concerned, and even though it denies service connection to thousands of tubercular and mental cases, it is, nevertheless, significant that every dollar paid under its terms will go to the disabled veteran or his wife, widow, orphans, or other dependents. I feel that it should pass without a dissenting vote, with the Rankin amendment, if possible, but by all means pass the bill in some form. This Government has too long delayed doing justice by our disabled veterans, who are growing impatient under endless red tape, extravagance, and incompetency.

In following the discussion thus far upon the floor relative to the committee bill, and especially the speeches I have heard with reference to the proposed Rankin amendment to the bill, the outstanding argument against the passage of this legislation is the enormous expense. Some have placed the estimate of cost of this measure, with or without the Rankin amendment, at approximately $100,000,000. No one seems to know what it will be. The best evidence appears to be that of General Hines, Director of the Veterans' Bureau, who first estimated the Rankin bill at $48,000,000, and later, I believe, changed his figures to $44,000,000. General Hines also estimated that some 77,000 cases would come under the Rankin bill, or amendment. Now it is a significant fact, as brought out in the hearings, that more than 23,000 mental cases included in the Rankin bill would be absolutely barred under the committee measure. In addition to that, more than 18,000 tubercular cases that the Rankin amendment proposes to care for would fail to come under your committee measure. I do not care to hazard a guess at what it will cost the Government under either measure, but I can not conceive of this Congress connecting all claims of all veterans who have disabilities of 10 per cent up to the year of 1925, and, at the same time, refusing to recognize more than 40,000 tubercular and mental cases merely because they did not file their claims before 1925.

Inasmuch as opponents of this legislation insist upon discussing the cost of caring for the disabled veterans, permit me to remind Members of the House that you have passed many bills here for more than $100,000,000 without a roll call. A few weeks ago this House voted to spend $230,000,000 for public buildings, and not a protest, as I recall, was raised against the bill.

Early in the present session of Congress a law was passed returning to the big interests of the country $190,000,000 of income taxes. Some one has raised the point that if this bill is passed, Congress will be compelled to repeal the law refunding $190,000,000 income taxes. This, to my mind, is abundant reason for this legislation. Why not let those millionaires who profiteered to the tune of 500 to 700 per cent during the World War, while our soldier boys worked for $1 a day, help pay cost of this legislation for these disabled and helpless veterans? Last December this House voted to relieve France of $407,000,000 of indebtedness to the United States. Some of you who are now opposing this bill stood on the floor of the House and pleaded eloquently for "poor poverty-stricken France." You were anxious to relieve France of the debt of $407,000,000 which she owed the American people, in order to show your "brotherly love," but to the thousands of our own American soldiers who lost their health in France and who are to-day looking to this Congress for their very existence, you turn a deaf ear, put your hands on your pocketbooks, with the flimsy excuse that it will cost too much money. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in the early part of the present session of Congress I introduced a number of bills to amend the World War veterans' act, looking to the relief of our disabled soldiers. Inasmuch as I may offer further criticism of the pending bill before concluding my remarks, which criticism I trust will be constructive, permit me to say I am delighted to find, after scrutinizing the committee bill, that certain provisions of my measures are incorporated in part in it. Since I shall not hesitate to criticize the weakness of the pending bill, I want to say in all fairness that it has several commendable features, some of which I desire to mention.

For example, the committee bill, when passed, will be of assistance to those tubercular cases filed before 1925, many of which have been turned down. If there was nothing else in your bill except section 13, that proposes to amend subdivision 7, section 102, of the 1924 act, I would favor the bill, provided, of course, we can do no better. If you will turn to page 22, line 10, you will find it reads:

That any ex-service person shown to have had a tuberculous disease of service origin, whether active or otherwise, shall receive compensation of not less than $50 per month.

I am also in hearty accord with a further provision to pay the wife of a veteran in a hospital suffering with tuberculosis and whose income is less than $1,000 per year compensation at the rate of $30 per month; a wife and child of such hospital patient, $40 per month, with $5 for each additional child.

The bill further provides additional time for the filing of application for disability compensation. Concerning misconduct cases heretofore disallowed the committee bill provides that—

No person suffering from paralysis, paresis, or blindness shall be denied compensation by reason of willful misconduct.

The cumbersome insurance law, with all of its red tape, has also been somewhat broadened and clarified, and it is hoped that it will not be necessary to employ additional attorneys to interpret its meaning.

My bill, H. R. 7766, provided that—

Veterans suffering with chronic diseases which competent medical judgment indicates was incurred, increased, or aggravated in the service, such chronic diseases shall be held to be of service origin or aggravation, notwithstanding the lack of historical affirmative evidence.

Immediately after introducing my bill I followed my usual course of asking for a hearing. Not only did I request a hearing on H. R. 7766 but also on the several other measures I introduced for the relief of disabled war veterans. I was not accorded a hearing on any of these bills, but I am not complaining about that. I have understood that this so-called omnibus committee bill would take care of all necessary veterans' legislation. The Veterans' Committee has labored tirelessly for weeks and months and is to be commended for its sincere, unselfish efforts. However, in looking over its bill very carefully I fail to find a paragraph, a sentence, or syllable favoring the admission of competent medical evidence in establishing claims of our disabled veterans. Your committee bill is as silent as the sphinx of the desert on the question of admission of evidence of the local doctors by bureau officials in establishing disability claims.

I have no desire to criticize the Veterans' Bureau unjustly. I have prosecuted many claims before the bureau, and, as a rule, my claims have been successful. It has some 24,000 employees, and a majority of those I have come in contact with, from the director down, have impressed me as being high-class men and women and thoroughly capable. But all of us know that one of the most severe and oft-repeated criticisms heard on the floor of the House against the Veterans' Bureau is the fact that so little consideration is given to affidavits furnished veterans by local doctors. Under the present rule and practice the bureau has employed too many young fellows not long out of school, many of whom have had little or no actual experience. The pay, as I recall, is about $3,000 per year. No one expects competent medical men for that small salary. It is very difficult to secure successful practitioners for $3,000 per year. These school boys, as a rule, know just enough to find fault with the diagnosis of the competent local physician.

The claim of the veteran is promptly turned down because the local doctor did not go into detail and use a lot of high-sounding medical terms that a layman could not understand. For example, this morning I appeared before the division of appeals of the Veterans' Bureau on a tubercular case appealed from the regional office in my State. The record of the case disclosed that the veteran had a hospital record while in the Army, that he was suffering from acute bronchitis at the time of discharge, and that only a few months thereafter a well-known local doctor residing in the district I have the honor to represent diagnosed his case as pulmonary tuberculosis, stating that the claimant was having frequent hemorrhages, with subnormal temperature. Three other physicians whom I know personally, and whose ability and integrity are beyond question, also examined him during the years of 1922, 1924, and 1929, and each found the patient suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis, and so diagnosed the case. Even an insurance company rejected his application as soon after the veteran's discharge as 1920 on account of his weak lungs and bad heart, as determined by an X ray. This poor fellow, who weighed 172 pounds prior to his enlistment, is to-day a walking skeleton and absolutely unable to perform a day's labor. He is one of the thousands who refused to file a claim against his Government as long as he was physically able to do work, even part of the time. When first examined by bureau doctors in 1929 his case was diagnosed as chronic pulmonary tuberculosis, far advanced "B" active. In a little over 30 days thereafter, however, other alleged bureau physicians, after a supposed-to-be examination, found, or, rather, the record states they found, "no disease of chest found." Shortly thereafter the claim of this veteran was disallowed. The inconsistency, incompetency, and utter lack of sympathy for the veteran on the part of some of the bureau physicians is absolutely appalling.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the veteran had not filed his claim until 1929?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; that is the case. He had not filed his claim until 1929, although four competent local doctors who examined him gave clear and convincing evidence that he has had tuberculosis for 10 years at least.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Then that case would not come under the Johnson bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No; that case and thousands of other similar cases could not possibly come under the Johnson bill if it is passed without amendment.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Then that appears to be a good argument for the so-called Rankin bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think it is a very good argument for the Rankin bill, and I am certain there are thousands of other cases similar to this in the districts of every Member of Congress.

