

adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9043. By Mr. CLANCY: Petition of 20,000 signatures of Detroit and Wayne County, Mich., citizens praying for immediate payment in cash of veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9044. By Mr. CLARKE of New York: Petition of the members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Mount Vision, N. Y., urging Congress to enact a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures, establishing higher standards before production for films that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9045. By Mr. DEBOUEN: Resolution of Acadia Post, No. 15, American Legion, Department of Louisiana, Crowley, La., urging the Congress of the United States to pass adequate legislation pertaining to the needs of ex-service men and their families; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9046. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of the Sunnyslope Parent-Teacher Association, of Wenatchee, Wash., for the passage of the Hudson bill (H. R. 9986) for the supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9047. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of Eaton County Guernsey breeders, requesting Congress to enact a new law taxing all yellow oleomargarine at least 10 cents a pound; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9048. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Battle Creek, Mich., urging the passage of the Hudson motion picture bill, H. R. 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9049. Also, petition of Bellevue Village Club, requesting Congress to enact a new law taxing all yellow oleomargarine at least 10 cents a pound; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9050. Also, petition of Eureka Nutrition Club, requesting Congress to enact a new law taxing all yellow oleomargarine at least 10 cents a pound; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9051. By Mr. HUDSPETH: Petition of residents of El Paso, Tex., urging favorable action on House bill 15489 for the benefit of Indian war veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

9052. By Mr. HULL of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Prairie Farm Cooperative Creamery Co., requesting a tax on colored oleomargarine, in opposition to the recent ruling by Commissioner of Internal Revenue Burnet regarding palm oil in oleomargarine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9053. By Mrs. KAHN: Petition of numerous citizens of California, favoring passage of House bill 7884 for the exemption of dogs from vivisection; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9054. By Mr. KIEFNER: Petition of Coleman Frazier Post, No. 39, of the American Legion, at Flat River, St. Francois County, Mo., urging payment in full of all adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9055. By Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia: Petition of the Baxley (Ga.) Woman's Club, requesting Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9056. By Mr. LEAVITT: Resolution of District No. 13, American Legion, Department of Montana, urging that a new hospital of at least 400 beds be constructed for the use of war veterans in the State of Montana; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9057. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Resolution of the American Exporters and Importers' Association, recommending a new member of the Cabinet to represent foreign commerce of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9058. By Mr. REED of New York: Three petitions indorsing the Sparks-Capper amendment to the Constitution to cut out approximately 7,500,000 unnaturalized aliens and

count only citizens when making the new apportionment for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9059. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Resolution of National Cooperative Council of the Farmers' Cooperative Business Organizations, expressing appreciation of efforts made in behalf of agriculture by the Federal Farm Board in encouraging the organization of cooperative associations and opposing the enactment by Congress of any amendment to the agriculture marketing act and protesting against efforts made to destroy agriculture cooperation in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9060. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of East Grand Forks (Minn.) Post of American Legion, in support of immediate cash payment of face value of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9061. Also, petition of Minneapolis Building Trades Council, Minnesota, indorsing cash payment of soldiers' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9062. Also, petition of American Legion Post, of Henning, Minn., urging enactment of bill for immediate payment of adjusted-compensation certificates in full; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9063. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of Methodist Church of Gen, Kans., for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9064. Also, petition of the Sunday School of the Methodist Church, near Colby, Kans., for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9065. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of 55 ex-service men of Cedartown, Ga., asking the payment in cash of the face value of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9066. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition of citizens of the fifth congressional district, San Francisco, Calif., urging the enactment of House bill 7884; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9067. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Lions Club of East Liberty, approving proposed construction of a high dam and bridge connecting the Washington and Allegheny River Boulevards with Freeport Road near Aspinwall, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9068. Also, petition of Titusville Chamber of Commerce, Titusville, Pa., urging tariff on crude petroleum and its refined products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9069. Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Greensburg, Westmoreland County, Pa., protesting against an extra session of Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 26, 1931)

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:

Ashurst	Cutting	Hatfield	Morrow
Barkley	Dale	Hawes	Moses
Bingham	Davis	Hayden	Norbeck
Black	Deneen	Hebert	Norris
Blaine	Dill	Heflin	Nye
Blease	Fess	Howell	Oddie
Borah	Fletcher	Johnson	Partridge
Bratton	Frazier	Jones	Patterson
Brock	George	Kean	Phipps
Brookhart	Gillett	Kendrick	Pine
Broussard	Glass	King	Pittman
Bulkley	Glenn	La Follette	Ransdell
Capper	Goff	McGill	Reed
Caraway	Goldsborough	McKellar	Robinson, Ark.
Carey	Gould	McMaster	Schall
Connally	Hale	McNary	Sheppard
Copeland	Harris	Metcalf	Shipstead
Couzens	Harrison	Morrison	Shortridge

Smith	Thomas, Idaho	Wagner	Watson
Smoot	Townsend	Walcott	Wheeler
Stelwer	Trammell	Walsh, Mass.	Williamson
Stephens	Tydings	Walsh, Mont.	
Swanson	Vandenberg	Waterman	

Mr. WATSON. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one 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 clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 4944. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River at or near Dahlgren, Va.;

S. 5319. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the French Broad River on the proposed Morristown-Newport Road between Jefferson and Cocke Counties, Tenn.; and

S. 5360. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills:

H. R. 2936. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Tittabawassee and Chippewa Rivers, Mich., with a view to the prevention and control of floods; and

H. R. 6668. An act to provide for discharging certain obligations of Peter R. Wadsworth, former superintendent and special disbursing agent of the Consolidated Chippewa Indian Agency.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2643. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission, approved May 23, 1928; and

S. 4665. An act extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Sistersville, Tyler County, W. Va.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5776) to provide for the advance planning and regulated construction of public works, for the stabilization of industry, and for aiding in the prevention of unemployment during periods of business depression, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept, without cost to the Government of the United States, a lighter-than-air base, near Sunnyvale, in the county of Santa Clara, State of California, and construct necessary improvements thereon;

H. R. 6867. An act to authorize appropriations for construction of a storehouse for ammunition at Fort Benjamin Harrison;

H. R. 8736. An act to authorize and direct a preliminary examination of the Hocking River for the distance that it flows through Athens County, Ohio;

H. R. 9326. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to carry into effect provisions of the convention between the United States and Great Britain to regulate the level of Lake of the Woods concluded on the 24th day of February, 1925," approved May 22, 1926, as amended;

H. R. 9599. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out his 10-year cooperative program for

the eradication, suppression, or bringing under control of predatory and other wild animals injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry, wild game, and other interests, and for the suppression of rabies and tularemia in predatory or other wild animals, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12966. An act authorizing H. C. Brenner Realty & Finance Corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near a point between Cherokee and Osage Streets, St. Louis, Mo.;

H. R. 13262. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to donate to the city of Oakland, Calif., certain guns and mounts that were formerly in service on the Coast Guard cutter *Bear*;

H. R. 13522. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the State of Florida the silver service set donated to the U. S. S. *Florida* by the people of Florida;

H. R. 14043. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lease Governors Island, Mass., to the city of Boston, Mass., and for other purposes;

H. R. 14049. An act to provide for special assessments for the paving of roadways and the laying of curbs and gutters;

H. R. 14452. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.;

H. R. 14558. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near New Martinsville, W. Va.;

H. R. 14676. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Arlington, Oreg.;

H. R. 14689. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Cairo, Ill.;

H. R. 15137. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of an overhead viaduct across the Mahoning River at or near Niles, Trumbull County, Ohio;

H. R. 15276. An act authorizing the States of Alabama and Mississippi, through their respective highway departments, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Escatawpa River at or near Wilmer, Ala., and Latonia, Miss., connecting Mobile County, Ala., and George County, Miss.;

H. R. 15366. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River near Bemidji, Minn.;

H. R. 15433. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Little Calumet River on South Halsted Street at One hundred and thirtieth Street, in Cook County, State of Illinois;

H. R. 15434. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Fox River at Algonquin, in McHenry County, State of Illinois;

H. R. 15931. An act to provide for the relocation of statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins;

H. R. 16078. An act to amend the act approved June 2, 1930, providing for a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt for his leadership in the cause of forest conservation;

H. R. 16297. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), and acts amendatory thereof;

H. J. Res. 416. Joint resolution to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the expenses of participation by the United States in the International Exposition of Colonial and Overseas Countries to be held at Paris, France, in 1931; and

H. J. Res. 462. Joint resolution to further provide for defraying the expenses of the International Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. PARTRIDGE presented the following resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, which were referred to the Committee on Finance:

Whereas the United States Government has established a policy of constructing hospitals for the care of the veterans of the various wars; and

Whereas Vermont is one of the few States for which hospitals have not been built; and

Whereas there now appears a real need for hospital facilities for Vermont, and this will become increasingly great within the next few years; and

Whereas it is undeniably true that the scenic advantages of Vermont are unsurpassed and that Vermont is renowned for the purity of its air and water and the health of its climate, making it an ideal location for a veterans' hospital: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont memorialize the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of such legislation as will enable the Veterans' Bureau to build a veterans' hospital in the State of Vermont for the care of sick and disabled veterans and for the housing of veterans' activities of the Federal Government; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each member of the Vermont delegation in the Congress.

EDWARD H. DEAVITT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
BENJAMIN WILLIAMS,
President of the Senate.

Approved January 28, 1931.

STANLEY C. WILSON, *Governor.*
STATE OF VERMONT,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of joint resolution relating to disabled veterans' hospital in Vermont approved January 28, 1931.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal at Montpelier this 30th day of January, A. D. 1931.

[SEAL.]

RAWSON C. MYNCK,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a petition of sundry citizens of Dallas, Tex., protesting against delay in considering the World Court protocols until next December and praying for their ratification this winter or spring, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Melbourne and Eau Gallie, Fla., praying for the passage of legislation for the barring of all immigration for a period of not less than two years, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Melbourne and Eau Gallie, Fla., praying for an amendment of the Constitution of the United States excluding aliens from the count of the whole number of persons in each State in apportioning Representatives among the several States according to their respective numbers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TYDINGS presented resolutions adopted by Annapolis Lodge, No. 622, Benevolent Protective Order of Elks, of Annapolis; Montfaucon Post, No. 4, the American Legion; and the Fleet Reserve Association, Branch No. 6, both of Baltimore, Md., favoring the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates of ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Maryland branch of the League of Nations Association in conjunction with the History Teachers' Association of Maryland, favoring the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE presented a petition signed by 505 citizens of the State of California, praying for the passage of the so-called Capper-Kelly bill, being the bill (H. R. 11) to protect trade-mark owners, distributors, and the public against injurious and uneconomic practices in the distribution of articles of standard quality under a distinguishing trade-mark, brand, or name, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH presented petitions numerous signed by sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying

for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WALCOTT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Cheshire and Hartford, Conn., praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented letters in the nature of petitions from the First Church of Christ, Scientist, of Norwalk; the First Church of Christ, Scientist, of Danbury; the First Church of Christ, Scientist, of Meriden; and the First Church of Christ, Scientist, Stamford, all in the State of Connecticut, praying of the passage of the so-called Vestal copyright bill, which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented petitions of the Lebanon League of Women Voters, of Lebanon, and sundry citizens of Granby, New London, Hartford, East Hartford, West Hartford, and Windsor, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the State Institute, under the auspices of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, at Clinton, Conn., favoring the passage of legislation for the Federal supervision of motion-picture films, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. MORROW presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions numerous signed by sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. COUZENS. I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Detroit News of January 31, entitled "Mr. Mellon and the Veterans' Bonus, So Called." I desire particularly to have this called to the Senate's attention at this time because of the position the Secretary of the Treasury takes on the so-called payment of adjusted compensation.

In view of the great Secretary being alleged to have served under three Presidents, I desire to point out that the fact of the matter is that three Presidents have served under the Secretary of the Treasury.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News of January 31, 1931]

MR. MELLON AND THE VETERANS' BONUS, SO CALLED

It must have been a painful surprise to the whilom acclaimers of Andrew Mellon as "the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Alexander Hamilton" to read his statement Wednesday to the Senate Finance Committee that the cash redemption of the soldiers' delayed compensation certificates "would upset the Nation's financial structure and greatly disturb world equilibrium."

Probably even more surprising was his assertion that, according to present indications, the Government would face a deficit of \$375,000,000 at the end of the current fiscal year—which certainly doesn't speak so well for the management of a National Treasury that for 14 years has been in receipt of the largest public revenues in the history of the world.

Elaborating his claim that the payment of the bonus would be an extremely hazardous undertaking, the Secretary thus expressed himself to the Senate committee:

"I can say without qualification that the Treasury Department could not sell \$3,400,000,000 of bonds at the present time except on terms which it would be very hard to justify and without complete disorganization of the Government and other security markets."

Without venturing at this time to challenge the soundness of the Secretary's opinion as to the difficulty of floating a \$3,400,000,000 Government loan, we can not refrain from calling attention to the striking contrasts between the picture which he draws of American financial conditions in 1931 and that which Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart has painted of them in 1917, the year we entered

the World War. In the brief but comprehensive history of the United States from 1910 to 1925 which he wrote for the thirteenth edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica, Professor Hart thus describes the marvelous and rejoicing ease with which the United States raised literally tens of billions of dollars in that grand and glorious time when to stand at Armageddon and battle for the Lord was all in the day's work:

"Soon after the declaration of war by the United States, missions from the various allied countries were sent to America. The British mission, headed by Lord Balfour, British Foreign Secretary, reached Halifax April 20 and proceeded to Washington. The French mission, headed by Rene Viviani, the former premier, and including Marshal Joffre, landed April 24. Other missions came from Italy, Belgium, Russia, Rumania, and Japan. The United States was able at once to help the western Allies in their pressing financial difficulties. Taxes were low and little felt; money abounded. Under acts of Congress beginning October 17, 1917, the Allies received essential credits, which amounted eventually to \$9,500,000,000. These enormous payments were made possible by the Liberty loans. In June, 1917, 4,000,000 people joined in offering \$3,000,000,000 to the Government; and at the end of the war the interest-bearing debt had increased from \$972,469,000 on December 31, 1916, to \$25,234,496,000 in 1919. These loans were supplemented by the war revenue act (October 17, 1917) and later statutes, which laid a variety of new taxes, increased the income tax heavily, and combined with it an excess-profits tax to bring into the Treasury unreasonable profits likely to be made in the war industries."

Such is the glowing account which Professor Hart gives us of the generous way in which America, which was then the bread basket and cream jug of the allied powers, responded to the Macedonian cry of the visiting European missions for unlimited supplies of money and materials, although we notice that he neglects to tell us that when all the war expenses had been totaled up the American people found that they had paid over \$36,000,000,000 for the luxury of hating the Kaiser and fighting for an "idealism" which made them the partners of those European rulers and diplomatic feudists whose measureless ambition had given the world over to misery and death.

He also forgets to state that the "new taxes," including the excess-profits tax, still left a sufficiently wide margin of "unreasonable profits" to create more than 15,000 new millionaires in this country, not to speak of promoting the greatest "melon cutting" in the shape of extra cash and stock dividends in the history of modern industry and finance. All of which, it is hardly necessary to say, has laid a tremendous mortgage on coming American generations.

And what have we got out of it all? It seems to the News the answer to that question was given for us and for all the other warring nations by John Bright, the great English champion of justice and peace, in his memorable protest in 1854 against the Crimean War:

"The past events of our history have taught me that the intervention of this country in European wars is not only unnecessary but calamitous; that we have rarely come out of such intervention having succeeded in the objects we fought for. I believe if this country, 70 years ago, had adopted the principle of nonintervention in every case where her interests were not directly and obviously assailed, that she would have been saved from much of the pauperism and brutal crimes by which our government and people have alike been disgraced. This country might have been a garden, every dwelling might have been of marble, and every person who treads its soil might have been sufficiently educated. We should have less of military glory. We might have neither Trafalgar nor Waterloo; but we should have set the high example of a Christian nation, free in its institutions, courteous and just in its conduct toward all foreign states, and resting its policy on the unchangeable foundation of Christian morality."

Inasmuch as Woodrow Wilson himself admitted that our interests were not "directly and obviously assailed" by the Germanic powers (an opinion that has been emphatically expressed by nearly all of the authoritative governmental and military spokesmen for our late "noble democratic allies") and that we came out of the horrible conflict "without having succeeded in the objects we fought for," or rather which we professed to be fighting for, it would seem that Bright's noble protest against English intervention in foreign wars holds just as righteous condemnation of our own Government as it did for his government when he uttered it 77 years ago.

It is always an irreparably costly business—this paying the fiddler after the mad international war dance. But inasmuch as our Government, after the war was over, generously handed several billion dollars to various European nations because their war veterans and people were hard up, it does seem an unquestionable duty for our Government to be equally generous to its own war veterans when they are hard up. It may be difficult, as Secretary Mellon says; but what of it? Many duties are difficult, but nevertheless have to be performed. We are sure the people of the United States will support the Government in paying the full value of the so-called bonus certificates at once with much greater enthusiasm than they would show for cancellation of the foreign debts. And yet the advocates of that cancellation are the ones most opposed to payment of the veterans' certificates.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. COUZENS. As in open executive session, I desire to report back to the Senate, without recommendation, the

nominations of the three Power commissioners that were referred to the committee.

Mr. COUZENS, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which had been recommitted the following nominations for membership on the Federal Power Commission, reported them without recommendation, and they were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar:

George Otis Smith, of Maine;
Marcel Garsaud, of Louisiana; and
Claude L. Draper, of Wyoming.

REPORTS OF NOMINATIONS

As in executive session,

Mr. SHORTRIDGE, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nominations of several officers in the Customs Service, which were placed on the Executive Calendar.

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Manufactures, to which was referred the bill (S. 5904) relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed on public buildings of the United States and the District of Columbia by contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1445) thereon.

Mr. COUZENS, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 3199) authorizing refunds to certain railroads of interest erroneously collected on account of overpayments under sections 209 and 212 of the transportation act, 1920, as amended, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1446) thereon.

Mr. NORBECK, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11285) to amend the Alaska game law, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1447) thereon.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 5810) to facilitate the use and occupancy of national-forest lands for purposes of residence, recreation, education, industry, and commerce, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1448) thereon.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10380) adjusting the salaries of the Naval Academy Band, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1449) thereon.

Mr. FESS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14) to make the Star-Spangled Banner the national anthem of the United States of America, reported it without amendment.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. FESS:

A bill (S. 6002) for the relief of Eva A. Kramer (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 6003) to authorize reinstatement of war-risk insurance of John D. Deardourff, deceased (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PARTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 6004) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Greene; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 6005) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Scappoose Bay, Columbia River, Oreg.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 6006) for the rehabilitation of the Stanfield project, Oregon; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

A bill (S. 6007) for the relief of John W. Beck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 6008) to authorize and direct the appointment of Levin Milton Price as a first lieutenant, United States Army (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEAN:

A bill (S. 6009) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Douglass (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A bill (S. 6010) granting a pension to Ruth L. Retan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRAZIER (by request):

A bill (S. 6011) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to purchase certain land in California for addition to the Cahuilla Indian Reservation, and issuance of a patent to the band of Indians therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 6012) for the relief of Alfred L. Hudson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 6013) granting a pension to Alice Clyde Stafford; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 6014) to provide a public terminal aviation field at Governors Island, N. Y., and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 6015) providing for the retirement of certain Medical Reserve officers of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS:

A bill (S. 6016) granting an increase of pension to Mary McLaughlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 6017) granting a pension to Christine Pedderson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 6018) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Hastings, Minn.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. REED:

(By request.) A bill (S. 6019) to amend the World War Veterans' act, 1924, as amended; and

(By request.) A bill (S. 6020) to provide for the establishment of a permanent medical service in the United States Veterans' Bureau; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 6021) granting a pension to Gwennie A. Philson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HATFIELD:

A bill (S. 6022) to establish a term of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at Huntington, W. Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 6023) to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society United States Daughters of 1812 in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEIWER:

A bill (S. 6024) relating to the improvement of the Willamette River between Oregon City and Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 6025) for the relief of Patrick J. Lynch; and
A bill (S. 6026) for the relief of Edward M. Watts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 6027) to provide for an investigation and report of losses resulting from the campaign for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruit fly; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 6028) authorizing the erection of a monument to the memory of Sacajawea or Bird Woman; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 6029) granting a pension to Philip Gump, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

(By request.) A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 245) authorizing the Secretary of War to cooperate with the county of Allegheny, Pa., in the construction of a bridge across the Allegheny River in connection with the modification of Lock and Dam No. 2, Allegheny River, now authorized by law; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GOFF:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 246) authorizing the placing in the Capitol of a statue in honor of the American mother and other patriotic women of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

REDEMPTION OF INTERNAL-REVENUE STAMPS

Mr. HARRISON (for Mr. SIMMONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. SIMMONS to the bill (H. R. 10658) to amend section 1 of the act of May 12, 1900 (ch. 393, 31 Stat. 177), as amended (U. S. C., sec. 1174, ch. 21, title 26), which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL—RECONSTRUCTION OF SENATE WING OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. COPELAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 16654, the legislative appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 24, after line 4, insert the following:

"The unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$500,000 for the reconstruction of the Senate wing of the Capitol, contained in the legislative appropriation act for the fiscal year 1929, is hereby continued and made available until expended."

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES

Messages in writing from the President of the United States making nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, which messages were subsequently referred to the appropriate committees.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 6810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept, without cost to the Government of the United States, a lighter-than-air base, near Sunnyvale, in the county of Santa Clara, State of California, and construct necessary improvements thereon;

H. R. 13262. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to donate to the city of Oakland, Calif., certain guns and mounts that were formerly in service on the Coast Guard cutter *Bear*; and

H. R. 13522. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the State of Florida the silver service set donated to the U. S. S. *Florida* by the people of Florida; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 6867. An act to authorize appropriations for construction of a storehouse for ammunition at Fort Benjamin Harrison; and

H. R. 14043. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lease Governors Island, Mass., to the city of Boston, Mass., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 14049. An act to provide for special assessments for the paving of roadways and the laying of curbs and gutters; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 8736. An act to authorize and direct a preliminary examination of the Hocking River for the distance that it flows through Athens County, Ohio;

H. R. 12966. An act authorizing H. C. Brenner Realty & Finance Corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near a point between Cherokee and Osage Streets, St. Louis, Mo.;

H. R. 14452. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.;

H. R. 14558. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near New Martinsville, W. Va.;

H. R. 14676. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Arlington, Oreg.;

H. R. 14689. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Cairo, Ill.;

H. R. 15137. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of an overhead viaduct across the Mahoning River at or near Niles, Trumbull County, Ohio;

H. R. 15276. An act authorizing the States of Alabama and Mississippi, through their respective highway departments, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Escatawpa River at or near Wilmer, Ala., and Latonia, Miss., connecting Mobile County, Ala., and George County, Miss.;

H. R. 15366. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River near Bemidji, Minn.;

H. R. 15433. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Little Calumet River on South Halsted Street at One hundred and thirtieth Street, in Cook County, State of Illinois; and

H. R. 15434. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Fox River at Algonquin, in McHenry County, State of Illinois; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 9599. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out his 10-year cooperative program for the eradication, suppression, or bringing under control of predatory and other wild animals injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry, wild game, and other interests, and for the suppression of rabies and tularemia in predatory or other wild animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 15931. An act to provide for the relocation of statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins; and

H. R. 16078. An act to amend the act approved June 2, 1930, providing for a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt for his leadership in the cause of forest conservation; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 16297. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), and acts amendatory thereof; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 9326. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to carry into effect provisions of the convention between the United States and Great Britain to regulate the level of Lake of the Woods concluded on the 24th day of February, 1925," approved May 22, 1926, as amended;

H. J. Res. 416. Joint resolution to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the expenses of participation by the United States in the International Exposition of Colonial and Overseas Countries to be held at Paris, France, in 1931; and

H. J. Res. 462. Joint resolution to further provide for defraying the expenses of the International Water Commission, United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

GEORGE ROGERS CLARK SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2643) to amend the joint resolution establishing the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission, approved May 23, 1928, which was, on page 1, to strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive, and insert:

That there is authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated by the joint resolution establishing the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission, approved May 23, 1928, the sum of \$500,000. Appropriations made under this act and under such joint resolution shall not exceed

\$1,500,000, and shall not be in excess of such contributions of the State of Indiana, the county of Knox, the city of Vincennes, and other contributors (other than the United States), as have been or may be expended for the purposes specified herein, or as have been or may be made available solely for the purposes specified herein. Sums appropriated under this act or hereafter appropriated under such joint resolution, or heretofore appropriated under such joint resolution and unexpended on the date of the enactment of this act, shall be available for expenditure solely for the purposes of acquiring, grading, improving, and embellishing the site of and grounds adjacent to Fort Sackville, the erection of a monumental memorial structure and its ornamentation, the ornamentation of a bridge across the Wabash River adjacent thereto to be constructed by the State of Indiana and the State of Illinois, the protection of the grounds by a river wall, and the administrative expenses of the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission.

Mr. FESS. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I wish the Senator would explain the amendment.

Mr. FESS. The bill as passed by the Senate included an appropriation of \$750,000. The House cut down the amount to \$500,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the amendment of the House.

The amendment was concurred in.

Mr. FESS subsequently said: Mr. President, out of order I want to make a unanimous-consent request. Earlier in the day a message came over from the House of Representatives setting out the amendment to the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission bill. I moved to concur in the amendment made by the House. I was told that the only item in the amendment was a reduction from \$750,000 to \$500,000. Thinking that was all there was in the amendment, I moved to concur. My attention was called at once to a long-involved amendment which affected the original appropriation, and we do not want to concur with that. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment was concurred in be reconsidered and that the bill be sent to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered, the bill will be sent to conference, and the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Mr. FESS, Mr. HOWELL, and Mr. MCKELLAR.

"FREEDOM OF THE SEAS"

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article by J. M. Kenworthy, member of Parliament, on the subject of "Freedom of the Seas."

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

The article is as follows:

[From the New York Times, January 29, 1931]

FREEDOM OF SEAS—BRITISH AUTHORITY VIEWS IT IN RELATION TO GENEVA CONFERENCE

(By J. M. Kenworthy, M. P., lieutenant commander, Royal Navy)

LONDON, January 28.—The maintenance of aggressive armaments is a barometer of international relations. Failure to make substantial reductions in weapons is a symptom that the disease of war is still latent, especially in the European body politic.

Whereas before the great "war to end war" \$3,500,000,000 was spent annually by the nations of the world in preparations for war, to-day they are spending \$5,000,000,000, and this despite the compulsory limitation of the armaments of Germany, Austria, etc., and the world-wide economic crisis which has resulted in the impoverishment of large classes of populations everywhere.

Just a year from now—in February, 1932—a world conference on disarmament will assemble. Attended by all states which are members of the League of Nations and by the United States, Russia, and Turkey, it will mark the crisis in the attempts to secure the reduction of weapons of war. If the conference fails, no informed person will guarantee the peace of Europe, and therefore the world, even until 1940.

There will be an almost irresistible demand by Germany to be allowed to rearm, the rivalry between two potentially hostile groups of nations, headed, respectively, by France and Italy, will be accentuated, and it will be doubtful if the recently improved relations between England and America can continue.

NAVAL REDUCTION FIRST

Now the great military powers will never consent to substantial reductions of their armaments on land and in the air unless the naval powers are prepared to reduce their equipment substantially. No nation can to-day tolerate the possibility of its sea-borne trade being interfered with as it has been in the past,

Naval armaments are different from land armaments in that they are more easily limited because they are less easily concealed, and yet at the same time they contain the greatest menace to other nations. For example, Japan might maintain a standing army of 5,000,000 conscript soldiers, and no one anywhere would lose a night's sleep. But if Japan proceeded to double or treble her present naval forces, there would be alarms and panics not only on the Pacific coast but also in Canada, Australia, India, and especially Great Britain. Again, only the nations on her border are alarmed at the Russian land armies, but a great increase in the Russian naval force, especially of submarines, would be felt by every nation whose shores are washed either by the Mediterranean or the Baltic.

WILSON'S DOCTRINE SOUND

The history of attempts to reduce naval armaments since the end of the war, even including those at the peace conference itself, proves to the hilt the necessity of an honest acceptance of President Wilson's doctrine of freedom of the seas, which was only a restatement of the doctrine favored by generations of statesmen of the American Republic. In a world organized for peace the seas, outside of the recognized 3-mile territorial limit, should be free for the merchandise of all nations in peace or in war. To-day every civilized State is dependent for its prosperity on overseas trade. Apart from the growing importance of America's export trade she is dependent on overseas supplies of rubber and certain metals, such as tin. Great Britain and Japan can be starved out by a hunger blockade. Italy is particularly vulnerable, as holding the Straits of Gibraltar at one end of the Mediterranean and the Suez Canal at the other would strangle her commercially.

At the London naval conference last year France and Italy asked that this question of blockade be settled. France demands a bigger navy than Italy because not only must she secure her military lines of communication with northern Africa across the Mediterranean but her Atlantic trade routes are liable to interruption. The Italian demand of parity is based on the sound strategic argument that in case of war with France the bulk of the French forces would be concentrated in the Mediterranean to cut off her sea-borne commerce.

The second of President Wilson's 14 points for peace on which Germany undertook to lay down arms read as follows: "Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants." There was some demur on the part of Great Britain after the Germans had accepted these terms, and the British Government obtained the temporary support of France. Rather than recommence shooting, the matter was left in abeyance. It is known that President Wilson attempted to revive it at the peace conference and have a provision for freedom of the seas included in the peace treaties. But he was stoutly resisted by Lloyd George, the then Prime Minister, claiming to have an agreement with the opposition in the British Parliament. Supported again by France for diplomatic reasons, he overbore Mr. Wilson, and the provision for freedom of the seas was left out of the peace treaties. To this omission can be traced the naval rivalry which began in England, America, and Japan before the ink on the peace treaty was dry.

QUESTION AGAIN DODGED

With a view to checking this rivalry the Washington Naval Conference of 1920-21 was called. Again the question of the use of navies on trade routes in the event of future wars was dodged. As a consequence, although the building of great battleships was checked, a new rivalry commenced in England and America in the construction of cruising vessels, which were not limited as to numbers; and France and Italy immensely strengthened their flotillas of light vessels, especially submarines. At that time cruisers and flotillas were the greatest menace to commerce.

In an attempt to check the new cruiser rivalry, the Geneva Naval Conference of 1927 was summoned. It failed completely, and to that failure can be traced the neglect of this question.

On Ramsay MacDonald's taking office for the second time as Prime Minister of England conversations between the British and American Governments were reopened and led to the naval conference of 1930. Following on the breakdown of the Geneva naval conference, conducted on the British side by a Conservative government, a resolution was passed at the Labor Party's annual conference in October of the same year at Blackpool covering this very subject. The annual conference of the Labor Party decides the policy and elects the all-powerful executive committee. Without one dissenting voice the following resolution was passed:

"The conference calls on the Government to reopen negotiations with the United States with a view to obtaining a settlement of all outstanding political questions between them, including the question of the control of the sea in war time, the conclusion of a treaty outlawing war between the two peoples, and the drastic reduction of naval armaments."

Thus fortified, it was expected that Premier MacDonald would avoid the mistakes of his predecessors in three previous conferences and agree to decide on the future use of navies in order to limit or reduce them by agreement. Other delegates from the five powers participating in the 1930 conference were still further fortified by the universal signing of the Briand-Kellogg pact for the outlawing of war. Ordinary citizens of the countries concerned, who pay taxes for preparations for war and fight and die when war breaks out, had supposed the Kellogg pact outlawed "private war." But apparently it has not outlawed private blockade!

HOLDING TO OLD DOCTRINE

The British Admiralty clings to the eighteenth and nineteenth century doctrine of sea power despite the granting of theoretical parity in navies to the United States. There are ominous signs that with naval parity within reach the American Navy Department in its turn flirts with the idea of adopting the same doctrine.