Often we have heard here the Pension Bureau compared with the Veterans' Bureau by Members of Congress, and it is an open secret that the Veterans' Bureau always suffers sadly by the comparison. The Commissioner of Pensions accepts the findings of a competent local doctor. That has not only proved satisfactory but has eliminated much expense, and the taxpayers are certainly entitled to some consideration in the enactment of this legislation.

On the other hand, if a World War veteran can comply with sufficient red tape to secure a medical examination by the bureau, he is sent to his nearest regional office at Government expense. He waits in line for hours and sometimes days, and then, too often, faces one of the bureau's so-called doctors, who would not know a shrapnel wound from an ingrowing toenail. The embryonic, supposed-to-be doctor looks wise and gives the veteran an alleged examination. He seems to delight in telling the veteran there is positively nothing wrong with him. In some instances I have known bureau doctors to lecture veterans and even scold them for taking up their valuable time. I have one case in mind where a disabled soldier who was suffering severely with a pain in his side was scolded and referred to as "a tramp" and "dead beat" by the examining bureau doctor. He was sent home and not long thereafter died of the disability of which he complained and had appealed many times to the bureau for relief. I refer to a personal friend who died because of criminal negligence of a United States Veterans' Bureau medical officer.

Can you imagine such a thing—one of our disabled soldiers held up to contempt and scorn by one of these bureau doctors and called "a tramp" and "a dead beat"? Shortly afterwards this soldier died of the disability he complained of and I had the sad and painful duty of being one of his pallbearers.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the Johnson bill do anything for that man's widow and children?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am sure it would not if he had any.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the Rankin bill do anything for his widow and children?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am not sure about that.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. When did the man die?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. About two years ago, July, 1928, I believe.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The Veterans' Bureau denied his claim?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; for many months prior to his last illness his claim was denied. But, may I add, that after the veteran died the bureau suddenly decided that the bureau doctors were wrong and allowed the claim, and his dependent mother was granted a small allowance.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. That will not help the man now?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No; it will not help him now, but the point I want to convey is that, under the present law and under the Johnson bill, little or no consideration is given to the evidence of competent local doctors.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. This is entirely a presumptive bill. If the man is disabled, he is presumed to have incurred his disabilities in the service. The gentleman says he is for the so-called Rankin amendment, because it will help more people?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes. I am for the Rankin bill, because I think it will take care of the innumerable tuberculosis and mental cases who filed their claims since 1925, and who are absolutely ignored in your bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. How does the gentleman come to the conclusion that the Rankin bill, with an expenditure of $47,000,000, would take care of more men than the Johnson bill, with an expenditure of $100,000,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Frankly, I think the gentleman is begging the question. He very well knows I quoted figures from the sworn testimony of Director Hines. Granting that the gentleman's bill will take care of more cases up until 1925, I submit that Congress can not afford to ignore the 40,000 mental and tuberculosis cases. Those figures are in the record. I am of the opinion, however, that neither the director nor the gentleman from South Dakota have any definite information as to what his bill will cost.

Permit me to say further to the gentleman from South Dakota that I am for his bill, but let me suggest to him and other Members of the House that the Rankin amendment would greatly strengthen his bill. It would be a happy compromise to adopt the Johnson bill, that takes care of all cases up to 1925, and then add the Rankin amendment, to care for the many tuberculosis and mental cases that would not come under the Johnson bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I have been interrupted several times, I would like to have a little more time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 10 minutes more.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I will be glad to yield again to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The gentleman says he is in favor of the Rankin bill because it will take care of these additional cases.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Answering, I will say that the Rankin amendment provides for all chronic or constitutional cases who file their claims before 1930.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Provided that the Veterans' Bureau does not prove that the man was not disabled during the time of his service. The only way to reach a case like that is by the passage of the Swick bill, or the bill I introduced two years ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Permit me to suggest to my colleague from Missouri that neither his bill nor the Swick measure is before the House at this time. If this bill is not full and broad enough, I shall be glad to assist my good friend in passing the Swick bill or some other meritorious measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman must know that the President would probably veto such a bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman that I do not know that; neither does he. I do not pretend to speak for the President. But I must add that during my limited experience in Congress I have never seen so many who professed to be spokesman for the President.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I am delighted to yield to the able gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The Johnson bill will cost more than the Rankin bill because the Rankin bill would be limited to those cases to the rating of the schedule of the Veterans' Bureau, but the Johnson bill leaves out the tubercular men and the neuropsychiatric men. By the Rankin bill we will reach more men who are in a serious condition and at a cost of less money.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his contribution.

I am informed by an official of the United States Veterans' Bureau, in whom I have confidence, that my competent medical evidence bill, if passed, would connect many thousands of worthy cases of disabled veterans that have been disallowed under the existing law. I submit for the earnest consideration of this House that an amendment incorporating the competent medical-judgment provisions should, in fairness to the veterans, be written into this so-called omnibus measure.

Another section of my bill, which I was unable to get a hearing on, provided for the admission of "lay" evidence, or, in other words, evidence from a disabled veteran's comrades and friends. I note this bill provides that "due consideration shall be given lay evidence." Those words "due consideration" are mighty weak, vacillating, and almost meaningless. Some one has said that when a Member of Congress is opposed to a measure and is solicited to vote for it, he invariably answers with the old stereotyped reply, "I shall be glad to give the matter due consideration." The law governing the Veterans' Bureau in these cases should be specific and mandatory. One of the greatest indictments against the old law enacted in 1924 is that it is too elastic and permits entirely too much "due consideration" on the part of the bureau officials.

For example, during the late unpleasantness I stood within a few feet of my dearest chum and buddy when he was painfully, seriously, and perhaps permanently injured while in action in the front lines. This young man has not seen a well day since his discharge from the Army. A few years ago I submitted a sworn statement to the Veterans' Bureau, setting out my personal knowledge of the facts in connection with the soldier's injuries.

I being a layman and not a member of the medical profession, the Veterans' Bureau, after "due consideration," rejected my testimony and held that the soldier's disability was not of service origin. Even if this and other worthy claimants fail to obtain relief under the pending bill, it will probably be of great consolation to them to know that the Congress of the United States has ordered, adjudged, and decreed that, hereafter, sworn evidence given in the veterans' behalf must needs have "due consideration." [Applause.]