One of the mysteries of the London naval conference is why the freedom of the seas was never discussed. In private conversations British delegates swore the Americans did not wish it discussed. Likewise Americans declared solemnly that the British had asked that it be not raised. Certainly the Italians attempted to have the subject ventilated and settled, while the French Government in an official note drew attention to the fact, which was indeed obvious, that no real settlement of sea armaments could be achieved unless the future use of navies on trade routes against peaceable merchant shipping was regulated.

In any event, the whole subject was avoided. Worse, in Article XXII of the treaty, rules for the polite sinking of merchant vessels by submarines on trade routes were drawn up, although it was in order to prevent such sinkings in the future that America entered the Great War and poured out treasure and the blood of her sons.

The result was that the 1930 conference was disappointing, as might have been expected. Relations between France and Italy changed definitely for the worse. Far from reducing existing fleets, the ratio fixed will lead to an actual increase in British cruiser strength and a considerable augmentation of the British submarine fleet. If the United States decides to build up to the agreed parity it will cost her a billion dollars.

There is a slight reduction in battleship strength, but the growing school of naval expert opinion looks on the great superdreadnought battleship as obsolete, especially in view of the menace of attack from the air. These costly mastodons are really only luxuries for the wealthiest powers. Yet just as individuals sometimes ruin themselves in gratifying desires for luxuries, so can nations. If the world conference for disarmament fails next year a new race in \$45,000,000 battleships will surely start.

FREEDOM OF SEAS PARAMOUNT

Are we to learn from these lessons?

Unless the doctrine of freedom of the seas replaces the doctrine of right of blockade, real reductions in naval armaments at the conference next year will be far to seek. Then there will be no chance of obtaining corresponding reduction in military and aerial armaments and Europe will rattle on toward another war, with final ruin of the Continent and damage to the whole world as the result.

There is no time to be lost. There is just a year in which preparations can be made, conversations carried on, and, above all, education of public opinion on this question begun. There will be a far greater menace to merchant shipping, passengers, goods, and crews carried on such vessels in the next war than submarines were in the last conflict. I refer to the rapidly improving flying boats and seaplanes with aerial torpedoes and poison-gas bombs, for the use of which against merchant shipping no rules exist.

Failure of the forthcoming world conference would be the greatest disaster since the outbreak of the World War. Yet unless the highways of the seas are made free to all by honest agreement among the maritime powers its failure is practically certain.

CHAIN STORES

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the United States Daily of yesterday with reference to chain stores.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the United States Daily of Monday, February 2, 1931]

EFFECT OF CHAIN STORES ON LIFE OF COMMUNITIES—LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF WISCONSIN POINTS TO EVILS WHICH HE BELIEVES SYSTEM HAS INTRODUCED AND URGES REMEDIAL LEGISLATION

(By Henry W. Huber, Lieutenant Governor State of Wisconsin)

The day of reckoning has come with chain stores that are fast driving the country storekeeper to the wall, with consolidations of enterprises to stifle competition and boost prices on the consumer and with a growing financial dictatorship that tells the farmer what will be paid for his crops—not what the crops are worth in labor and industry.

The chain store is a vital question that strikes to the very lifeblood of society. This question is not only attracting the attention of the people of Wisconsin but of the whole Nation.

What has become of the neighbor who ran a grocery store and bought the products of the near-by farmer? He has been crowded out by the chain grocer. Maybe members of the community may save a few pennies on a package of raisins or a dozen oranges, but they have lost a real citizen in their community. In the place of the home grocer has come the clerk for the chain grocery, whose home is in some far-away city and who is interested only in sales, the profits of which take wing out of the community.

What has become of the home-owned city meat market? It has become an adjunct of a distant city-owned packing house or unit in a chain of butcher shops interested more in volume of trade than in the question of how advanced is the city or how much better is school and community life.

What has become of the general merchandise store? It is now owned by a New York chain that demands the profits of the

day's business for use in Wall Street almost before the sales of the day can be checked.

Monopoly has seized the commercial life of village and city for a ruthless exploitation that is planned and managed from Wall Street. Monopoly is interested only in profits. Monopoly wants a quick return and the highest cash profit it can get and still hold the business. Chain monopoly is fast sapping the rich blood of community life. It is the most blighting curse that has struck this country.

The chain-store issue is a form of monopoly that strikes at the very root of the home. Ordinarily in discussing a monopoly the effect has been so far away that people can not readily understand the evil of the system. But in the chain-store monopoly people will become interested. It is the greatest evil of any system of monopoly that has ever come into existence, because it aims at the home.

Should the chain-store monopoly securely fasten itself upon Wisconsin, our children's children will be like peasants and the property which rightfully belongs to them will be owned and controlled by absentee landlords in the large community centers.

It is reported "that in one State alone over 300 stores went out of business during a period of a little more than three years; that 61 chain stores are now filling the places once occupied by these 300 independent stores." That is exactly what is taking place with the mercantile establishments of every State in this Union.

Scores and scores of small towns have been wiped off the map, so to speak, and homes and business buildings of such towns are of little value.

The chain store must be met by an educated opposition. Wisconsin business men should take a lesson from California. Independent grocers there have formed themselves in federations and have been able to so organize that the inroads of chain stores have been effectively checked. There should be organizations to study legislation which will work out a plan or plans which will no longer give advantages of taxation to the chain stores which are not enjoyed by the independent enterprise.

Such legislation should check deceptive advertising by these stores. The man who buys soap of a well-known brand for a cent less in a chain store seldom discovers that he has bought an ounce smaller bar. The same is true with the sales of many canned goods. Legislation should protect the public from such practice.

Coincident with the chain-store invasion in the last few years, the resources of the State banks of Wisconsin have fallen off more than \$45,000,000. Before then they were increasing, and in 1927 the increase was \$22,000,000. The resources of Wisconsin State banks of December 31, 1927, were \$637,600,000. On December 31, 1929, the resources of Wisconsin State banks as recently announced by the banking department were \$591,200,000. The decline in the year 1929 was about \$20,000,000.

Community life is being robbed of its profits and its industries. Chain stores, chain oil stations, chain drug stores, chain insurance companies, and mail-order houses are taking the profits of the storekeeper and the farmer and the business man of Wisconsin and distributing it outside of the State.

There are those who say that other factors—the decline of farm values, expansion, and speculation—have caused this depletion of the resources of Wisconsin banks. These other factors may have had a part, but an important rôle was played by the chain system.

The six big national chains operating in this State have increased their stores in the Nation 144 per cent between 1920 and 1928. These same stores increased their national sales 176 per cent in the same period.

While the farmer has found it difficult to hold on to his acres and labor has been often out of employment, the chain-store magicians of finance have been increasing their stores and business all over the Nation.

If further evidence were wanted, it is to be found in the bankruptcy records of Wisconsin. There were 61 merchant bankruptcies in Wisconsin in 1921; there were 243 in 1928, and 229 in the year 1929. The home merchant has been ruined financially by the hole-in-the-wall chain store, which has little invested, pays comparatively little in taxes, and makes no contributions to community progress. The chain absentee ownership system of merchandising is rapidly forcing home activities out of business. The percentage of failure to total operating commercial concerns in 1920 was about one-fourth of 1 per cent. In 1929 the per cent of failure had jumped to almost 1 per cent.

The idea of merging all kindred enterprises has seized the commercial life of village and city for a ruthless exploitation. In hundreds of cities of this country independent merchants that have been the support and brace for upbuilding community life have been sucked into a merging vortex, designed and planned to drain elsewhere the profits of community activity.

Financially, a great many smaller cities of this country will become mere suburbs. The independent community life of many a city and hamlet of this Nation that has been the pride of citizens is to be turned into a financial vassalage.

Congress and the legislature are now in session. I sincerely hope some constructive legislation will be enacted to curb the unfair practices and monopolistic tendencies of the chain system.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that

the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 16415, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, as announced the other day, I shall pursue the same policy, and therefore object to the request of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I feel under the circumstances that I am justified in moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 16415) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. JONES. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments may be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I dislike to object to the Senator's request, but so far as I have any knowledge the bill has just been brought to our attention. None of us, except members of the committee, have had an opportunity to read it and the only opportunity we will have to learn of its contents will be by having the bill read now. I think in the interest of expedition it will be better to have the bill read at length so that Senators may be advised of its contents.

Mr. JONES. Does the Senator object to dispensing with the formal reading of the bill?

Mr. KING. I do not like to object, but I ask the Senator, in view of the fact that so few Senators are familiar with the contents of the bill, if it would not be better to pursue the course which I have indicated?

Mr. JONES. I want to see if I understand the Senator. Of course, the formal reading of the bill might be dispensed with and then the bill read word for word for amendment, the committee amendments to be disposed of first, and then, of course, the bill would be open to individual amendments. Does the Senator object to pursuing that course?

Mr. KING. No; I have no objection to that course.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, we all know that the reading of an appropriation bill for action on the committee amendments receives very little attention as a usual practice. Senators are not then in attendance in any considerable number. Later on when debate on the bill begins and attention is called sometimes to committee amendments which have been agreed to informally without any debate or any special consideration it becomes necessary to reconsider some of the committee amendments in order to have a fair consideration of them. When a Senator wants to have a reconsideration of a committee amendment which was adopted under those circumstances, it has been the custom that there would be no objection; but we found in the consideration of a recent appropriation bill that there was a good deal of difficulty about that and it was necessary to make a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to. If we can have an understanding that under the conditions I have mentioned the Senator from Washington will not object if some Senator later on wants to reconsider a committee amendment, I would have no objection to his request.

Mr. JONES. I would have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RELIEF OF SUFFERERS FROM DROUGHT

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, several times during the discussion of emergency measures it has been

pointed out that the limitations imposed in the act itself and by regulations relating to the feed, seed, and fertilizer loan fund will make it difficult, if not impossible, to use a large part of the fund. I have received literally dozens of telegrams relating to that subject. Among them is a message which was received this morning from the mayor of the town of England, Ark., which place has become somewhat well known because of the incident which occurred there when several hundred people appeared and demanded food. I send to the desk the telegram referred to and ask that the Secretary read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

ENGLAND, ARK., February 2, 1931.

HON. JOE T. ROBINSON:

Unless something is done in the feed line of livestock at least 85 per cent of land will not be cultivated around England. Banks unable furnish funds to buy feed. Stock unable to work. Any number have died. Something must be done. Please wire your answer. This telegram is sent at the request of approximately 20 of our large planters who are unable to finance their own plantations.

W. O. WILLIAMS, Mayor.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I also send to the desk the answer to the telegram and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 3, 1931.

MR. W. O. WILLIAMS,
Mayor, England, Ark.:

Your message received. The only Federal funds available for feed are carried in the \$45,000,000 loan bill, and use of that is limited to work stock. Pending set-up for administration of feed loan bill, Red Cross has in some instances made advances for feed; but I do not think there is any claim that requirements in this particular are being met. The bill authorizing loans to supply the Capital Stock of Agricultural Credit Corporation passed the Senate two weeks ago, but no action yet in the House. It is believed this will finally become law, but whether it will pass House and be put into operation in time to save large numbers of livestock from dying of starvation I can give no assurance.

JOE T. ROBINSON.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I also send to the desk a telegram from Mr. F. B. Murphy, of Paris, Ark., that town being located in the western part of the State. I understand that Mr. Murphy is well acquainted with conditions in his county. His message relates to the administration of the seed loan fund. I ask that this telegram may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

PARIS, ARK., January 30, 1931.

Senator JOE T. ROBINSON:

No applications complete. Farmers afraid of restrictions. Making no headway. Soon be too late.

F. B. MURPHY.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I also send to the desk a telegram from the county agent in Grant County, Ark., which is in the central southern portion of the State, and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegram will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SHERIDAN, ARK., January 31, 1931.

JOE T. ROBINSON,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Our farmers reluctant to mortgage all crops for seed, feed, and fertilizer. Fear that they can not obtain food for families will prevent many using loans. Red Cross here holds out no assurance that they can continue to meet the demands along this line.

W. B. VINZAND, County Agent.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I also send to the desk a telegram from the Sheridan Rotary Club of Sheridan, Ark., relating to the same subject, which I ask may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegram will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SHERIDAN, ARK., February 2, 1931.

JOE T. ROBINSON,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Many of our farmers hesitate to mortgage crops for feed, seed, and fertilizer without some provision for food during the crop season assured. Many will not be able to take advantage of loans this reason. Red Cross gives no assurance aid will continue through crop season.

SHERIDAN ROTARY CLUB.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, Col. Elgan C. Robertson, who is chairman of the feed-loan organization in Lee County, in the State of Arkansas, recently declared that, in his opinion, it was doubtful whether a single farmer in Lee County would be able to avail himself of the fund under the seed and feed loan bill for the reason that it is equally, if not more, essential to secure food for those who work the crops, and that the mere supplying of feed to work stock does not solve the problem. I ask to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Arkansas Democrat, one of the leading daily newspapers of the State of Arkansas, relating to this phase of the subject.

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

The editorial is as follows:

[From Arkansas Democrat, January 30, 1931]

THE FIRST FEDERAL LOAN

M. Williams, Greene County farmer, is selected to receive the first Federal drought loan granted an Arkansas applicant. He applied for a \$75 loan. His application said he had an 80-acre farm near Lefe, Ark., and will plant 29 acres. Ten acres will be in cotton, 14 in corn, 3 in oats, and 2 in hay.

Accompanying announcement of the loan comes a statement from the chief loan administrator in which he denounces as "ridiculous" the contentions of certain Arkansians that Federal seed and feed loan allowances are insufficient for Arkansas cotton farmers.

Col. Elgan C. Robertson, chairman of the feed-loan organization in Lee County, had told newspaper men that he doubted a single farmer in Lee County would be able to take advantage of these loans. What farmers of Lee and other counties in this section need, he said, is not so much seed and fertilizer as feed for livestock.

This brought the retort from the food administrator that "we won't have any trouble getting rid of the money." Colonel Robertson had declared that \$30 a head to buy feed for stock for the work season was only half enough. But the administrator says allowances were based on a survey and "we know what the actual cost in each section is."

We quote these two authorities merely to show that the Federal feed and seed loan policy apparently is based on the theory that just enough to avoid starvation is enough to lend the farmer—a policy now being followed by the Red Cross in distribution of food.

J. W. Sargent, county agent for Pulaski County, says more than half the applicants for Government loans in this county will be able to qualify. That is good news, but what of the applicants in other counties? How many will be able to meet the requirements necessary to get money for their crops?

What of the farmers who have ownings sufficiently large to be known as "plantations"? Ninety-five per cent of such farmers not only have on their hands the burden of buying feed and seed, but the problem of feeding their tenants or share croppers. What can or will be done for those drought sufferers?

Of course, any amount loaned to any number of farmers, regardless of how few they are, is welcome. But let it not be thought that Federal farm loans is going to solve our agricultural problem as a whole. They will help a little, but mighty little, and the sooner that fact is realized the better.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, sufficient time will be taken to point out to Senators that the only emergency measure which has so far passed Congress, save the bill for the speeding up of certain construction, under which latter bill little has been done, is the seed loan bill, and while a liberal sum was appropriated for the purposes of that measure, the restrictions in the act, and in the regulations for its administration, are of such a nature that very little benefit is to be expected from it.

I wish to take this occasion to say, in a very few words, what I think the Senate fully realizes, namely, that there has been a display of indifference or inefficiency in the disposition of emergency measures which the Senate almost unanimously recognizes as necessary, which is almost incomprehensible; certainly such a course is inexplicable. Does not everyone realize that the proper way to deal with matters

of this kind is promptly and decisively? Who fails to realize that indecision and hesitation and indifference merely defer the day when some decisive action must be taken or the most serious results accepted?