Another bill introduced by me, but which the committee was evidently too busy with great perplexing and nation-wide problems like, for instance, putting uniforms on bellhops and elevator boys at the United States Veterans' Bureau and thus further increasing an already unreasonable overhead expense, as provided in your committee bill, to give even "due consideration," is H. R. 8152. The provisions of my measure are somewhat similar to the Rankin bill and would extend the presumptive period for 10 years from date of the soldier's discharge in cases of chronic diseases. Under the pending committee bill the presumptive period is extended until 1925, which, I think all will agree, is the outstanding feature of this bill. Under the terms of this committee bill all veterans who are given a rating of 10 per cent disability or over by the bureau's alleged doctors are presumed to have contracted such disabilities, regardless of the nature of same, in the service, and the burden of proof is to be taken off the veterans' shoulders and placed on the Veterans' Bureau. Under the amendment which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has given notice he will offer the presumptive period on all chronic and statutory cases is proposed to be extended until 1930. I have endeavored to make it plain that I sincerely trust the Rankin amendment will prevail.

We have heard considerable discussion this afternoon in defense of the officers emergency retirement bill passed by the last Congress. Congress has been magnanimous with the disabled emergency officers of the World War. With one fell swoop it gave them what really amounts to a pension to the tune of from $100 to $300 per month, according to rank. But the enlisted man, who bore the brunt of the war, has been grossly discriminated against. These men gave their all in the most perilous time of the country; and now, when broken in health and down and out, they are entitled to every protection by the Government they fought to defend. Why quibble about dates? Whether they broke in health before 1925 or whether it was 1926 or later, the Government owes the disabled soldiers a debt it can only repay in a small way by providing for them in their hour of need. I somehow feel that I speak the hearts of the loyal citizens of our Nation when I urge that our disabled veterans be given some relief at the earliest possible moment, even though they may be unable to absolutely prove to the satisfaction of the Veterans' Bureau that their disabilities are of service origin.

Shortly after the close of the World War there appeared on the front page of a European edition of an American newspaper published in France for the American soldiers, sailors, and marines a cartoon depicting a wounded American doughboy. This American soldier was portrayed as leaning heavily for support on crutches. One empty sleeve hung limp at his side. The soldier's head was bandaged, and he wore large, darkened eyeglasses, as if he had been blinded by that damnable poison gas. Under that unusual war cartoon were these immortal words:

For him the war has not ended.

To-day I am pleading for that multitude of disabled veterans who are unable to help themselves and for whom "the war is not over." I shall not speak further of this pitiful and heart-sickening tragedy of human wrecks for whom the war did not end November 11, 1918. It is enough to say that thousands of

such cases have been neglected and ignored for a dozen years. Many of these human wrecks represent what were the finest specimens of manhood the world has ever seen back in those never to be forgotten days of 1917 and 1918.

But why consume more of your time in this manner? You have hundreds of these unfortunate men in your districts. I call your attention to the inevitable fact that Congress must act, and act quickly, if many of these war victims are to participate in any benefits at the hands of the Government. They did not fail us back in those dark days when the black clouds of war hung heavily over the land. We must not fail them now! [Applause.]

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the Chairman advise the members of the committee how much more general debate remains on the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota has 2 hours and 11 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Mississippi has 3 hours and 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. 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. MAPES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 10381, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4138) entitled "An act to amend the act of March 2, 1929, entitled 'An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries,'" 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. BAIRD, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. SHEPPARD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed House Concurrent Resolution No. 29, providing for the printing of 3,000 additional copies of House Document No. 328, Seventieth Congress, first session, concerning the Battle of Kings Mountain and the Battle of the Cowpens in South Carolina.

G. A. R. PENSIONS

Mr. STOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of G. A. R. pensions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of G. A. R. pensions. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STOBBS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, when we are considering a measure providing additional relief for our World War veterans, I want to say a word in behalf of certain legislation now pending before the Committee on Invalid Pensions providing additional relief for the veterans of our Civil War and their widows.

The number of Civil War veterans now surviving is a little less than 53,000, of an average age of 86 years. They are passing away at the rate of about 12,000 a year. The actual death rate for the month of March this year was 984, so that within three or four years more in all probability only a few will be with us.

The number of Civil War widows now living is a little over 150,000, of an average age of 75. They are also passing away at a rapid rate—about 21,000 a year, with the actual death rate for the month of March of 1,804.

If there is to be any additional relief furnished by this Government to these veterans and their widows, it must be passed at this session in order to be of any practical benefit.

The proposed bill (H. R. 8765), which was introduced by me, embodies the legislative program of the Grand Army of the Republic and is sponsored and approved by that organization. Briefly, it provides that every Civil War veteran who is now receiving $65 a month shall receive $72, those now receiving $72 a month shall receive $90 a month, and those now receiving $90 a month shall be given $125 a month.

The bill further provides that any widow of a Civil War veteran shall receive $50 a month, irrespective of her age, with the proviso that it shall not apply to the widow of any veteran whose marriage may take place subsequent to the date of approval of this bill, if enacted into law.

Under the present law only those widows whose marriage took place prior to June 27, 1905, are eligible for a pension, and then only at the rate of $30 a month, unless by special act. There are about 55,000 widows now receiving $30 a month and about 98,000 receiving $40 a month as a result of the recent amendment providing for this increase to widows 75 years of age or over.

It is estimated that there would be about 5,000 additional widows entitled to pension as a result of changing the date of eligibility from June 27, 1905, to the date of the enactment of this bill into law.

The additional expense involved, if this legislation were enacted, is estimated by the Commissioner of Pensions at approximately $38,000,000 annually, with a reduction on account of estimated death losses of about $3,400,000 a year, making the net cost the initial year about $34,657,472.

Of the gross amount, the additional expense necessitated as a result of increase in amounts provided for the veterans themselves would be about $9,827,112 annually, and the additional expense necessitated as a result of the increase in amounts provided for those widows who were married prior to June 27, 1905, would be about $25,230,360 annually. An approximate amount of $3,400,000 would be added to this for those widows who married since that date and are not now eligible for pension, but who would become so if this bill were enacted into law.

Surely if we are to do anything more for these few surviving Civil War veterans and their widows now is the psychological time to act, before it is too late for any such additional financial recognition to be of benefit.

No fair-minded person but must agree that this country has been generous to its veterans and their dependents. It has every reason to be, I think we will all agree, and gladly so.

Personally, I am in hearty accord with any plan which may be evolved for handling the whole question of our obligation to our veterans of all wars on a scientific basis, so that there may be no question ever raised of discrimination between veterans of different wars in respect to their individual treatment. All men who have fought for their country in any war and have hazarded their health, their opportunity of earning a livelihood, and their lives should be treated exactly alike. Until such a plan may be worked out we can not be unmindful of our obligation to these few remaining survivors of the war that was fought to save the very existence of this country.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE RURAL MAIL SERVICE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the work of the rural mail carriers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the work of the rural mail carriers. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, it appears that a great amount of pressure is being brought to bear in Congress against the interests of the rural mail carriers. Many Members who are not familiar with the duties of the rural carriers or the net salaries which remain after they have paid the cost of maintaining their equipment for carrying the mail, are led to believe that they are overpaid.