Does anyone believe that he who promoted and insisted upon the appropriation of \$25,000,000 from the Federal Treasury to feed starving Russians and \$100,000,000 to supply the wants of other foreigners is moved by considerations of sound economics in opposing any appropriation from the Federal Treasury for the benefit of hundreds of thousands of fellow Americans who are threatened with starvation? Does any newspaper editor or newspaper correspondent believe that Members of the House of Representatives who voted to impose on the Red Cross the distribution of \$25,000,000 for the aid and encouragement and relief of drought sufferers in the Soviet Republics of Russia or who voted and insisted upon imposing on the Red Cross the obligation to distribute \$100,000,000 for the benefit of Europeans, who were not worse off than hundreds of thousands of American citizens now are, were moved by the desire then to destroy or embarrass the Red Cross? Do we not all recognize the fact that the claim made by the leader of the majority in the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Rules in that body that to consider an appropriation for the benefit of starving Americans is so violative of sound principles of government that it must not be contemplated for a moment is an example of hypocrisy that must shock those who are familiar with the fact that both those gentlemen in the Russian case and in the Belgian case recognized the principle as wholly sound and consistent?

At another time it is my purpose to go into this subject more fully. The best brief statement I have seen giving emphasis to the incorrectness of the position taken by those who now declare that it is an unconscionable act to divide the burden of paying the expense of the relief required between the generous hearted whose benevolence has already been taxed almost to complete exhaustion by steady and continuous drafts and the Federal Treasury is by the St. Louis Star of January 31. Does it not seem strange that they who thought it advantageous to make liberal appropriations from the Federal Treasury for the benefit of foreign sufferers now find it worthy of condemnation even to seek a measure of relief for Americans and impose a part of the burden on the whole people of this Nation?

What is there bad or unfair in asking all the people to contribute something in this great crisis? How is it sound and just to insist that those who are generous must be made to bear the entire expense or no relief shall be granted?

I ask that the clerk read and I call the attention of Senators to the statements and arguments in the editorial published in the St. Louis Star of January 31.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Star of January 31, 1931]

LOAVES AND FISHES

What would be thought of our military commanders if, in conducting a war, they refused to maintain a line of communications because Caesar burned his bridges behind him?

They would be exactly on a par with those who say that the United States Government should not relieve a million starving Americans because the Roman Empire fell after distributing free corn among the poor.

Rome fell, not because free corn was distributed but because a fat and fatuous aristocracy paid no attention to conditions that made free corn necessary. But that is neither here nor there. The plain fact is that we have in the United States at this moment an emergency as unusual as war, as disrupting as war, equal to the devastating effect of war upon a civilian population. Yet, facing this emergency, the President of the United States and those sharing his philosophic detachment employ every obstructive effort to prevent it from being met as a public responsibility.

A drought, even though it affected a vast area and a vast population, could under ordinary circumstances be met by ordinary methods of relief. Chronic suffering in the cities, in ordinary times, could be handled indefinitely by the usual agencies. Unemployment, even though affecting millions, could be coped with for a brief period by the communities affected.

But we have at this time a combination of chronic suffering, unemployment, and drought piled together in the midst of a

prolonged business depression. What senseless chatter is it that says this whole extraordinary burden must be met by voluntary gifts from the generous hearted, because in some mysterious way it would be bad for everybody if everybody had to help bear the expense?

Government aid is called a "dole," and the dole is bad. Of course it is. So is war. But when you are in a war you have to fight or run away. And when conditions require Government aid to starving people you have to furnish it or run away from the responsibility.

Charity is like medicine—a bad habit, but an occasional necessity. Continued charity will ruin any man's life, no matter whether it comes from the Government, a private organization, or from the family next door. The "dole" isn't harmful to the recipient because it comes from the Government. It is dangerous because, persistently given, it means that the Nation is failing to cope with a rotten economic situation. That is what it meant in ancient Rome. That is what it means in England to-day.

Does that mean we should not meet an emergency with the concerted force and wealth of the Nation? Does it mean haggling over theories when people are starving?

Talk about the Roman corn laws! What will the historians of 4000 A. D. say if they discover from the archives of 1931 that the United States Government held 100,000,000 bushels of wheat in granaries, to avoid glutting the market with food supplies, while a million people vainly begged for flour in their cupboards and bread in their stomachs?

If Jesus came back to earth at this moment and repeated the miracle of the loaves and fishes, He would be accused of corrupting the people with a dole. The Department of Agriculture would convict Him of a plot to depress the price of wheat. He would be too dangerous a man to have out of jail, arousing discontent and disturbing the complacency of satisfied citizens and rut-minded political leaders.

Meeting an emergency ought to sharpen the vision for preventing its recurrence. Drought is beyond human control. Employment is not. Distribution is not. It is those who have no ideas for dealing with a problem in the future that fear to face it in the present.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I have here a very able editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch, a very conservative paper published in Virginia, which I ask to have read for the consideration of the Senate, and then I desire to make a few remarks about it. It is very short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reading of the editorial? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of February 3, 1931]

THE RELIEF WRANGLE

Confidence of the people in their government is seldom subjected to a test as severe as that provided by the disgraceful squabbling between the President and the Senate over the question of providing food and medical care for the million or more small farmers who were made destitute by the drought. Hoover, the great humanitarian, help of the helpless, comforter of the poor, feeder of the hungry in all other lands and nations, discovers that treating hungry Americans as we have treated hungry Belgians and Russians would violate some precious principle of our Government.

Not even during the reigns of Harding and Coolidge has the Washington arena offered a more depressing spectacle. We have grown accustomed to chief executives who played politics from night to day, who never permitted themselves the luxury of plain and honest talk on any important political issue; but for any man to be able to see only the political aspects of drought relief is to establish a new "low" in statesmanship.

It may be that the Senators who are demanding passage of the relief measure are playing politics also, but there is really little point in scrutinizing their motives. The facts—admitted by both sides—are that upwards of a million of our farm population must have aid from somewhere if they are not to suffer hunger, some of them die of starvation and others from the diseases which result from malnutrition. That is enough to know. Whatever their motives may be, those Senators who are determined to force an extra session if the relief bill is not passed are in the right. Whatever ills may come of an extra session (and they may be many) ROBINSON and his followers should disregard all fear of consequences in their fight for the relief appropriation.

And, of course, there is no earthly excuse for making that extra session necessary. The President's following can recognize and admit the inevitable and permit the relief bills to pass; or it can persist in its bullheadedness, force the extra session, and then pass the relief bill. For a group as numerous and as determined as the Democrats have mustered in the Senate must be met halfway if the measures which are necessary to the operation of the Government are to be acted upon.

President Hoover has done more than delay the extension of help to a million of our citizens who need it. He has endangered temporarily, at least, the prestige of an organization which has always had the unreserved support and sympathy and confidence of the American people. It can hardly be doubted that he has been partly responsible for the sorry figure the Red Cross has cut

in this controversy. A few weeks ago Chairman Payne appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee with the assurance that there was no need either for a Federal appropriation or a popular collection by the Red Cross. Within four days both he and Mr. Hoover had reversed themselves and called for \$10,000,000 from the people. Then it was made known that the Red Cross would not expend the \$25,000,000 even if Congress made the money available.

This quibbling over the manner and method of relief has not helped the Red Cross to raise the \$10,000,000 which it now says is needed. Nor has it silenced the relief advocates in Congress. They are more than ever determined to make available some Federal relief money before they adjourn, and they will do so, regardless of what agency assumes the responsibility of distributing it. A reasonable compromise has been suggested—and promptly turned down by the Hoover followers. It is that \$15,000,000 be appropriated, to be spent when and if the need for it becomes apparent. If the President is wise, he will exert himself to see that this compromise is accepted.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, let us in a brief way present clearly the issue that has been precipitated between the President and the Senate.

When this drought—which was the most extensive drought this country has had for more than a century—came with its devastating ruin through 22 or 23 States, the President recognized the extent of it and the destruction engendered by it; and he appointed committees in these States to devise a method of meeting the situation. They were appointed in all the States under the direction of the President and under his control. All of these representatives—the most prominent men in these States—met here, and devised a plan of giving relief to the drought-stricken region. The character of the men appointed can be recognized from the fact that the leader in Virginia was ex-Governor Byrd, one of the most prominent, conservative, thoughtful business men of our State.

These men met, conferred with the Secretary of Agriculture, and devised a plan to give relief to a curse that had come not in a century before. They prepared a bill calling for \$60,000,000, which was introduced in the Senate and in the House. In the Senate the bill was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the assistant Republican leader.

I appeared before the Agricultural Committee to urge the passage of that bill, recommended by the men that the President had trusted to bring relief to this distressed situation. The bill was reported as recommended by his committee. This committee, appointed under the direction of the President, had said that was the minimum amount that could be used for the commendable purposes that the President had called them together to accomplish in the form of relief.

That bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate by the chairman of the committee, the assistant Republican leader. It came to the Senate, and it passed the Senate unanimously. No man raised a protest against it. The situation had been investigated. The number of people in every State had been ascertained. The number for Virginia was given. Organizations were appointed from county to county in Virginia, consisting of leading citizens, to ascertain the facts of the situation and report to Governor Byrd. I understand the same method of procedure was had in all of the 22 or 23 States.

The bill passed the Senate unanimously and went to the House, and for the first time objection was engendered. It was said the objection was occasioned by the President, and I have no doubt that is true.

What occurred? First, the amount was reduced from \$60,000,000 to \$30,000,000. Second, the terms of the bill were changed.

Let us see now what the issue between the President and the Senate is. Let me state it clearly, distinctly, and fairly. The Senate had passed a bill recommended by the President's drought relief commission providing that there should be advanced to the citizens of the States affected with the drought \$60,000,000. For what purpose? First, it was a loan, not a dole, not a gift. It was a loan to help agriculture.

Second, it was provided that in order to obtain a loan one must be engaged in production. No one could get the benefit of it unless he were engaged in the production of a crop. If he stopped producing, if he stopped raising a crop, the ability to get a loan ceased. That had been the underlying principle followed in those States for years by banks, by merchants, to assist the farmers in raising crops. The loans were limited to that. The farmers did not ask for a dole. All they asked the Government to do was to lend them money enough to make another crop, and they would pay the money back. The loans were limited to those engaged in production, and if one ceased to produce, his chance of getting a loan ceased.

Third, it was limited to the drought sections, the devastation in which was greater than any we had had for more than a century. Only those sections would get any benefit from the measure. An applicant for a loan had to declare that his State was one of the drought-stricken States, and that there was a situation of distress entitling him to come under the terms of the measure.

The bill as it passed the Senate authorized loans for food for man, feed for cattle, and fertilizer and seed. The practice of making such loans is followed down in the South and in the West to assist in the raising of crops, loans to tenants, to those who are not able to raise crops without loans. Assistance is given by a system known as advances, to enable them to get food for man and beast, and fertilizer and seed, and then the production of the crop proceeds, and one takes his chance of getting his money back out of the crop when it is raised.

Fourth, the Government would have a first lien on the crop, ahead of the merchant, ahead of the bank. The Government would have the first lien, in order that it might be safe in its loans.

When the bill went to the House, the House said "We will not authorize loans for the purchase of food for man, though he may be engaged in production. You must eliminate the provision for loans for food for man, and we will consent to the appropriation of \$30,000,000." Finally, under the conference report as agreed, \$45,000,000 was agreed to, eliminating food for man.

Now what is the issue? The issue is plain and clear, with the President and the House on one side and the Senate on the other. The House and the President say, "You can not get this provision for relief unless you pledge that you will feed only animals engaged in production, and for seed and fertilizer." In other words, they are willing to furnish money to buy feed for a mule engaged in production, but a man who is engaged in production and raising a crop may starve if he can not get money from some other source. Men may do all the quibbling they please, but that is the issue over this question: "We will feed a mule producing, but we will not feed a man producing."

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

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. How can a farm producer obtain the money with which to procure food for those who work the crop if he gives a first mortgage on the crop in order to obtain seed, feed, and fertilizer?

Mr. SWANSON. In other words, he gives a lien on his crop to feed his mule, and precludes himself from having any credit on which to get the food to feed his starving family. That is the issue the President has raised, and we are willing to meet it.

It never has been the case that any man made a difference in making advances or loans South for the raising of crops, so that he had to exclude the feeding of people engaged in the same production. It is nonsensical. It is impossible. A man could not get the privilege of securing a loan from this fund unless he could in honor say, "I will use the loan to feed a mule, and I pledge that not a cent of it shall go to feed my starving wife or child." That is the condition that is imposed. Of all the folly and nonsense, when an issue is created over a measure of relief in a time of great distress, this takes the lead.

That is the measure which precipitated this tremendous fight between the Senate on the one side and the House and the President on the other. I would like to have some one explain to me, in common sense, how, when an industrious man goes out, he can work without food, he can work without subsistence, any more than a mule can; why a mule should be kept in good health and the man prohibited from having any food whatever from the same source.

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

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Possibly the administration takes the viewpoint that even though the man who is plowing the mule may from hunger drop dead between the plow handles, the mule will go on producing.

Mr. SWANSON. That is the folly of the contention here.

Mr. President, it is utterly impossible for a farmer to raise a crop if he has no credit and has no money with which to get food. Of all the folly that I have ever seen in this Capitol, in the 35 years I have been here in public life, this takes the lead, tearing the Nation all asunder over the question of whether the Federal Government shall confine itself to feeding mules, and refuse to feed starving human beings.

Everybody knows that that is the issue. We did not ask that the people should have doles. We simply asked that they should have the privilege of borrowing money, giving a first lien on the crop, a lien ahead of that of everyone else, in order that they might raise their crops. Is not this Nation interested in 22 States being put on a productive basis? Is not this Nation interested in seeing that production shall go ahead, and that the farmers should not fail in the raising of their crops for lack of some aid?

When the President realized the extent of the disaster he knew the local communities could not meet it. In Arkansas over a hundred banks have failed. In Virginia banks have failed, but not as many as failed in Arkansas. The banks have failed because the farmers could not pay the advances heretofore made, because the merchants had made advances to the farmers, and they could not meet their obligations. It is utterly impossible to get any advances from those banks, any advances from the merchants, any advances from the fertilizer companies, because they are all loaded with debt and helpless to extend any further credit.

Here is the President of the United States, known as the great humanitarian, made President because he fed a starving world out of the Treasury of the United States, refusing to aid these starving men, who simply ask the privilege of getting a loan for 12 months and have the privilege of proceeding to work to raise a crop to relieve their distress and to benefit this great country.

Mr. President, that is the issue when reduced down to the ultimate facts. Shall a farmer be forced to give a lien on his crop—a first lien—to feed a mule, and for the purchase of feed and fertilizer, and preclude his credit to borrow money to feed his family? Shall he be refused a cent of relief if he diverts any of the money from feeding a mule to feeding his starving wife and family? If he makes a diversion, loans will be no further extended.

It seems to me in common sense, it seems to me from an economic standpoint, it seems to me from a humanitarian standpoint we should pass the bill as originally reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, authorizing the appropriation of \$60,000,000 for advances to farmers, to give them relief, so that they may raise another crop.

It seems to me that any administration which can not do that, which stands as a barrier, in this economic crisis, and prevents this assistance being extended, is unworthy of being sustained by the American electorate, I do not care whether the President is a Republican or a Democrat or a Progressive.

The time has come when the President of the United States must recognize conditions, must not be influenced by pride, must not be actuated by stubbornness, but must recognize a condition which he himself has appointed a

commission to investigate, a commission which recommended this method of relief.

As far as I am concerned, I am willing to meet the issue. I am willing to let the fight go on between the Senate and the President on the measure his commission of relief recommended unanimously, which the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate recommended unanimously. I am willing to share the responsibility of an extra session if a million people must starve on account of the stubbornness of the Chief Executive of this country.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, this morning I received a communication from the St. Louis Red Cross in the form of a letter written by a lady named Mrs. Frank V. Hammar, a brilliant woman, a thoughtful woman, one not given to exaggeration, who has been at the head of the American Red Cross movement for many, many years.

On the letterhead I find the names of distinguished men and women from my community. No one would question their veracity. No one would refuse to accept their judgment upon this subject. This lady states that there are 900,000 individuals in Arkansas, Missouri, southern Illinois, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas who need—what? Food, clothes, shoes, medicine. I shall ask that the letter may be inserted in the RECORD, because to me it is convincing evidence that the situation has not been exaggerated. When we find in those few States after investigation that 900,000 people are actually in want, it should follow without question that something immediate should be done for their relief; there should be no delay. There is actual suffering, as this lady points out. I ask that in printing her letter in the RECORD the names of the directors and officers of the Red Cross chapter be likewise printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COUZENS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

[National officers: Herbert Hoover, president; Charles E. Hughes, vice president; Robert W. DeForest, vice president; John Barton Payne, chairman; William D. Mitchell, counselor; Miss Mabel T. Boardman, secretary; Ogden L. Mills, treasurer. Directors: Dr. Fred W. Bailey, W. K. Bixby, Bert H. Lang, Mrs. J. Porter Tirrill, Mrs. Peyton T. Carr, Mrs. Ross Bowles, Ingram Boyd, Charles Wiggins, Mrs. W. T. Donovan, Mrs. J. B. Rule, Frank M. Mayfield, J. Lionberger Davis, Mrs. Horace Rumsey, Dr. Borden S. Veeder, Mrs. Henry C. Scott, Frank V. Hammar, Mrs. G. H. Capen, Tom K. Smith, D. K. Catlin, Mrs. E. T. Senseney, George D. Markham, Col. Stephen E. Lowe, A. L. Shapleigh, Edmund F. Brown, John R. Shepley, Garneau Weld, Mrs. Joseph W. Bray, Robert A. Holland, F. O. Watts, Rolla Wells, Mrs. Sidney Schwab, Mrs. Max Kotany, Mrs. H. G. Mudd, George A. Meyer, Archbishop J. J. Glennon, Benjamin Gratz, Rabbi Samuel Thurman, Bishop Frederick F. Johnson, Alfred Fairbank, W. Frank Carter, J. H. Holliday, J. L. Mauran, J. Sheppard Smith, Dr. Harry F. D'Oench, Harry F. Knight, Ernest W. Stix, Mrs. Frank V. Hammar, Mrs. Marcus A. Hirsch, Mrs. George Warren Brown, Mrs. John T. Davis, Jr., Dr. Malvern B. Clopton, Oliver F. Richards. St. Louis chapter officers: Mrs. Frank V. Hammar, chairman; Bert H. Lang, vice chairman; Oliver F. Richards, treasurer; Robert A. Holland, secretary; P. H. Byrns, executive secretary.]

AMERICAN RED CROSS,

ST. LOUIS CHAPTER,

St. Louis, Mo., January 30, 1931.

DEAR FRIEND: This is a story of slow accumulation of misery. The absolute exhaustion of family food supplies following the breakdown of normal facilities.

The country literally cries for your mercy and for your aid. You may have given to many things—and that in itself is a reward. But to-day the need of 21 States is greater than it has ever been in any other calamity.

Financially, we are substantially behind. We hope for \$220,000; \$95,000 has been pledged. We need your support—anything, but something, please—to-day.

Our request could not be inspired by a deeper thought or greater reverence for the cause of suffering humanity. There are at this very minute in the drought area of Arkansas, Missouri, southern Illinois, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas over 900,000 individuals in actual want—and this is from only 7 of the 21 States in the drought regions.

We want this money for individuals who need our help, not for organization expenses. We want it to fight pellagra, that dread disease. We want it to prevent the spread of influenza. We want it for medicine, for food, for clothing, and for shoes. If you could see the cases—pitiful, desperate—that come to us every day, your heart would bleed with sympathy and you would dig down into your pocketbook and give whatever you could. You would give with the satisfaction of knowing that you were doing something to help in a situation the intensity of which you did not appreciate before.

We simply must answer the cry of the helpless, the suffering. If you haven't already done it, please put your name on our roll of honor. Give something! We need it badly—now. In the spirit of mercy, please send what you can for the Red Cross—your Red Cross.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. FRANK V. HAMMAR, *Chairman.*

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD a letter with reference to relief in Iowa.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 3, 1931.

Senator SMITH W. BROOKHART,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BROOKHART: You will be gratified at the information in the telegram given below. Your constituent at Shenandoah, Iowa, Henry Field, and his organization through their broadcasting station, KFNF, have not waited for the Red Cross or any other agency to bring relief to our fellow sufferers in the drought district.

In that little town of 6,000 people and the community surrounding they show the big heart which is so essentially a part of the American people. They realized their fellow citizens in the South were hungry and cold. Their neighbors were suffering. They were not afraid of any dole, but they wanted to relieve distress, and they went at it directly. Why can't our Congress respond in the same splendid spirit, instead of making a political football out of human misery?

The appeal made over the Henry Field broadcasting station has brought real results. Other broadcasting stations might do well to follow this lead. The following telegram tells its own splendid story:

SHENANDOAH, IOWA, January 31, 1931.

Hon. W. D. JAMIESON,
Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

Please note Saturday's Shenandoah Sentinel report on our famine relief drive. We have already loaded five carloads of supplies and will load two more Monday. The total value will run to probably \$10,000. This was done through an appeal by Frank Field and James Pearson to listeners of KFNF, and they certainly responded nobly. Judge Frederick Fischer will accompany the cars to Arkansas for us.

HENRY FIELD.

I want to commend you for the good work you are doing.
Cordially,

W. D. JAMIESON.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I send to the clerk's desk a communication addressed to me by G. E. Kellogg, of San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire the communication read?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

PAY THE VETERANS' BONUS CERTIFICATES
(Copyright by G. E. Kellogg, January, 1931)

Secretary Mellon opposes the bonus payments to World War veterans, because it would necessitate the issuing of \$3,500,000,000 of bonds by the Government, and his patriotic impulses are paralyzed by the thought of the "immense sum lost in interest." He does not worry, however, over the "immense sum" paid in interest by the veterans when they use their bonus certificates as collateral for loans. That being the case, let us see just how much and what kind of interest Mr. Mellon really has in the welfare of the men who sacrificed their jobs and staked their lives for the welfare of the Government when it needed help.

There is supposed to be no class distinction or class legislation in this land of the free. Therefore "equality of opportunity," about which President Hoover has talked so much, demands that the veterans be treated as generously as Uncle Sam treats the bankers. Here's how.

A Government bond is the Government's promise to pay the amount called for in the certificate—at maturity.

A bonus certificate is the Government's promise to pay the amount called for in the certificate—at maturity.

A bond is delivered to the banker in exchange for money.

The bonus certificate is delivered to the veteran in exchange for service.

The bond and the bonus certificate are each a promise of the Government to pay face value at maturity, and Uncle Sam always keeps his promise to pay. Therefore the bonus certificate is absolutely as good as a Panama Canal bond.

When the banker receives the Panama Canal bond he is allowed to deposit it with the Government and receive the face value of the bond in bank notes—without interest. And the banker is allowed to use the bank notes as legal tender money until the bond is redeemed. What is more, Secretary Mellon does not worry about the loss of interest.

Now, if "equality of opportunity" means anything, the veteran should be allowed to deposit his bonus certificate with the Gov-

ernment and receive its face value in bonus notes that would circulate like the bank notes—without interest—until they are redeemed.

If bonus certificates are as good as Panama Canal bonds, bonus notes should be as good as bank notes; and the issuance of the face value of the bonus certificates to the veterans at this time—when the veterans need the money, would be a simple demonstration of real "equality of opportunity"—and there would be no "immense sum lost in interest."

Congress should establish "equality of opportunity" by enacting a law that would make bonus notes possible.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, to my mind that is an unanswerable argument in favor of paying a cash bonus to our brave distressed ex-service men. As I said once before, the paying of this money now would put into circulation about \$3,000,000,000. We need more than that added to the \$4,000,000,000 now in circulation. The Government ought to have between \$8,000,000,000 and \$10,000,000,000 in circulation all the time. It is a strong indictment of the Government that in 1919 there was more money in circulation in the United States, when the population was smaller, when business enterprises were fewer, than there is in circulation now in the year 1931.

Mr. Mitchell, a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate yesterday, and I quote from an Associated Press dispatch appearing in the Washington Post of to-day with reference to his statement:

As a means of curbing stock-market inflation, Charles E. Mitchell, New York financier, yesterday demanded repeal of the capital-gains tax.

Mr. President, this tax is perhaps the fairest tax in the world. The Government now levies a tax upon profits derived from speculation on the New York Stock Exchange. It obtains a few million dollars from this source. I submit to the Senate that it is certainly a fair tax. Men go upon the exchange frequently speculating in fictitious stocks, stocks that have no actual existence. Frequently they win on the exchange by selling short in an organized movement to break the market, to cause a crash, and probably to produce a panic; but they win millions on the deal. Those methods are employed for that purpose. I submit again that profits made in this way certainly ought to be taxed. But here is a big New York financier, Mr. Charles E. Mitchell, coming before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate and instead of suggesting how the New York Stock Exchange can be curbed and how wild and reckless speculation can be prevented he is asking to take the tax off of the vast profits made in speculation on the exchange.

Mr. President, those profits run not into hundreds of dollars, but they run into hundreds of millions and into billions of dollars. And yet here, while we are battling in the Senate to bring relief to the starving people of 21 States of the Union, Mr. Mitchell appears before a committee of the Senate and suggests that the tax of the Government be taken off of these colossal profits of millionaires on the New York Stock Exchange. Mr. Mitchell was asked if he thought the rediscount rate of the Federal reserve system in New York, reduced to 2 per cent, was too low. Listen to what the morning paper says about his reply:

Under questioning he said he did not regard the existing 2 per cent rediscount rate in New York too low. He said he was discouraged with what he termed the "sloppiness of credit" and added, "Easy money is generally one of the factors in the revival of business."

Mr. President, we are talking about easy money now. If we use this money to pay to the ex-service man of the United States, we are putting \$3,000,000,000 in the hands of people who will spend it, and it will get into circulation at once. These men will buy the necessities of life—supply their wants and prevent them from starving. Mr. President, I agree with Mr. Mitchell's argument that easy money is necessary to revive business. The putting of \$3,000,000,000 into circulation would do more to bring prosperity to the United States than anything else we could do.

How can Mr. Mellon justify his course in the face of the facts set out in Mr. Kellogg's letter which I had read at the

desk? A Panama Canal bond is purchased from the Government, and the owner of it brings it to the United States Treasury and borrows the cash on it when he deposits it, the Government keeping the bond. He can take that money out and circulate it, loan it over and over again at interest, and then finally bring it back and turn it into the United States Treasury and have the Government pay him the face value of his bond with interest. That is what we are doing for the purchaser of the Panama Canal bonds.

But that is not all, Mr. President. A national bank can purchase \$1,000,000 in Government bonds. It can bring those bonds to the United States Treasury and simply pay the Government to print money to the value of the \$1,000,000, the Government holding the bonds of the national bank. The bank can take that money and put it in its coffers and loan it out to citizens here and yonder, over and over again, collecting interest on it and all the while drawing interest on its bonds then in the hands of the Government. Finally the bank brings back the notes issued by the Government and has its bonds paid in full when it has had the use of Government money without a cent of interest all that time, for months and it may be for years.

Mr. Mellon is very much afraid that we will get too much money in circulation. Mr. President, the people are suffering to-day because of a dearth of money. There is not enough money circulating in the body of American business. There is paralysis in the body of business. Business is nearly dead. Why? For want of sufficient blood in its veins. We hear almost every day of some patient in a hospital who has been in an automobile accident and that the loss of blood makes it necessary to have a blood transfusion. Blood is obtained and put into the veins of the person whose greatest need was blood. Mr. President, that is the situation with American business to-day. Money, the lifeblood of business, has been taken out of the veins of business in great quantities. The money changers in the temple of American liberty have extracted the blood from the veins and the body of business until business is pale and weak and nigh unto death. We are calling for more money so as to give a transfusion of blood—money, the lifeblood of business.

Mr. President, the burning question at the Capitol now is how to relieve the suffering of men, women, and children in 21 States; and here comes a big financier from New York, Mr. Mitchell, who asks the Government to take the tax off the great profits made by the speculators on the New York Stock Exchange.

Something has been said here about why Rome fell. Some would have us believe that it was the distribution of free corn to the poor that caused Rome to fall down among her beautiful hills and die. That was not the cause, Mr. President. It was because the wealth of Rome had been concentrated into the hands of the few. In the language of Clark in his *Lost Atlantis*:

The few claimed all the increase
From ocean, soil, and air,
Precious stones and gems and metals,
Flocks and grain and fruitage rare.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Alabama, I understand, has made reference in his remarks to Mr. Mitchell. The Senator will recall that Mr. Mitchell said if the adjusted compensation bill shall be enacted into law it will break a great many small banks? I wonder how many of those banks will fail if the soldiers' shall deposit their \$2,000,000,000 in them?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Georgia. The suggestion of Mr. Mitchell that the settlement of the soldiers' bonus in cash would cause many small banks to fail is ridiculous. One reason such action would not cause many of those banks to fail is that a great many of them have already failed, and I can not understand the

logic of the suggestion, as my friend from Georgia has said, that depositing money by the soldiers in those banks will help to break them.

Yet that is what is being said. Mr. Mitchell has stated and Mr. Mellon has also stated that the putting of this \$3,000,000,000 into circulation would seriously interfere with business. How can anybody take such a position as that? Mr. President, to illustrate, a man goes out into the country where there has not been rain for a long time. Crops are suffering and rain is needed. This man sees the clouds gathering and he sees the lightning flash and he hears the thunder roar. Rain is in prospect, and the farmers are praying for it to come, but some one says, "I hope it will not rain, for if it does it will destroy the crop prospect and injure vegetation," when as a matter of fact the only way in which crops can be made and vegetation revived is to have refreshing rains, rains sufficient to wet the soil. That is the way to put life into the plants and make them bear fruit. That is what it is necessary to do with business to-day, and money is the rain of business. Money is necessary to the success of enterprise and industry of every kind, whether it is that of the small individual or of the big concern; and yet to-day we have the money kings "holding tight" the purse strings of the Nation, sitting heavy on the strong box, and refusing to let money sufficient to meet the needs of everyday business get into circulation.

It seems to me that any sound political economist can see the value of my suggestion to put more money into circulation when to-day the country is struggling and business is suffering greatly because we have not a sufficient amount of money in circulation.

However, I was about to state, when interrupted, what it was that helped to bring about the downfall of Rome. Concern for the welfare of the individual was minimized, and the rights of the masses were trampled upon by the money kings. Instead of giving each one a fair chance in the struggle of life, they were seeking power, and more power the leaders craved, and more power they got. Rome reached that time in her degeneracy until Pertinax marshaled his soldiers and offered to sell the emperors for \$500,000; and the doom of Rome was sealed.

Mr. President, we have a situation now out in Arkansas and in some places in my State and other States that remind us of the days that preceded the fall of the Roman Empire. And yet we are the richest government in all the world. The Washington Star last night—listen to this—carried an article under these headlines:

American income highest in the world. Total of \$75,000,000,000 estimated for 1930 by our economists.

The income of the United States is the greatest in all the earth, and here we are with pitiful reports read day after day in this body from men, women, and children on the verge of starvation, and we can not get adequate relief to them.

Mr. President, I saw a statement the other day to the effect that Alabama had made more cotton last year than it made the year before and therefore was not entitled to very much relief from the funds provided by Congress for citizens in distress there and elsewhere. I want to acquaint the Senate and the country with the terrible situation that exists amongst many cotton producers in my State.

When the farmer planted the crop of 1930, cotton was bringing about 8 cents a pound more than it is selling for to-day, or \$40 a bale more. To-day it is bringing around \$50 a bale, which is 4 or 5 cents a pound below the cost of production. What matters it to him that he made more cotton than he made the year before if it is worth less than the smaller crop made the previous year? He can not sell it for a price that will cover the cost of production; the money that he expended in producing that crop, the debts incurred, the obligations made, are hanging around his neck like a millstone, and now he comes with his products into a dead market and the price offered is below the cost of production. He can not buy the necessities of life; he can not even get the price that it costs to produce the cotton by selling it at the prices that obtain to-day.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I want to ask the Senator two questions. First, was there a drought in Alabama?

Mr. HEFLIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. How many counties were affected?

Mr. HEFLIN. There are 38 listed where the drought was severe, and there is suffering from drought in all the other counties except 4 or 5 out of 67.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have been interested in what the Senator said about the depreciation in the price of cotton. I have been receiving numerous letters from the South protesting against the agricultural marketing act, and many of the letters contain allegations that the depreciation in the price of cotton is somewhat due to the operations of the Federal Farm Board under that act. I should like to have the Senator's view about that.