A few rural carriers have been accused of making their trips in two or three hours at certain times of the year, but no mention is made of the hours spent in sorting and routing the mail before they start on their trips, or the time required to take care of their collections, or the time it takes to keep their equipment in shape for the next trip. Critics say that many rural carriers do not work eight hours per day, but they fail to state that only a few carriers are receiving eight hours' pay, and they are the ones with extra-long routes. By eight hours' pay I mean the same wages as are paid to other postal employees. The rural carriers run a traveling post office and a freight truck combined. They deliver and collect all classes of mail—C. O. D.'s, insured parcels, registers, money orders, and parcels weighing up to 70 pounds.

The rural carrier is paid for the miles he travels and not the hours he works or the mail he handles. The Government allows him 4 cents per mile to pay the cost of maintaining his equipment. He makes 291 trips each year and receives $11.64 for each mile of his route. But this 4 cents pays only about half the actual cost of his upkeep; he must take from his basic salary at least $10 per year for each mile of his route to pay that part of the cost of maintaining his equipment which the 4 cents per mile fails to cover. Most rural carriers find that it costs them more than $10 a mile per year over the 4 cents allowance, but I take this as the lowest possible estimate. The department has acknowledged that he should be allowed one hour each day to take care of his equipment, whether it be motor or horse drawn.

The rural carrier with the standard route of 24 miles receives $1,800 per year. But he must spend $10 per year for each mile

of his route to pay that part of his upkeep which the 4 cents per mile fails to cover. This amounts to $240. Subtract this from his $1,800 and he has $1,560 as his net salary. He is being paid for only 5 hours and 56 minutes, including the hour allowed for caring for his equipment. When we speak of the time required to serve the rural route, we mean the average the year around, including the long days at Christmas and the auxiliary help which he pays out of his own pocket.

Congress may be asked to consider a bill requiring the rural carrier to do extra work in the post office after he has served his route. In no case should this extra duty lengthen his day's work beyond the time for which he draws pay. In other words, if he has a 24-mile route he is being paid for working 5 hours and 56 minutes each day, and the extra duty should not require him to work longer.

For each mile added to the standard route of 24 miles the rural carrier receives $30 per year, but he must use $10 of this money to help maintain his equipment, leaving $20 per year to add to his salary. So you see, in order for a rural carrier to receive a net salary of $2,100 he must have a mail route 51 miles long. Now, if there can be found a rural carrier serving a 51-mile route who does not work eight hours, or a carrier on a shorter route who does not work all the time for which his route pays him, then there would be no objection to giving him extra work in the office to make up the time lacking, but those on routes having extra heavy mail or very bad roads, who are now working 8 or 10 hours per day, but receiving pay for only 5 or 6, should be paid for their overtime.

Below is a table showing the basic salary for routes ranging from 24 to 51 miles long, the amount that must be deducted from this basic salary to pay that part of the upkeep which the 4 cents per mile fails to cover, the net salary remaining, and the extra time for which this net salary pays.

| Length of route in miles | Basic salary | Excess cost over 4-cent rate | Net salary, less upkeep | Time paid |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | *Hrs. m.* |
| 24 | $1,800 | $240 | $1,560 | 5 56 |
| 25 | 1,830 | 250 | 1,580 | 6 00 |
| 26 | 1,860 | 260 | 1,600 | 6 05 |
| 27 | 1,890 | 270 | 1,620 | 6 09 |
| 28 | 1,920 | 280 | 1,640 | 6 13 |
| 29 | 1,950 | 290 | 1,660 | 6 18 |
| 30 | 1,980 | 300 | 1,680 | 6 23 |
| 31 | 2,010 | 310 | 1,700 | 6 28 |
| 32 | 2,040 | 320 | 1,720 | 6 32 |
| 33 | 2,070 | 330 | 1,740 | 6 37 |
| 34 | 2,100 | 340 | 1,760 | 6 41 |
| 35 | 2,130 | 350 | 1,780 | 6 46 |
| 36 | 2,160 | 360 | 1,800 | 6 50 |
| 37 | 2,190 | 370 | 1,820 | 6 55 |
| 38 | 2,220 | 380 | 1,840 | 7 00 |
| 39 | 2,250 | 390 | 1,860 | 7 04 |
| 40 | 2,280 | 400 | 1,880 | 7 09 |
| 41 | 2,310 | 410 | 1,900 | 7 13 |
| 42 | 2,340 | 420 | 1,920 | 7 18 |
| 43 | 2,370 | 430 | 1,940 | 7 22 |
| 44 | 2,400 | 440 | 1,960 | 7 27 |
| 45 | 2,430 | 450 | 1,980 | 7 31 |
| 46 | 2,460 | 460 | 2,000 | 7 36 |
| 47 | 2,490 | 470 | 2,020 | 7 41 |
| 48 | 2,520 | 480 | 2,040 | 7 45 |
| 49 | 2,550 | 490 | 2,060 | 7 50 |
| 50 | 2,580 | 500 | 2,080 | 7 55 |
| 51 | 2,610 | 510 | 2,100 | 8 00 |

LAWSON-OWEN ELECTION CONTEST

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Speaker, I have pending at the Speaker's desk a request for absence from the House for one week owing to death in my family.

For the benefit of the Members of the House I want to say that had I been able I had intended to call up the Lawson-Owen election case at the conclusion of the consideration of the Johnson bill. Inasmuch as I shall be unable to do so, I can only say that as soon as I return I shall make an endeavor to call up the case for consideration by the House.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. I yield.

Mr. GARNER. Can the gentleman state about when he expects to call up that case?

Mr. BEEDY. Just as soon as I return from a funeral in my family, of which I have just been notified; possibly in one week.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BEEDY, for one week, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. CLARKE of New York, for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. PARKER, for three days, on account of important business.

THE LONDON NAVAL CONFERENCE

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD an address of the Secretary of State on the result of the London conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting in the RECORD an address by the Secretary of State on the subject of the London conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address from London, April 13, of the Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State, on the results accomplished at the London Naval Conference:

STATEMENT BY THE HON. HENRY L. STIMSON, SECRETARY OF STATE

Almost three months ago the American delegation landed in England to take part in the London Naval Conference. In order to understand its purpose and to appraise the results which have been accomplished it is necessary to view the background and history of which it is a part. Naval limitation has formed a part of the organized efforts of the world to limit international suspicions and promote good relations. It is a new effort and has grown gradually. At the first Hague conference in 1899 the subject of limitation of arms was one of the purposes for which the conference was called, but all that resulted was a resolution favoring restriction as a desirable end. At the second Hague conference in 1907 it was considered too dangerous to put on the program. Naval competition was going on unchecked in those days as it had been in one shape or another for centuries.

This particular naval race ended in the Great War in 1914, and when that war was over another competitive naval building race had begun. This later one included the United States. For the first time in our history we found ourselves facing the irritations and ill will arising from naval competition. Neither the experiences of the war nor the exhaustion which it caused prevented the world from resuming naval competition, and we found ourselves entangled in it.