Mr. HEFLIN. I myself have had quite a number of complaints regarding the activities of the Federal Farm Board. I have had deep sympathy with the board in the terrible situation which has confronted it and which now confronts it. I voted against the confirmation of some of the members of that board. I believed that the board could do good; I am not satisfied with the results of the efforts of the board; but I am still hoping that the board will do something to lift the price of cotton out of the valley of despond where the price is below the cost of production. The price of cotton is much lower than it was at this time a year ago. No cotton should be sold for less than 15 and 20 cents a pound.

The selling prices of all cotton goods justify a much higher price for cotton.

Mr. President, to recur to the subject I was discussing, that they say the farmer has more cotton now than he produced in the previous crop year, but that is no reason why he is not in dire distress. He is in great distress; he owes the merchant, and if he sold every bale of his cotton he has or had he could not pay what he owes the merchant. He has already sold it all in thousands of instances, and the debts due the merchant still hang over him. He owes the bank, and he can not pay the bank. If he had cotton he could not eat it, and he can not sell it at a profit. That is the situation that confronts tens of thousands of cotton farmers to-day.

Mr. President, I helped to pass through Congress a farm loan bill under which the farmer was permitted to borrow money and buy a home and farm. He could pay back his loan over a long period of 30 or 35 years at a rate of interest of 5 per cent. It was my purpose and the purpose of those who supported that measure to encourage farmers everywhere to buy farms, to own farms; and thousands and hundreds of thousands of them availed themselves of that law and purchased homes and farms. I regret to say that they are losing their homes now by the hundreds and by the thousands. That, to me, is a deplorable picture; it is a sad and calamitous thing for our farmers and for our country. These men are losing their homes because of no fault of their own. Drought, hard times, business depression, the lack of sufficient money in circulation, panicky conditions have driven them to the point where they are unable to meet their payments to the Government. Then what happens? Their homes and farms are put upon the block and sold. They are turned out after making improvements on the farms for years, after living there and becoming attached to the place they see all their labor spent in vain; the payments they have made are gone up in smoke and they are driven out and down the road empty handed. It is to me a sad and pitiful sight.

Mr. President, every one of those farmers is suffering, not only financially but suffering physically and mentally. His morale is being broken, and he is despondent and downhearted. That is the way to make reckless, desperate citi-

zens. These men ought to be helped to hold their homes and farms.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

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

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator raises quite an interesting point when he suggests that where farmers have had good seasons and big crops they are still unable to get any return from those crops. If they undertake to market them they find that transportation charges and other expenses in that connection eat up all the proceeds, and often they are, as the expression goes, "in the red"; that is, they actually have to pay freight to get their products to market. They not only derive no profit out of what they produce, but they burden themselves with additional expenses when they attempt to market it.

Is there any real difference in the actual situation where farmers are unable to produce any crop because of the drought and the situation where they do produce a crop but can not get it to market? They are just about as bad off as if they had suffered a drought are they not?

Mr. HEFLIN. That is absolutely correct. Thousands of farmers who have made good crops have found the price of those products so low and the freight charges required to get them to market so high that their entire crop operations for the year have been unprofitable.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am inclined to agree with the Senator as to the Federal Farm Board, which was organized and created in order to devise a proper system of marketing and distribution. I want to give them a chance, and I have been hoping they would solve this problem. They have not so far done so, and I do not think they have made much progress in that direction. It is true, however, that all over the country where splendid crops are actually produced the producers are not only unable to get the cost of production but they are unable to get the crop to market without additional expense. It seems to me, therefore, it is largely a question of economic distribution that we have to deal with.

Mr. HEFLIN. I thank the Senator for his very valuable suggestion.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEFLIN. I do.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Do I understand the position of both the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Alabama to be that the farm marketing act has not yet been tried out sufficiently long to determine whether or not it is a success, and that the Senators are still holding in abeyance their judgment as to its success?

Mr. HEFLIN. So far as I am concerned I am not satisfied with what has been accomplished, but I want to give it every opportunity to show that it is of value to the farmers of America.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think both Senators agree with me, however, that there has been a growing protest throughout the country against the operations of the act. My mail contains a constantly increasing volume of protests, particularly from business men throughout the South and other people interested in the cotton business.

Mr. HEFLIN. There is no doubt that there is widespread complaint about the activities and nonactivities of the Farm Board. The farmer, who formerly got 18 cents a pound or 20 cents a pound for his cotton—20 cents meant \$100 a bale and 18 cents meant \$90 a bale—is not satisfied now, when the price of cotton has fallen down to \$50 a bale; and he ought not to be satisfied with the present price. He can not produce cotton at that price and live. He will have to get a better price or go out of the cotton-producing business.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for just a minute further in reply to the inquiry of the Senator from Massachusetts?

I am very largely in the attitude of the Senator from Alabama with respect to the Federal Farm Board. I realize, of course, that the question of transportation is lodged with the Interstate Commerce Commission; but it seems to me the Federal Farm Board has to consider and exert its influence in some way to deal with the question of transportation. I have not figured out how the board can do it; but certainly that is a question that enters into its success in dealing with the marketing problem.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator would not say it was a success up to date, would he?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; I think not. I think it has been rather disappointing; but I think there are possibilities there, and I should like to give them a further chance.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I introduced in the Senate a resolution calling upon the Federal Farm Loan Board to make a report upon the number of farmers who had purchased lands through loans from the Government and how many of them had failed to make their yearly payments and had lost their homes and farms. In other words, how many of them had been foreclosed. I wanted to get a report upon this situation. The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] introduced a resolution along the same lines as mine, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and he and I agreed that we would support his resolution, which has passed the Senate, calling upon the Federal Farm Loan Board to give us this information.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] has introduced a bill providing that wherever the farmers in the drought-stricken areas or in other places are unable to meet their payments for 1930 the amount due the Government shall be counted in the body of the debt and carried for three years. I submit that that is a wholesome and a just and a fair proposition. Why can we not make this additional loan to these farmers in order to save farms and save homes, when we are loaning \$500,000,000 to the railroads?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to remind the Senator, in connection with his reference to farm loans, that in the case of irrigation in the West Congress allows \$5,000,000 to those people, \$1,000,000 a year, to save them from being foreclosed. We are asking nothing for the cotton section in the way of loans more than has already been given to the irrigation section.

Mr. HEFLIN. That is true. The Senator from Georgia is absolutely correct about that.

Mr. President, since I have been in Congress, the House and the Senate, I have never failed to vote for a measure to give a fair deal to the people in every section of the country. We are living in a very unusual time. Things are out of joint the world over, they tell us. Economic conditions are serious and disturbing the world over, and we are striving as statesmen to bring relief to American people in distress and to solve the problem that confronts us. We are obliged to deal with these extraordinary conditions in an extraordinary way.

The surgeon does not operate until all other treatment has failed with his patient. When the other remedies have been exhausted and the time for heroic treatment has come we see the surgeon's knife, and the patient is operated on and the cause of his desperate illness is removed. Maybe it is a cancer. Maybe it is a tumor; but in order to remove it an operation is necessary, and when this disturbing element has been taken out of the body the physical health of the patient is restored.

The body of American business is sorely afflicted. A cancer is eating upon the vitals of business. That cancer, in one form, is the New York Stock Exchange. It has already eaten into the vitals, and it is now injuriously affecting the livelihood of every man and woman in the Nation. How many Members of the House and Senate are grappling with this question and trying to solve it? Instead of our putting an end to it, curbing its activities, confining its activities to legitimate business—the buying and selling of

shares in stocks and bonds—the speculators are selling fictitious stuff. If there are 100,000 shares in a concern, they sell a million. Watered stock and fictitious stuff are dealt in; and a crash comes and a billion dollars is lost in a single day.

My God! Is it not time we were doing something to relieve legitimate business of this destructive and deadly evil? Are Senators and Members of the House afraid to tackle this giant evil? It looks so. What are we coming to in this Government?

Mr. President, if a farmer mortgages a mule that he does not own, he is put in the penitentiary. If a merchant sells something that is not his, he is arrested and punished; but a stock gambler, unhampered and unfettered on the stock exchange, can sell in unlimited quantity the stuff they speculate in, stuff that he does not own, and with it run prices up or beat them down on the exchange, clip his coupons, and make his millions, and then everybody says, "O he is a smart guy." They do not even talk about arresting him. You let the giant evil go on undisturbed, but you seize the little fellow and punish him. That is the philosophy of some statesmen.

I am reminded of a little doggerel that a brother of mine found in a newspaper in London:

The law imprisons man or woman
Who steals a goose from off the common,
But lets the greater culprit loose
Who steals the common from the goose.

In a little different form we have that situation here. We will pounce upon the little fellow who violates the law, but when it comes to the big fellow we say, "Excuse me; I did not recognize you at first," and he passes on undisturbed.

That is one of the great evils in our country to-day. Speculating in cotton and speculating in wheat in unlimited quantities are two other great evils. We permit the speculator on the grain exchange to sell billions of bushels of wheat when we do not make one-fiftieth of the amount dealt in on the exchange. It is not in existence. The farmer is holding his wheat, we will say. The price is below the cost of production. He is trying to hold it until it yields a profit; and these speculators go on the exchange and sell, in competition with him, ten times, a hundred times, a thousand times the quantity of the wheat he has. They beat down the price in the market where he has to sell, and he comes, despondent and heavy-hearted, with his produce and dumps it on a market where he must sell below the cost of production; and he goes home empty handed, with debts hanging over him, with fear haunting him that his home and farm will be sold from under him.

The cotton exchange does the same thing. We produce 14,000,000 bales of cotton, and they sell 250,000,000 bales. The farmer says, "I am going to hold my cotton until the price goes up to the point where it will yield a profit." They say, "You will? Watch us beat your price down by selling something we call cotton, just the word cotton, in unlimited quantities." They go upon the exchange, and they sell this stuff. To-day, the price will be 10 cents. To-morrow, the report will go out that: "The cotton exchange price broke yesterday half a cent a pound. It is down to around 9½ cents," and not a pound of cotton has been dealt in. They have only sold the name of cotton in unlimited quantities; and the farmer who sells his cotton in the open market must take 9½ cents, the price fixed by selling counterfeit cotton against the actual cotton. Yet cotton is the only American product every pound of which is converted into money, and every dollar's worth of which contributes to the financial wealth of the United States. Cotton gives to America the balance of trade, and brings into our country every year more gold than the world's annual output; and yet those who produce it are having a hard struggle because they are forced to sell this great American staple below the cost of production.

These are three of the four giant evils. The other one I touched on briefly at the outset and that is the lack of sufficient money in circulation to meet the business needs of the American people.

Senators, this country never will prosper as long as the volume of money in circulation depends upon the whim and caprice of the money lords of America. The Government owes it to the people to see that sufficient money is kept circulating in the body of business—an amount sufficient at all times to meet the business needs of every man and of every woman in the United States. I challenge any Senator to deny the soundness of that proposition.

The Government demands the exclusive right to print bills and coin money and the exclusive right to supply the people with the money needed to answer the needs of their business. In the old days a coon skin had a certain value, and was used as a medium of exchange in various communities. Gold and silver nuggets were used as a medium of exchange and a measure of value. But one day the Government said, "You must get rid of all these measures of value and mediums of exchange. The Government is going to coin money. The Government is going to print bills for use as money in the United States; and anybody who prints or coins anything for use as money is a counterfeiter and will be arrested, prosecuted, and punished." So the Government assumed the authority and the responsibility to supply the money necessary at all times to meet the daily needs of the American people.

And I submit to the Senate that it is the duty of this Government to do that, and I further submit to the Senate that this Government is not doing that to-day.

Money is the lifeblood of business, and the body of business is prone upon the ground, well nigh paralyzed for want of sufficient blood flowing in its veins.

If I had it in my power, I would put \$4,000,000,000 in circulation in 30 days, and I would guarantee to the Nation a return of prosperity in 60 days. That is all that is needed. Curb the activities of the stock exchange, curb the activities of the cotton exchange and of the grain exchange, pay the soldiers their bonus, and put that \$3,000,000,000 in circulation, and you will see business shake off the sickening habiliments of depression and put on the wholesome and healthy robes of prosperity. Business is crying out for lifeblood, and the lifeblood of business is money.

Mr. President, I have spoken longer than I had intended to. I want to say to Senators that this sad and distressing situation among the farmers of the South and West has made me very unhappy. I know what is happening there. It is a sad picture to me to see a farmer who has lived in a community for 15 or 20 years, perhaps longer, called on by an officer, who says, "I have come to foreclose the mortgage." The farmer says, "Well, I am mighty sorry," and the tears come to his eyes, and his children gather around him and cry, and his brave wife stands there and drops a tear in silence. The home place is being sold and the farm is to be taken from them, with all the improvements the man has made. A farm home is broken up, and the farm family set adrift, with nothing to live upon and no home to shelter them.

Mr. President, if free government is to live, this thing has got to stop. Senators will recall the dream of old Pharaoh. He had a dream about seven fat years and seven lean years. He was told to store an abundance of grain during the seven fat years to serve the needs of the people during the seven lean years. We in the United States have been passing through the seven fat years, with America's income bigger than that of any Government in all the world.

What did Pharaoh do? He accumulated grain during the seven fat years, and when the lean years came what happened? The people in great numbers came to buy grain.

What happened then? They got a supply of grain and went away satisfied. But after a while their grain supply was gone and they had to go back to buy more grain. They took that home, and by and by they consumed it, and then they said: "Our grain supply is exhausted, but we have no more money with which to buy grain." And then Pharaoh's men said: "Take your golden trinkets, silverware, and metals of every kind and go up and buy grain." They did so, exhausting their household goods. They got another

supply, and they consumed that. They went back again, and what did Pharaoh's agents tell them? "Go bring your sheep and your cattle." They did so, and they got grain again on which to live for a time. Finally they came again, and Pharaoh's agents said, "Go bring the deeds to your land," and the work of Egyptian bondage was complete. God help us to-day to respond to the needs of American farmers in distress before they, like the farmers of Egypt, become serfs in the kingdom of American agriculture.

I plead to-day for the relief of a drought-stricken and a poverty-stricken people in 21 great States of this Union, proud, patriotic, upstanding, brave people, who are worried, troubled, hungry, and in great distress because the wolves of sheer want are howling around their doors. God help us to do our duty in this trying hour.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] told us yesterday of a report from the Red Cross, telling of a mother down in Tennessee with four little children, hollow eyed, emaciated, begging the mother for something to eat. She had some rancid grease, which she was mixing with a little meal to cook them some johnnycakes. This white mother in America is facing starvation with her little children. It is the duty of this great Government to see to it that starving men, women, and children are fed.

It is estimated that more than two millions of people in the drought-stricken area are suffering for want of food and clothing. They have been overtaken by a drought, a condition over which they have no control is upon them, and they are crying to us to "come and help us or we die."

Let me give a note of warning to Senators on the other side. I sympathize with the President. I know he has a hard and difficult situation to deal with. I fear that somebody is misinforming him. Senators, here is what is going to happen one of these days: We are going to have reports coming here, if something is not done quickly, of men, women, and children dying of starvation and funerals being held to bury them in a land where there is more wealth than in all the other countries in the world. Will we permit such a thing to happen? God forbid.

Mr. President, I commend the Red Cross for what it is doing, but it is not able to meet the requirements of the hour. It is not reaching and feeding the hungry as they should be reached and fed. It is doing something, but it is not doing enough.

The Government, which can lend \$500,000,000 to the railroads; the Government, which can lend one hundred and thirty-five to one hundred and fifty million dollars to the Ship Trust; the Government, which will permit national banks to buy bonds and then deposit them with the Government and have the Government issue money to the amount of the bonds, and take it out and use it and charge interest on it, can certainly rise to the occasion now and come gladly and lovingly to the rescue of the distressed and starving and save men, women, and children and make them happy once more in this the greatest government in all the world. [Applause in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must warn the occupants of the galleries that there must be no demonstration of approval or disapproval.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, this controversy over human relief has been injected into this body and the House of Representatives and before the President, creating a sharp difference of opinion and an issue which daily has become more exaggerated, disturbing the orderly procedure of the Congress. I am sure there is not a Senator who desired to create an issue on this question, and, of course, no one believes that the President desired to raise this issue. It is just a situation that has been thrown upon us, which, in my opinion, able men, conscientious legislators, ought to be able to settle humanely and in the public interest.

This is no time for men of high standing to become piqued, for leaders of thought to lose their heads, either the Congress or the President to become so irritated over the issue that we or he can not think along straight lines.

My 20 years' experience in the House and the Senate has taught me to observe that all legislation is a matter of com-

promise. I have never been able to have my way in all things; I have not desired it. I have sought counsel and advice. I have desired cooperation, because I have appreciated that only through that avenue could I reach my goal.

So it would seem to me that there may be in this controversy not an issue but a mere difference of opinion, and I am glad that in the statement issued by the President only this afternoon he has seen fit to express himself in a more conciliatory spirit, and it seems to me he has opened the way by which the Congress and the Executive might get together.

For my part, that is all I want, and I do not see how in good grace anyone should desire more. The fact that I might think that \$25,000,000 or \$50,000,000 is necessary in order to relieve the distress and the suffering in the afflicted area does not make that amount absolutely the correct one, but the thing to do is to clarify the situation, and for all of us with a common purpose to try to get together and adjust our differences.

The statement of the President which has just been given to the press, as I have said, is more conciliatory than some of the statements heretofore issued from the White House. I notice that he says—and I congratulate him upon the expression:

I do not wish to add acrimony to a discussion, but would rather state the case as I see its fundamentals.

He has that right. Nobody believes that he wants to add acrimony to the controversy. In his statement he reiterates largely what his expressed views have been in the past and again states his reasons. At the close of the statement he makes this very significant suggestion:

I will accredit to those who advocate Federal charity a natural anxiety for the people of their States.

Of course, it does not take any stretch of the imagination for one to conceive that, but I am glad to know that the President in his heart believes that those of us who made an effort to obtain some measure of relief for our people were actuated by motives conscientiously formed. Then this further very significant statement comes from the President's pen:

I am willing to pledge myself that if the time should ever come that the voluntary agencies of the country, together with the local and State governments, are unable to find resources with which to prevent hunger and suffering in my country, I will ask aid from resources of the Federal Government because I would no more see starvation amongst my countrymen than would any Senator or Congressman.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I believe that statement is true. I am not that hard-hearted nor am I that partisan that I believe the President of the United States, if he knew it, would see starving people left unaided in the United States even though he thought some other way should be found to relieve them. But the trouble about this controversy is that the President believes that the situation can be taken care of through the Red Cross and that it is being taken care of now. I have no doubt he conscientiously believes that. But others differ with him. For my part, I think the preponderance of the evidence which has come to us shows that the Red Cross is not now able to take care of the situation, and will not be able to take care of it; that it can not raise sufficient funds to take care of the situation; and that it will not be taken care of if we leave it solely to the Red Cross agencies. I say that not disparagingly of the fine efforts and heroic work of the Red Cross.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. I would like to have the Senator explain then why it was that the President appointed commissions in 22 or 23 States to go and investigate the situation and report to him. Why did he ask the Red Cross to do it at that time?

Mr. HARRISON. I think he should have done it.

Mr. SWANSON. Why should he have asked it at that time? Why did he have to appoint commissions in 22 or 23 States to examine into the situation and report to him and advise with him and then, when they reported unanimously that the condition was such that Federal aid must be invoked, refuse to do anything about it?

Mr. HARRISON. I believe in the recommendation of the commissions. I believe the President should have accepted them.

Mr. SWANSON. When does the Senator think the President ought to be satisfied to proceed to act—now or next June or July?

Mr. HARRISON. Of course he should act now. If the Senator will wait and let me explain myself fully I think he will understand exactly what I am driving at and he will know exactly my position.

I stated that I believe that the President honestly believed the money could be raised by the Red Cross. The Senator from Virginia does not believe that it can be done in that way. I do not believe it. The two able Senators from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON and Mr. CARAWAY] do not believe it. There is hardly a Senator on this side of the aisle who believes it. But I think some way can be found and ought to be found to clarify this situation and bring about some common understanding.

Mr. President, I have seen very few occurrences in this body which so impressed me as did the one on yesterday. The distinguished and eloquent Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], in one of the greatest oratorical flights of speech to which I have ever listened, expressed my viewpoint on the whole situation. No one with a heart could have failed to be touched. Men who are at times partisan and usually cold in politics were seen with tears upon their cheeks, moved by the fine flights of oratory and the sincere and sympathetic expressions of the Senator from Idaho for the people in our section of the country.

I believe that the heart of America is charitable. But what are we trying to do? We have not asked for anything exceptional here. The one controversy about which we have all been so distressed, the one controversy that has been raging here, has been over the provision which I want to read once more and analyze briefly, the \$25,000,000 appropriated out of the Federal Treasury.

There is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$25,000,000, to be immediately available—

That is significant, because we want to take care of the situation now.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. That is not the beginning of the controversy. The controversy first was over the \$60,000,000 loan for food for man and for beast, and for fertilizer. That is where the controversy began. The controversy began because it was proposed to appropriate money for food for mules and other beasts, while at the same time refusing to appropriate money for food for human beings.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is right. That was the beginning; and all of us appreciate the fact that if the Secretary of Agriculture had not spoken up and if the President had not raised his opposition to the \$60,000,000 appropriation, it would have been made instead of \$45,000,000.

Mr. SWANSON. The other matter came up later.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; but the \$25,000,000 item is largely the matter now in controversy.

Mr. SWANSON. No; we still can pass a bill providing for \$60,000,000 if the President will permit it.

Mr. HARRISON. The amount that is now in controversy in the conference committee is the \$25,000,000, which is—

To be immediately available and to be expended by the American National Red Cross for the purpose of supplying food.

Who can object to supplying food? As was said by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] just a little while ago, we made provision to supply food for animals, but are

unwilling to supply food and medicine and assistance for human beings.

Mr. SWANSON. That is for a dole, a gift. Our proposal was to make it a loan to produce a crop. That is where the controversy started.

Mr. HARRISON. I appreciate that.

Mr. SWANSON. That is not the only controversy between the President and the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not want to go back to trace the history of the whole controversy from the beginning. The one proposition that is now before us, with which the President and the Congress are grappling, is the proposed appropriation of \$25,000,000. The provision continues:

Supplying food, medicine—

Who could raise any objection to supplying food and medicine?—

medical aid, and other essentials to afford adequate human relief in the present national emergency to persons otherwise unable to procure the same.

Then there is another provision that if it does not take all of the sum of \$25,000,000 which is appropriated the remainder shall be turned back to the Treasury of the United States:

Any portion of this appropriation unexpended on June 30, 1932, shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. President, the Seventy-first Congress closes on the 4th day of March. Congress does not meet again until next December, unless an extraordinary session is called, and that is up to the President to determine. We have no alternative in the matter. We can not dominate that situation unless we want to filibuster here to defeat appropriation bills during this Congress and thus force an extra session by that method. If the ordinary procedure is pursued we will not meet after the 4th of March until next December, after many months shall have elapsed. When we have departed for our homes and when the present situation continues, as it seems it will continue, and as it becomes more aggravated, as it seems it is becoming more aggravated, what is to happen then, Mr. President? This fund can be used during the months intervening between the 4th of March and next December as an insurance, so to speak, as a reservoir that might be tapped in order to relieve the distress and suffering in those sections that need it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In line with that suggestion of the Senator I wish to emphasize the fact that in the State of Kentucky, and I am sure the same condition exists elsewhere in the drought area, the drought has been in existence for more than a year. In my State we are hauling water all over the State to supply even cities. The water level beneath the surface of the earth is so low that it will take 12 inches of rain to supply the wells and creeks and streams again. If that condition continues indefinitely, it will make it impossible to produce a crop in 1931. In what condition will those people be with Congress in recess for nine months and with no funds to relieve their distress?

Mr. HARRISON. They will be in a horrible condition, Mr. President, a most distressing situation—a situation that should not be permitted, if within our power to prevent it.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. HAWES. Having in mind the suggestion of the Senator that some compromise agreement might be reached, and having in mind the necessity for the use of a large sum of money, would not a proper compromise be for the Congress of the United States to loan to the Red Cross a fixed amount of money, \$25,000,000 or \$50,000,000, and let the Red Cross repay that loan to the Government if they were able to collect it from the people?

Mr. HARRISON. I may say to the Senator that the suggestion may be a very good one, but I think the President

should accept the \$25,000,000 proposal now before us. I think he should accept the other relief measures that we have passed by a vote of more than 2 to 1, by an almost unanimous vote in most cases, in fact.

I can not and would not offer a defense or an excuse for the position taken in his refusal to accept the \$25,000,000, especially in view of the fact that the Congress is to adjourn on the 4th of March not to meet again, unless there is an extraordinary session of Congress, until December next.

But if the President is right in his contention, conscientiously moved, I am willing to concede, as expressed in his statement of to-day, what objection could there be to the conferees writing into the bill a provision that only in the event that the situation is being taken care of through charitable institutions such as the Red Cross, that then the money shall not be used, but that if it is necessary in order to relieve distress and suffering such as exists now, then the \$25,000,000 or so much of it as may be needed shall be used. That would be carrying out the ideas expressed by the President in his statement of to-day, because he said that this money should be raised through charitable institutions, that that is the American way, that that is in keeping with our traditions and institutions. I do not agree with him about that.

Many times, as has been pointed out in the debates here, we have appropriated money out of the Federal Treasury to be used to relieve distress in this country. It has been provided in large and small amounts and to every section of the country. Many times has it been related here how the President himself asked for \$100,000,000 to be expended in relieving Europe, to take care of the hungry people there. Reference has been made to the \$20,000,000 he asked to take care of the distress in the Volga regions of Russia and the \$10,000,000 appropriated at his request for the purpose of feeding the little children of Germany in 1924. I voted for those relief measures. I believe that every Senator voted for them because we were touched by the human appeal involved. We wanted to extend assistance to the starving and distressed people in every part of the world. When I voted for those measures, it was not because I thought more of the people of Europe, the people of Russia, the people of Germany, than those of my own country. I have never been able to reconcile or understand the position of anyone who might believe it humane and right to tap the Federal Treasury to take care of suffering in Russia and in Europe, but that it was un-American, save through the Red Cross and other charitable agencies to care for the suffering among our own people.

The Federal Treasury is not more sacred to respond to the call of distress to foreign peoples than to the call of distress among our own citizens.

But, Mr. President, carrying out the President's thought that he would invoke every agency of the Federal Government, that he would draw upon all the resources of our own country, if he could not raise this money through charitable organizations, in order to take care of the suffering and the afflicted in this country—if that be true, I can not see why any objection can be raised to the appropriation of \$25,000,000, which perhaps may not be used and which ought not to be used if the situation can be taken care of through the Red Cross; but the money will be there; it will be a guaranty that relief will be afforded, that suffering will be ameliorated to some degree, and that some relief will be granted to those who are in distress. So, Mr. President, I do not believe the President is giving up wholly his conviction in this matter—as he terms it, a principle—when he will accept this amendment, and on the theory that the money will be spent only in the event that the Red Cross and other charitable organizations can not take care of the situation.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SWANSON. Does not the Senator know that every appropriation passed by the Senate for the purpose of providing relief, including the \$60,000,000 appropriation, left the

expenditure absolutely and entirely in the judgment and will of the President?

Mr. HARRISON. That is correct.

Mr. SWANSON. So, instead of it being any reflection on the President, it seems to me that not within my knowledge has the Senate ever shown such confidence in the President.

President Wilson was given \$100,000,000 for the emergency of war, but we voted to give President Hoover \$60,000,000 to spend for food for man and for beast, and for fertilizer for the farm, and then in the \$25,000,000 appropriation for those in destitution and distress we left the disbursing of the fund to his judgment and to his will. He would not need to spend a cent of it unless he thought the conditions warranted.

So, I repeat, instead of the Senate reflecting on the President, it has shown more confidence in him than it has shown in any President during the last 35 years, so far as I know, and he certainly has no grievance, other than his own unwillingness to take the responsibility and to administer the relief designed to aid those in destitution and distress.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SWANSON. All of the relief bills do that, do they not?

Mr. HARRISON. I think the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. SWANSON. That was done in the \$60,000,000 appropriation voted by the Senate and in the \$25,000,000 appropriation. Discretion is left to him, and if we adjourn, the responsibility will be on him to exercise his judgment and his will. What is a President for if he can not be an executive officer and carry out the will of Congress in its desire to relieve distress. Is he to hide behind those who say that it would establish a bad precedent, when the expenditure of the \$25,000,000, just as in the case of the other appropriations passed by Congress for relief of distress, if left to his will? The Senate has not reflected on him, but has shown more confidence in him than ever I saw reposed in any President in my time. This talk about a grievance against the Senate seems to me to be absurd. I think he ought to accept it to-morrow, and, if he does not want to spend a cent of it, he need not do so. If he considers there is distress he can spend it, but certainly it can not be claimed that Congress has not shown a disposition to aid him and leave it to his will and judgment. So what ground is there for any claim that he has a grievance against the Senate?

Mr. HARRISON. I think the Senator is eminently correct in his assertions that we have given to the President great authority to spend these large sums of money, and that in this particular measure we are also placing responsibility on the President to expend it through the American National Red Cross.

Mr. President, I would go further. If the Red Cross does not want to spend it—and apparently it says it does not—I do not believe that there would be any objection to clothing the Secretary of Agriculture or clothing the President himself with the authority to spend it, if necessary, in order to take care of the appalling distress in the situation which now confronts us. I believe that all of us are trying to drive at one common goal and that is to relieve distress and to help the situation, and it seems to me that there ought to be a getting together.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will yield, if it is a question of appeasing the pride of the President and letting him think that he has gotten something, I am willing to appease his pride. If it will appease his pride and make him think he has gotten something, let him be given the same authority he has already been given in the matter of relieving distress. I want to suggest that the proposal made by the Senator from Mississippi is not as full in giving the President authority as the bills which were passed by the Senate and sent to the House, which were unlimited in the authority given.

Mr. HARRISON. I agree again with the Senator; the Senator and myself are not in disagreement about the proposition, but we want to get together if we can.

Mr. SWANSON. I suggest then that the Senator see the President and address his remarks to him, and if he wants his power limited in handling the matter in order to satisfy

his pride and a compromise can be reached in that way, I will agree to it, but the Senator's remarks ought to be addressed to the President and not to the Senators. We have done nothing to the President; we have given him unlimited power.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. HAWES. I trust the Senator from Mississippi will make some other suggestion than that the duty be imposed upon the Secretary of Agriculture. Why not select some other Cabinet officer?

Mr. HARRISON. I do not care what Cabinet officer may be selected; I am not concerned as to which one may be charged with the responsibility. I want something done.

Mr. HAWES. We have had some experience with the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with farm problems.

Mr. HARRISON. In order that we may compose our differences, if giving the responsibility to the Secretary of Agriculture to expend the money would do that; personally, I would be glad to agree to such a provision.

Mr. SWANSON. I am willing to consent to that. If the President would rather act indirectly than directly I have no objection. Some would rather act directly and some indirectly. I do not know what the President prefers about it; all I want is to obtain relief for those who are suffering and in distress.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, we hear much in the newspapers about an extra session of Congress. Through a steady propaganda the business interests of the country are being lead to believe that there is going to be an extra session of Congress. Every effort is being exerted to frighten some into the belief that in that event much unwholesome and unwise legislation will be passed. Personally I do not care if there is an extra session of Congress. If some legislation that, in my opinion, should be passed, could be passed through an extra session, then I would say "yes." But I know that can not be done—that the President will thwart our plans and veto such wholesome and needy legislation. I am not concerned about an extra session doing any harm. It could be a means of doing much good. The country need not be frightened about the passage of unwise and radical legislation. The Congress is a pretty sensible aggregate of individuals, and has the interest and welfare of the country at heart quite as much as those who constantly criticize it.