Under these circumstances President Harding called the Washington conference, and Mr. Hughes made his historic proposals. They were historic because they changed the moral standards of the world. Before those proposals were made human experience seemed to indicate that naval competition was inevitable. Since that day the conscience of the world has insisted that naval limitation by mutual agreement shall take the place of competition. The Washington conference achieved enough to prove that what the conscience of the world demanded was a practical possibility. From the date of ratification of the Washington treaty not a battleship has been laid down by any nation in the world.

But though the success of that conference was great it was not complete. Only two kinds of warships were limited; cruisers, destroyers, and submarines were not; and after the conference adjourned competitive building began in those types—competition which bade fair to become dangerous. The preparatory commission of the League of Nations tried again and again to agree upon methods of limitation, but failed. In 1927 President Coolidge called the 3-power conference at Geneva, but that conference failed to reach an agreement.

Yet the work of these meetings was not entirely lost, for each one gave tangible evidence that the world believed in the principle of limitation and agreement. But each failure showed the extraordinary difficulty of reaching an international agreement upon that most vital concern of every sovereign State—national defense. And the aftermath of each failure made it more and more evident that an agreement was necessary to the good relations and stability of the naval world. International suspicion, irritation, and ill-will, the ugly children of naval competition, began to show their heads again. At the very time when the world needed all its resources to recover financially and economically from the exhaustion of the Great War the navies of the world were beginning to build up an expensive and dangerous rivalry. It was time to try again to halt this process. The other naval powers suggested that Great Britain and the United States should see if they could get close enough together in their figures to give assurance that the failure of Geneva would not be repeated. Long negotiations took place last summer, culminating in the visit of Prime Minister MacDonald to the United States. Then followed this naval conference.

The problem which faced the American delegation here was difficult and complicated. Since the Washington treaty the United States has laid down no battleships, no aircraft carriers, and no destroyers—and only three submarines. Impelled by the cruiser construction of the other nations, our Congress had instituted a cruiser program, but only two ships of that program were in the water. Our Navy was ill-balanced. The end of the battleship holiday, instituted by the Washington treaty, was approaching and most of our other ships were becoming old and approaching their normal time for replacement.

The question was, Should the United States replace the bulk of its Navy on a competitive basis or upon a basis of limitation reached by mutual agreement with the other naval nations of the world? Would

the other countries whose navies were in better condition than ours agree to such limitation without taking advantage of their better bargaining position? It is to the credit of the faith in the principle of limitation held by Great Britain and Japan that they made no such effort.

Our principal objective when we came here was to extend the principle of limitation by agreement so that it should cover all the elements of the fleet, and thus complete what had been left undone at Washington, at the league, and at Geneva. So far as the fleets of Great Britain, Japan, and the United States are concerned, that purpose has been achieved. There can now be no competition between us. The relation of the fleets is fixed.

Furthermore, the habit of mutual agreement has received one more successful precedent. The principle of limitation is strengthened by its successful practice. At the first meeting of the conference in January I made this statement: "Naval limitation is a continuous process. We regard disarmament as a goal to be reached by successive steps, by frequent revision and improvement. Human affairs are not static but are moving and, we believe, improving. * * * For that reason we feel that the sound and obvious course is to reach such agreements as may be possible now, with the knowledge that they are open to revision at appropriate periods." By our present agreement the favorable attitude of the world is made stronger than ever. The benefit of this momentum will not be limited to the three powers who have actually reached a basis of mutual agreement but will extend also to the efforts of our friends, the French and the Italians, to achieve that goal in the future. Limitation to be effective must be made willingly and with confidence.

We have every hope that France and Italy will eventually join in a limitation of their fleets similar to that which we have attained, but that is a result which to be effective must come only when each country fully realizes the advantages which will follow.

As I have thus pointed out, the main purpose for which this conference was called was to stop the dangers of competition in armaments and to establish the mutual confidence and good will which come with agreement. It is this purpose which connects the conference with the great movement for world peace. Reduction in expenditures, important as it is to each individual nation, is merely a by-product of the other and primary purpose. Moreover, reduction is a benefit which will be increasingly realized as the nations of the world progress in the security obtained by agreement. It is only as mutual confidence develops with increasing experience that nations reduce more and more drastically their military protection. Thus experience under the Washington treaty in regard to battleships has been such that the nations are eager now to reduce the battleship fleets more rapidly than was thought possible in 1922.

Nevertheless, it is proper for me to point out the great reductions and economies which our agreement will accomplish.

The first great economy which we shall achieve is not a reduction but a holiday or postponement of construction of ships. Under the schedules of the Washington treaty the United States was to lay down 10 new battleships and to complete 5 of them during the next six years. Under our present arrangement none of these vessels will be laid down. This means that approximately $300,000,000 which would otherwise have been spent during the next six years will not be spent.

Furthermore, this holiday will, we believe, pave the way for further economies in battleship construction. There is a strong movement under way for a reduction either in the number or the size of our existing battleships. But there is a difference of opinion among the nations concerned as to which of these methods will furnish the best avenue for such reduction. This holiday gives an opportunity to settle this question and to decide upon the method for this further economy.

In estimating the actual reduction which will result from the present conference you have doubtless read many varying sets of figures. These differences have occurred because of the different methods employed by the writers. Some have counted overage ships which happen still to be in commission, while others did not. Some others have counted ships authorized though not yet built, while others did not. And there have been many other variations. I will, however, give you two comparisons on battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines which I think will present the fairest picture of the reductions we have accomplished.

The first is to compare the limitations which we have fixed with the lowest limitations which were entertained at the unsuccessful conference in Geneva in 1927. In 1927 the lowest tonnage figures which Great Britain would discuss for cruisers, destroyers, and submarines taken together were 590,000 tons. In addition to this, she insisted upon retaining until 1936, 25 per cent of overage tonnage. As against this her tonnage in these types of ships under our present agreement will be 541,700 tons, a reduction of 48,300 tons. Japan has agreed to a reduction of 17,950. In addition to this reduction, Great Britain has agreed to scrap immediately 133,900 tons of her battleship fleet. We are to scrap immediately 69,900 tons of our battleship fleet and Japan 26,330 tons.

If you add the total difference for the three fleets of these three nations between the Geneva proposals and our present agreement, there is an aggregate reduction of 345,000 tons. And this is without counting the 25 per cent overage ships which were to be retained under the Geneva proposal.

The other comparison which I suggest is between the three fleets as they stand to-day, including ships built and building and appropriated for, and the same three fleets as they will stand in 1936 under our agreement. Taking these three fleets together, there will be nine battleships scrapped and not replaced. Their combined tonnage is 230,130 tons. Their numbers are the same as the number of Japan's total fleet of battleships under the treaty.

Next there will be a reduction of 205,000 tons in the destroyers of the three powers. That amounts to nearly 40 per cent more destroyer tonnage than will remain in any of the three fleets in 1936.

There will be a reduction of 68,000 tons in submarines, and that is nearly 16,000 tons more than will be allowed to any of three countries in 1936.

In American cruisers there will be an actual increase under the new agreement. But this is due solely to the fact that we have been idle in cruiser building for nearly 10 years and now find ourselves with less than a quarter of the normal proportion of cruisers which we should have in respect to the rest of our fleet.

Therefore, in order to create a smaller but better-balanced fleet than we now have and to achieve parity with Great Britain it is necessary for us to increase our cruiser tonnage. This increase is comparatively small because the British have agreed to reduce their tonnage by 20 cruisers in order to meet us, and for that same purpose the Japanese have agreed not to increase the number of their cruisers. As a result the total net reductions in the three fleets built, building, and appropriated for, is in the neighborhood of 460,000 tons. That reduction alone is greater than the total present Italian fleet.

Thus far, I have been speaking only of fighting ships. There are also, as you doubtless know, many service ships in the navy which are not classed as combatant but in discussing economy these ships very properly enter into the picture. In the three fleets of Great Britain, Japan, and the United States, there are 220,000 tons of these ships which under our present agreement will not be replaced after they are retired for age. This means ultimately a reduction of 220,000 tons and a corresponding reduction in expenses.

In our present agreement we have reached the lowest level of limitation that I have ever heard seriously discussed before. We have reached a lower level than any of us on any delegation felt confident could be attained when we came here.

Furthermore, this conference has achieved certain great moral advantages. The experience of our negotiations has made it clear that naval rivalry between the United States and Great Britain is definitely at an end. No negotiations could have been more frank and cordial and satisfactory than those we have had with the British delegation. The same applies to our relations with the Japanese delegation. They have shown a readiness to join in the great aims of the conference which is beyond praise. The very great improvement in the friendly relations between the United States and Japan which followed the Washington conference will certainly be intensified and continued by this conference.

As our naval problems do not reach those of France and Italy we have not directly participated in the negotiations of those countries, but our contacts with their delegations have been uniformly friendly and we believe that we have contributed to the present spirit of good will which makes it now seem probable that they will ultimately agree among themselves and add the limitation of their fleets to our present treaty.

And now a word about our own delegation. It has consisted of seven delegates who have worked together as a harmonious group. Every decision of importance has been discussed by every member before it was taken and every such decision has been unanimous. In technical matters we have had the advice and assistance of Admiral Pratt, the commander in chief of the United States Fleet, and his very effective assistant, and until his departure a few weeks ago on account of illness we had the able help of Admiral Jones. In addition to this we have had the advantage of the wisdom and advice of the loyal and capable staff of the Department of State and the American Embassy in London.

We believe we have successfully accomplished the mission with which we have been intrusted by our country.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow, Friday, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow, it adjourn until Monday next. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we want to finish the veterans' bill this week. A good many Members of the House are extremely interested in it, and some of them will not be able to be here a part of the time next week, and they insist that we finish the bill before we quit. So, I am going to object, for the time being at least. I may say to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] that I am willing to

speed up the general debate, and if possible read the bill and finish it to-morrow, and if that is done, then I will not object to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, I will say to the gentleman that there is no hope of finishing the bill to-morrow, with the requests for debate that we have and knowing what is going to occur in the shape of amendments to be offered.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, we have been adjourning over Saturdays, and next Saturday is the Saturday before Easter. Many of the Members would like to go to their homes for Easter Sunday, so I hope the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will not insist upon his objection. The bill under consideration will be the unfinished business and nothing else can come ahead of it next week.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman mean beginning on Monday morning?

Mr. TILSON. No; not Monday, because Monday is unanimous-consent day, but all the balance of the week will be available except the time taken up by the Calendar Wednesday rule, the special orders.

Mr. RANKIN. Would it suit the gentleman from Connecticut to make his request to-morrow?

Mr. TILSON. It is apparent that we can not finish the bill under consideration on to-morrow unless we sit very late. If we are to adjourn over at all the Members would like to have sufficient notice so that they may arrange to go to their homes.

Mr. RANKIN. I must insist that we finish this bill this week, if possible. I am sorry to disagree with the gentleman from Connecticut, but I think we can finish this bill by speeding up a little, and I think it is more important that we finish the legislation this week than that we adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. May I ask the gentleman from Mississippi why is it so important to finish the bill this week? There are many who would like to be heard, and in view of its importance it would be better to have it well considered.

Mr. RANKIN. It has been delayed quite a long time, and as I said a while ago there are some Members who can not be here a part of the time next week who can be here to-morrow and Saturday, who are insisting that the bill be finished.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I think it would be the part of wisdom to let this go over until next week so that we may have a full discussion of it.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. My idea is that we would run a great risk of being able to get through on Saturday, and I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. TILSON. If the gentleman insists upon his objection it will probably mean that we shall run here to-morrow and Saturday, and then have to go on next Tuesday. With the assurance that nothing is going to interfere with this bill and that it will go on next Tuesday until finished, I do not see why the gentleman should object.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman from Connecticut withhold his request until to-morrow at noon. I would like to confer with the Members I have in mind.

Mr. TILSON. The trouble is that Members would like to know in order to make their arrangements. For the convenience of the Members I should like to have it understood now that we shall not meet Saturday.

Mr. RANKIN. They can make their arrangements to-morrow afternoon. We ought to stay here and finish this bill. At any rate, I want to confer with these Members, because they have come to me personally and told me they are very much interested in this legislation and could not be here next week. Therefore it will be impossible for them to be here unless we finish the bill this week. If the gentleman will withhold his request until to-morrow noon I will confer with them.

Mr. TILSON. Then the Members of whom the gentleman speaks will probably not be here when the bill is voted on?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; they will.

Mr. TILSON. I think it very improbable that we shall reach a vote on Saturday, even if we remain in session Saturday. There are several Members who desire to go home and spend Easter with their families.

Mr. DENISON. If the bill is passed next week, it will receive the consideration of the Senate just as quickly as if it is passed this week.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that that is not the question with me. There are some Members who are very much interested and who insist on having the bill finished this week, because they can not be here unless it is finished this week.

Mr. TILSON. That will be unfortunate, because the same gentlemen would probably miss their votes even if we should remain in session Saturday.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman from Connecticut will assure me that this will be the unfinished business next week, if we do not get through with it to-morrow, I may withdraw my objection.

Mr. TILSON. We shall go on with the bill next Tuesday and it will be the unfinished business. Nothing else will be put ahead of it that is not required by the rules or authorized by special orders.

Mr. RANKIN. Will not Calendar Wednesday interfere?

Mr. TILSON. No; Calendar Wednesday has already been moved to Friday.

Mr. RANKIN. So we would have Tuesday and Wednesday?

Mr. TILSON. We shall have Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, if necessary, for the disposition of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. In the light of that statement, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my objection.

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

There was no objection.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6343. An act to provide for the extension of the boundary limits of the proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the establishment of which is authorized by the act approved May 22, 1926 (44 Stat. 616); and

H. R. 9546. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes;

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2757. An act to authorize the United States Shipping Board to sell certain property of the United States situated in the city of Hoboken, N. J.;

S. 3425. An act to amend the act of Congress approved March 1, 1929, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a children's tuberculosis sanatorium"; and

S. 3440. An act authorizing the exchange of 663 square feet of property acquired for the park system for 2,436 square feet of neighboring property, all in the Klingle Ford Valley, for addition to the park system of the National Capital.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 8960. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9183. An act to provide for the exercise of sole and exclusive jurisdiction by the United States over the Hawaii National Park in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9442. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make engineering and economic investigations and studies of conditions in Palo Verde and Cibola Valleys and vicinity on the Colorado River, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9637. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Champlain at or near Rouses Point, N. Y., and a point at or near Alburg, Vt.; and

H. R. 10173. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct investigations of cotton ginning.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 18, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Friday, April 18, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2

(10 a. m.)

To amend section 22, Title II, of the National Prohibition Act, to provide for citation by publication to relieve congestion of the courts (H. R. 9563).

(11 a. m.)

To provide for an additional justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia (H. R. 974).

To provide for the appointment of two additional justices of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia (H. R. 2903).

To provide for the appointment of two additional justices of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia (H. R. 2904).

For the appointment of two additional associate justices to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia (H. R. 9045).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider general legislation.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

414. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital for the fiscal year 1931, amounting to $299,157 (H. Doc. No. 353); was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. H. R. 4192. A bill to authorize the coinage of silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the expedition of Capt. Meriwether Lewis and Capt. William Clark; without amendment (Rept. No. 1188). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. H. R. 11008. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the sesquicentennial of the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown; without amendment (Rept. No. 1189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 11144. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to extend, remodel, and enlarge the post-office building at Washington, D. C., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PORTER: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 282. A joint resolution authorizing the appointment of an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. J. Res. 300. A joint resolution to permit the Pennsylvania Gift Fountain Association to erect a fountain in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 11134. A bill to amend section 91 of the act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McLEOD: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 9996. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia," approved February 11, 1929; without amendment (Rept. No. 1205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MERRITT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 11679. A bill to extend hospital facilities to certain retired officers and employees of the Lighthouse Service, to improve the efficiency of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLTON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 8003. A bill to fix the compensation of the assistant heads of the executive departments; with amendment (Rept. No. 1207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 320. An act authorizing reconstruction and improvement of a public road in Wind River Indian Reservation, Wyo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1208). 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. 11704. A bill to amend the air mail act of February 2, 1925, as amended by the acts of June 3, 1926, and May 17, 1928, further to encourage commercial aviation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LETTS: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 10932. A bill for the relief of homeless and destitute Chippewa Indians in Forest, Langlade, and Oneida Counties, Wis.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1210). 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. ENGLEBRIGHT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5292. A bill to authorize the city of Napa, Calif., to purchase certain public lands for the protection of its water supply; without amendment (Rept. No. 1194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COYLE: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3950. A bill for the relief of David A. Dehart; without amendment (Rept. No. 1195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HALE: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4731. A bill for the relief of Frederick Rasmussen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COYLE: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4906. A bill for the relief of Col. Frank E. Evans, United States Marine Corps; with amendment (Rept. No. 1197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4907. A bill for the relief of Thomas Wallace; with amendment (Rept. No. 1198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WOODRUFF: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4760. A bill for the relief of Guy Braddock Scott; without amendment (Rept. No. 1199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WOODRUFF: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 6453. A bill for the relief of Peder Anderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WOODRUFF: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 8117. A bill for the relief of Robert Hofman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COYLE: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 11212. A bill to recognize the high public service rendered by James C. Burke in voluntarily submitting himself for a test in an effort to discover the cause and means of transmission of malarial fever; without amendment (Rept. No. 1202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HALE: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 11297. A bill for the relief of Arthur Edward Blanchard; without amendment (Rept. No. 1203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. NOLAN: Committee of the Public Lands. H. R. 11477. A bill for the relief of Clifford J. Turner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 11718) to provide for the aiding of farmers in any State by the making of loans to drainage districts, levee districts, levee and drainage districts, counties, boards of supervisors, and/or other political subdivisions and legal entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. NEWHALL: A bill (H. R. 11719) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Carrollton, Ky.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 11720) to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern, eastern, and western districts of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 11721) for the construction of a Coast Guard cutter for Alaskan waters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 11722) to amend the act entitled "An act making eligible for retirement under certain conditions officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War"; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 11723) to establish a Federal flood control board; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 11724) for the relief of the State of Florida for damage to and destruction of roads and bridges by floods in 1928 and 1929; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. HALL of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11725) to amend the District of Columbia traffic act, approved March 3, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 11726) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate all phases of crop insurance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 11727) to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Bureau hospital in the State of California; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 11728) granting a pension to Lydia Jarvis Middleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 11729) to legalize a pier and wharf at the southerly end of Port Jefferson Harbor, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 11730) granting an increase of pension to Catherine A. Applegate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER of California: A bill (H. R. 11731) for the relief of Eleanor K. Webber; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 11732) to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Lake St. Clair and the Clinton River, Macomb County, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 11733) granting an increase of pension to Anna Corte; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11734) for the relief of John T. Pierson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 11735) granting a pension to Willumetta Powers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 11736) for the relief of B. A. Cannon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11737) granting an increase of pension to E. Jennette Redding; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALL of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 11738) granting a pension to Hobart A. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: A bill (H. R. 11739) granting a pension to Henry K. Duke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 11740) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe Jane Hanes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11741) granting a pension to Susan Barlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 11742) granting an increase of pension to Caroline York; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 11743) for the relief of William G. Burress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 11744) granting a pension to W. J. Vaughan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEAVEY: A bill (H. R. 11745) for the relief of Oscar C. Olson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: A bill (H. R. 11746) granting an increase of pension to Phebe Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 11747) granting an increase of pension to Louise L. Pettengill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11748) waiving the maximum age limit in the case of Capt. William E. Parker, and making him eligible for appointment in the Judge Advocate General's department, Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 11749) granting a pension to Sarah Dumpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 11750) granting an increase of pension to Sedate C. Cooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 11751) for the relief of Adolph Morales; to the Committee on Claims.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

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

6803. By Mr. BACON: Petition of sundry residents of Baldwin and Freeport, indorsing the proposal for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6804. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of post-office employees of New York, earnestly requesting Congress to enact into law House bill 6603, which provides for a 5½-day week; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6805. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of the Town Council of Barrington, R. I., memorializing Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 167, directing the President to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6806. Also, petition of residents of Providence, R. I., to the Congress to enact into law certain bills increasing Spanish War pension rates; to the Committee on Pensions.

6807. By Mr. CLARKE of New York: Resolution of the Common Council of the city of Binghamton, N. Y., memorializing the Congress of the United States for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 167, directing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6808. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of many citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., favoring increased Spanish War veterans' pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

6809. Also, petition of L. E. Mulkey and 120 citizens of California, favoring legislation for increase of pensions for the widows of Indian war veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6810. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of residents of Montgomery County, N. Y., against proposed calendar change of weekly cycle; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6811. Also, petition of residents of Schenectady and Scotia, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

6812. By Mr. CULLEN: Resolution of the National Farmers' Union, urging the granting of Philippine independence at the earliest possible time and the establishment of proper tariff protection on agricultural products coming from those islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

6813. By Mr. DEMPSEY: Petition signed by 49 residents of the city of Tonawanda, N. Y., urging speedy consideration and passage of House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

6814. By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of voters of Douglas County, Oreg., praying for pension legislation; to the Committee on Pensions.

6815. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Texas Farm Bureau Federation, Dallas, Tex., opposing a tariff on lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6816. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Kings County District Council, Steuben Society of America, Brooklyn, N. Y., expressing hearty accord with House Joint Resolution 213, providing for the issuance of special stamps in honor of Baron Von Steuben, and urging that it be enacted at once; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6817. Also, petition consisting of individual letters, registering protests against the Federal education bill, and contending that education is a local matter and not for Government administration, from the following citizens of the third congressional district, Brooklyn, N. Y.: Catherine Dwyer, Anna E. Kirwin, Robert J. Kirwin, Mary E. Lawler, Catherine E. Lawless, Sadie McAllister, Margaret McBride, Margaret McDonnell, William McGeough, Catherine Moran, F. C. Richardson, Margaret J. Richardson, Mary Richardson, and Margaret M. Savage; to the Committee on Education.

6818. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of residents of National Military Soldiers' Home, Los Angeles, Calif., urging passage of House bill 8976, for the relief of veterans and widows and minor orphan children of veterans of Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

6819. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce, of Huntington, W. Va., favoring legislation to provide adequate and just compensation to the personnel of the Army and Navy, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6820. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of Jacob Medley and 16 others of Logan, Kans., for an increase in pension for veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6821. By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of city council of Knoxville, Tenn., urging the passage of the Norris bill for the development of Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6822. Also, petition of Greene County (Tenn.) Chamber of Commerce, urging the passage of the Norris bill for the development of Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6823. Also, petition of Lenoir City (Tenn.) Junior Order Council, urging the passage of the Norris bill for the development of Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6824. Also, petition of Rogersville (Tenn.) Chamber of Commerce, urging the passage of the Norris bill for the development of Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6825. Also, petition of Knoxville (Tenn.) Automotive Trade Association, urging the passage of the Norris bill for development of Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6826. Also, petition of Retail Credit Association of Knoxville, Tenn., urging the passage of the Norris bill for development of Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6827. Also, petition of citizens of Coal Creek, Anderson County, Tenn., urging the passage of Norris bill for development of Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6828. Also, petition of citizens of Knoxville, Tenn., urging the passage of the Norris bill for the development of Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6829. By Mr. WOOD: Petition of citizens of Lafayette, Ind., asking for the enactment of legislation granting increased rates of pension for soldiers of the Civil War and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

---

## SENATE

### FRIDAY, *April 18, 1930*

*(Legislative day of Thursday, April 17, 1930)*

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

Mr. FESS. 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:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Allen | Frazier | Keyes | Smoot |
| Ashurst | George | La Follette | Steck |
| Baird | Gillett | McCulloch | Steiwer |
| Barkley | Glass | McKellar | Stephens |
| Bingham | Glenn | McNary | Sullivan |
| Black | Goff | Metcalf | Swanson |
| Blaine | Goldsborough | Norbeck | Thomas, Idaho |
| Blease | Gould | Norris | Thomas, Okla. |
| Borah | Greene | Nye | Trammell |
| Brock | Hale | Oddie | Tydings |
| Brookhart | Harris | Overman | Vandenberg |
| Broussard | Harrison | Patterson | Wagner |
| Capper | Hatfield | Phipps | Walcott |
| Caraway | Hawes | Pittman | Walsh, Mass. |
| Connally | Hayden | Ransdell | Walsh, Mont. |
| Copeland | Hebert | Robinson, Ind. | Waterman |
| Couzens | Heflin | Robsion, Ky. | Watson |
| Dale | Howell | Sheppard | Wheeler |
| Deneen | Johnson | Shipstead | |
| Dill | Jones | Shortridge | |
| Fess | Kendrick | Simmons | |

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] is unavoidably absent. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are all detained from the Senate by illness.

I further desire to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] are in London attending the naval conference.

Mr. NORBECK. My colleague [Mr. MCMASTER] is unavoidably absent from the city. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### PETITIONS

Mr. BLAINE presented resolutions adopted by the common councils of the cities of Marshfield and Menasha, Wis., favoring the passage of legislation dedicating October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, Revolutionary War hero, which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

#### JUDGE JOHN J. PARKER

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I send forward a telegram just received from E. B. Jeffress, editor of the Greensboro News, containing some information which Senators will be glad to have. I ask that the clerk may read the telegram.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read, as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

GREENSBORO, N. C., *April 18, 1930.*

Hon. LEE S. OVERMAN,

*United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:*

Have mailed you special delivery to-night complete text of what Daily News printed about Judge Parker's speech of acceptance in its issue of March 4, 1920, following his nomination for governor. Distorted reports of what the Daily News printed are being circulated as part of propaganda against Judge Parker, inspired perhaps by communists working through the negro organizations. Nowhere do we find that we printed that Judge Parker, if elected governor, would resign if election due to one negro vote. Would appreciate those undertaking to quote Daily News to furnish dates and we will gladly run the matter down and furnish true text of printed matter.

E. B. JEFFRESS.

Mr. OVERMAN. I now send forward a letter from Dr. E. A. Alderman, president of the University of Virginia, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read, as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA,
*Charlottesville, April 16, 1930.*

Senator LEE S. OVERMAN,

*Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR OVERMAN: I am just writing this letter to express the hope that you are going to be able to confirm Judge Parker for the Supreme Bench. I have been pleased to see how fine and thoughtful an interest you have been showing in it. It seems to me it would be a very wrong thing, from all standpoints, to fail to confirm him.

Faithfully yours,

E. A. ALDERMAN, *President.*

Mr. OVERMAN. I now send forward another letter, this one being from Judge Ernest Woodward, of Kentucky, and I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

LOUISVILLE, KY., *April 16, 1930.*

Mr. L. S. OVERMAN,

*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR OVERMAN: Having been engaged for more than 30 years in the general practice in both State and Federal courts, I presumed to telegraph you on the 14th, urging the confirmation of Judge Parker as a Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

In our practice we have and do represent corporations, individuals, and labor organizations. In 1920 Judge Moorman, now a judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, was a partner with the writer, and we defended a labor union which we thought was improperly enjoined, and on appeal to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at Cincinnati reversed the judgment of the district court. See Davis *v. Henry* (266 Fed. 261 (6 C. C. A.)). I mention this fact only to illustrate that I am not blind to the just claims of organized labor. However, when organized labor, or any other special interest, seeks to place upon the Supreme Court its own partisans, or seeks to defeat judicial advancement because the judge nominated has observed the binding force of decisions made by the Supreme Court, it seems to me that a vigorous protest ought to be made.

I have discussed Judge Parker's nomination with many lawyers representing a fair cross section of the Kentucky bar, and it is their unanimous opinion that the objections offered to his confirmation are trivial, and, if successful, would constitute a serious menace to judicial independence.

Your support of Judge Parker's nomination is much appreciated by the Kentucky lawyers, including myself.

Yours sincerely,

ERNEST WOODWARD.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, since the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has to-day and on a preceding day offered several telegrams and letters relating to the Parker nomination, in that connection I desire to ask that an editorial on the same question appearing in the Washington News may