I am, however, perfectly willing to bear the responsibility. I would rather maintain my place in public life by standing on the side of humanity than standing for some mercenary proposal; and even though an extra session of Congress would affect business, if such a session were necessary in order to take care of and provide relief for those who are suffering in this country, then I desire to remain here and help do the job. The business people of the country who appear so frightened about this prospect should analyze the situation. We have done in this instance nothing more than past Congresses have done. We have done what President Hoover has asked other Congresses to do; we have done what President Hoover has suggested and has almost coerced Congress in doing on other occasions. So there is no defense nor will we offer any defense on that particular score.

If an extra session shall become necessary the blame is going to lie at the door of the White House and not at the door of the Congress of the United States. It may lie also at the door of the House of Representatives if it persists in carrying out the wish of the President. I look into the faces of men who have been in this body for a long time, and I believe they will bear me out in the statement that no finer cooperation in the passing of appropriation bills and the consideration of measures on the calendar has been exhibited than during the present short session of Congress. There has not been a single obstacle thrown in the way of orderly procedure. We have proposed our amendments; we have called for the yeas and nays upon certain questions, but we have made no attempt to clog the machinery of the Senate. There has been a fine spirit of cooperation, and it

does not lie in the mouth of any man either in the White House or sitting in the editorial room of some Republican newspaper to say that the Democrats have done otherwise than cooperate.

If the President wants to insist upon the adamant position that he has taken, if the House of Representatives wants to insist that no appropriation shall be made for full relief, and is not willing to compose the differences at all, then, of course, there is going to be an extra session of Congress; but do not blame us for that result. We are trying to help humanity. We do not say to the President in the amendment which we have adopted, "You have got to spend the money if it is unnecessary to do so; but we give it to you, or we give it to the Red Cross, and it may be spent as the emergency may arise, a report to be submitted to Congress, and the amount not expended to be returned to the Treasury."

The newspapers that are publishing certain types of editorials and the business element which seem to be terrified may know what is coming up in the short session of Congress. I do not know whether there will be any adjusted-compensation legislation during the present Congress or not. It looks to me like there will not be. I know there is a sharp difference of opinion as to what kind of a bill should be reported and what kind of legislation should be enacted. I have my own ideas as to what kind of legislation should be passed. I would now pass a bill similar to that which has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. GARNER, the Democratic leader there, which is similar to the bill introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], paying the present value of the certificates to those who want them cashed. I would take into consideration at the same time the 25 per cent that was given to them when the law was written, and I would at the same time adjust the interest rate so that the boys who fought for this country should not be compelled to pay more interest to the Government than the Government has to pay for the money which it has borrowed from the bondholders of the country. However, there are others who believe that the full face value of the certificates, which are not due until 1945, should be paid and should be paid now. If there shall be an extra session of Congress, that proposition will be on the doorstep of Congress. Who will be to blame for it if any blame shall be attached on that account? The President of the United States, of course, is against it because the Secretary of the Treasury is against it, and they work in harmony; they know how they feel about these questions. So when the extra session of Congress shall come on I wish to let it be known that Senators on the other side played a part in laying before the Congress for consideration and passage a bill which in all probability the President will veto, but which might be passed over his veto.

Those who become frightened every time some important question comes up for consideration in the Congress, such as the power question, the soldiers' bonus, tariff, and what not, can take their cue, and the gentleman in the White House can take his cue and will bear his part of the responsibility if these questions shall be considered at the extra session of Congress.

If an extra session of Congress is not desired, the Republican majority had better play ball a little bit. Why do they not show the same spirit that has been shown from time immemorial when legislators get together upon some great and important questions by giving here and there a little, each one not ascribing to himself all the wisdom in the world, but conceding to the other fellow the same honesty of purpose and the same conscientious motives in his suggestions and his plans as actuated him. If we will all, including the President, work on that basis, with an eye single to giving real relief to the people who are in distress in certain sections of the country, we will work out the problem and we may be able to avoid an extra session of Congress. Otherwise there is not any way out of the difficulty and the Republican Party must bear the burden of it.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, it is significant that the two hours and a half which have been occupied to-day have

been filled wholly by voices from the other side of the Chamber.

I have no desire to interfere with that monopoly. I wish merely to point out that another voice emanating from that political group has been heard within the last few days, when a formal caucus was called to serve notice upon the Senate that unless the Senate and the Executive should do what that caucus demanded there would be an extra session of Congress. So be it, Mr. President.

There is also another Democratic voice, more powerful, more far-reaching, and much more consistent, as I view it, than any which has been raised either in the party caucus held the other day or upon the opposite side of the Chamber here this morning. It is the voice of the greatest Democratic newspaper in the country, in which I find in this morning's edition, as its leading editorial, double-ledged, a few remarks which I ask may now be read by the clerk and included in the brief statement I have just made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the New York World of Tuesday, February 3, 1931]

DEMOCRATS, BEWARE

The Democratic Party is playing with dynamite. In the last week its leaders in Congress have placed it in the position where it can properly be charged with an irresponsible willingness to raid the Public Treasury. If the party does not extricate itself promptly from this position, if it sponsors the soldiers' bonus and the dole, if in fighting for these measures it forces an extra session and identifies itself with inflation and subsidy, it will have achieved the miracle of reestablishing the morale of the Republican Party.

The present drift of policy among the Democrats in Washington is sentimental, greedy, and unprincipled. Unprincipled, because there is no principle so fundamental to historic Democracy as opposition to the substitution of Federal for private and local action. Greedy, because the prime mover behind proposals like the one to distribute cash to veterans is a desire to buy the votes of veterans. Sentimental, because the proposal to use Federal money for so many different kinds of relief is put forward by men who believe or pretend to believe that relief will not be furnished by the sound method of local effort plus private contribution.

Among the causes which gave the Democrats their great victory last November was the disgust of the voters with the recklessness of the Republican Party in taxing the country to benefit protected industries. If the Democrats now proceed recklessly to tax the country to benefit special blocs of their constituents, they can make no case against the Republicans. If they pass the bonus and the dole, they must be silent about the tariff. For to denounce the tariff and accept the bonus and the dole would be like the kettle calling the pot black.

The only way forward for the Democrats is to retreat from the folly into which they have blundered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, this is a very good time to exercise judgment and to refrain from intemperate statement.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] has just had read into the Record an editorial from the New York World. It has relationship to the redemption in cash of bonus certificates. It is not my intention at this time to enter upon a discussion of that subject further than to point out to the Senator from New Hampshire, and to others who may be interested, the fact that the suggestions relating to legislation on that subject have come from both sides of the Chamber in the two branches of Congress.

I recall that among the first to raise that issue during this session was the brilliant "Young Turk" from Michigan, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]; and I recall that numerous other Senators on the other side of the Chamber have given expression to their views regarding the subject. The same is true in the House of Representatives.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] is a very remarkable person. His individuality is notable, distinct, and charming. His resourcefulness is quite generally recognized and his affability is simply immeasurable.

Mr. President, if there is an extra session of Congress, in my judgment it will result because the President and the House of Representatives refuse to accede to measures supported by the majority of Republican Senators. It will result because of a strange and unaccountable indifference to issues and to relief legislation which challenge and invoke the concern of the people of this Nation. Let me say now that

I am no champion of an extra session of Congress. As everyone here knows, it has been my purpose and policy to contribute in every possible way to the enactment of the legislation generally regarded as essential to escaping the necessity for an extra session of Congress.

Both Houses are almost evenly divided. Marked differences of opinion exist as to the correct methods and policies to be pursued regarding legislation of permanent significance. It is certain that many measures favored by those who sit on this side of the Chamber and some who are on the other side of the Chamber, if enacted, would encounter Executive veto. But from the very beginning, Mr. President, it has been understood, in so far as I am capable of making it understood, that fair and adequate emergency measures must be enacted during the present session of the Congress, or the administration must accept the responsibility for an extraordinary session, even granting that if such a session be held there would still exist many of the difficulties that are being encountered now.

Anyone is at liberty to say that political motives underlie the attitude thus asserted. If partisan political motives prompt that position, I am unconscious of it. Long before this session of Congress convened the Chief Executive of this Nation—who had established a world-wide reputation as leader in movements of relief in times of great disaster or peril—summoned to the city of Washington prominent citizens from every State within the drought-stricken region. It was announced that relief committees would be organized to cooperate with a national committee headed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Promptly there came to the Capital individuals from every State in the territory affected. They conferred together for a prolonged period, reached a conclusion, and announced it. That conclusion was that \$60,000,000 would be required of the Federal Treasury in order to provide from national sources that measure of relief which the President's own agencies contemplated would be necessary.

The representatives from the territory concerned went back home, effected county and township organizations, made surveys of the existing conditions and estimates of probable future requirements, and submitted their report. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]—a patriotic representative of a great constituency—moved promptly to carry out the will and purpose of the agency set up by the Chief Executive. His joint resolution was unanimously reported to the Senate. After due consideration, it was unanimously passed by the Senate. In that joint resolution the representatives of the administration recognized the equality of the man with the mule, recognized the necessity for making provision to supply food for both man and beast in the season approaching when crop production must be resumed.

If the Secretary of Agriculture had not receded from the position which he took as the representative of the President in the assembly of the President's chosen spokesmen from the various States, if the President and the Secretary of Agriculture had gone forward and advised the enactment of that measure, there would have been very little controversy as to other measures. But for some reason which has never been explained the Secretary of Agriculture changed his attitude. He declared, in the conference to which reference has been made, in favor of a Federal appropriation for relief in the drought-stricken areas aggregating \$60,000,000. Before a committee of the body at the other end of the Capitol he subsequently stated that he had no recollection of any such agreement or conclusion. Recently a great man who was a member of the President's drought-relief committee, ex-Governor Byrd, of Virginia, issued a telegram challenging the Secretary of Agriculture to call back together in conference the men who had heard his statement, in order that they might then reach a conclusion as to whether the Secretary of Agriculture had changed his position. No action was taken on the demand of the former Governor of Virginia, thus warranting the conclusion that he correctly stated the facts, and that for

some mysterious and unexplained reason the Secretary of Agriculture had taken backwater.

In his statement issued this morning, President Hoover declares that it was generally understood from the beginning that there should be no Federal appropriation to relieve those who are suffering from want of food, and suffering from cold, in the drought-stricken areas, and that the entire obligation should rest on charitable organizations.

Who entered into any such understanding? In the message I sent to the President of the United States, when he asked that there be no filibuster against appropriation bills, I declared to him explicitly that the legislation of this session, in my judgment, should embrace adequate relief measures, and that his cooperation in the passage of such measures was hoped for and expected.

Is there any Senator who will insist, from the knowledge he possesses of the conditions which exist in almost one-half the territory of this Union, that adequate relief has been granted? If there is any who does so insist, let him rise now, for we are facing an issue which must not be evaded. If there is any Senator who takes the position that the Congress of the United States has done what the President's agencies thought should be done in the beginning, any Senator who believes that the Congress has done its duty in the passage of emergency measures, let him state it now, or "else forever afterward hold his peace."

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

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. Will the Senator give us the total of amounts appropriated by Congress?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. No; I do not know the total of amounts appropriated by Congress. The Senator may state that if he desires to do so.

Mr. MOSES. What I am seeking to bring out is with reference to the total number of those claimed to be in distress, and the relation between that number and the total appropriations made by Congress plus the sum of money given from private sources.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well; I will discuss the subject, if the Senator desires to have me do so.

I have asked that any Senator who believes that the Congress has met the standard contemplated by the President's commission rise and say so. We passed a measure contemplating the speeding up of the construction of Federal buildings, with a view to giving employment to a considerable number of unemployed.

We passed what is known as the feed, seed, and fertilizer loan bill, carrying \$45,000,000. Already to-day that bill has been discussed in its relation to the value which it has in the sections which it is designed to relieve.

Mr. MOSES rose.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Does the Senator desire to ask me a question?

Mr. MOSES. No; I merely wanted to say that I think the Senator has misinterpreted the question I asked him. What I am trying to get at is the relation of the total sum available for relief to the total number of people who claim to be in distress. Knowing that, it might be possible to take up the challenge of the Senator. I particularly wished to rise in my place now in order that I might not be estopped under the Senator's declaration that otherwise I must forever hereafter hold my peace.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, it is notable by all who hear this colloquy that the Senator from New Hampshire, instead of responding to the challenge, has asked a question.

There was an appropriation of \$45,000,000 for seed, feed, and fertilizer loans, and that requires, as it is being administered, that everyone who secures such a loan must pledge practically all the security he has, and must divest himself of any opportunity to secure food.

Why is it that some who take a part in this controversy fail to realize that the first requirement of a crop grower is food for himself and for his family? Why is it that those who are opposed to adequate relief insist that it is perfectly

appropriate that the Federal Government shall make loans to feed work stock, but that it is violative of all principle to make loans to feed the people who work the stock?

When anyone answers that question to his own satisfaction there will be some basis for argument that this Congress has taken steps to provide adequate relief for those who are in distress within the drought regions.

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

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. GLENN. I rise to obtain some information, if possible.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have no doubt the Senator needs it.

Mr. GLENN. I admit that; which is more than some other people who need it will admit.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Perhaps the Senator can supply me with some information.

Mr. GLENN. I am trying to get some information—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What is it the Senator desires to know?

Mr. GLENN. With which perhaps the Senator from Arkansas may be familiar.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well. The Senator must not take my attempts at humor too seriously.

Mr. GLENN. Not at all. I really would like to know—and I know the Senator from Arkansas has given this matter his very close attention—to what extent the various States affected by the drought have through their general assemblies made appropriations in an effort to take care of their own people. I am not asking that as a matter of argument or of controversy. I am simply seeking to elicit the information.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I can not give the Senator the information in detail which I would like to supply.

Early last summer relief committees were organized in the State of Arkansas, and contributions were made, privately and publicly, for supplying the wants of those who were in distress, and quite large sums were expended in that way which have not been accounted.

The Legislature of the State of Arkansas met on the second Monday in January last, just a few weeks ago. No statute has finally passed and been signed by the governor, but a number of measures are pending looking toward very liberal action on the part of the State.

One measure passed the house of representatives authorizing a bond issue of \$15,000,000 to provide food for the people who are in distress. Another, providing for the appropriation of a considerably smaller sum, passed the other branch of the general assembly. There are also pending measures providing for bond issues approximating \$20,000,000, to authorize the construction of what are known as farm-to-market roads.

One of the difficulties, however, of the final enactment and execution of such measures grows out of the fact that the State itself, in its political character, has suffered comparably to the citizens, and that for the time being many of the citizens are unable to meet their tax obligations. There will be a moratorium as to taxes, in all probability, until August or September. Those who are able to do so will be expected to pay as promptly as possible, but there are many citizens, including most of the farmers, who would, if compelled to pay their taxes now, have to permit proceedings for sale for taxes on the part of the State government. So that the problem to which the Senator has referred in itself presents very great difficulty.

Let me say this to the Senator, however, that notwithstanding the fact that there are 500,000 people out of about 2,000,000 in the State who are now on the roll of the Red Cross to receive charity, notwithstanding the fact that most of the banks of the State have closed and are not functioning, and that most of the merchants are unable to make any advances, the people of the State are promising to meet their assessments and to contribute their share to the \$10,000,000 which the Red Cross is seeking to raise.

If there is implied in the question of the Senator from Illinois any suggestion that the people of the State of

Arkansas are indifferent to their obligations or to their duties, I think in the answer I have given him he will find that the implication is unfounded.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield gladly.

Mr. GLENN. I did not intend, and I endeavored to make it clear that I did not intend, to start any controversy. I was trying to get some information. I have seen advertised recently a four-and-a-half-million-dollar bond issue of the State of Arkansas for hard-road purposes within the last 30 days, and in this great distress—and I am familiar with it, because I am really a neighbor of the Senator, living in that end of Illinois which is adjacent to his State—I was wondering whether the general assembly of his State had been called together into extraordinary session to deal with this great problem and whether or not it had made any appropriation at all up to this time. I am not seeking controversy; I am seeking information.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Have I answered the Senator to his satisfaction?

Mr. GLENN. The Senator has, stating that there has been no appropriation made up to this time, but that there are some bills providing for appropriations now pending.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I wish to extend the explanation, appreciating the spirit in which the Senator makes his inquiry.

The advertisement to which he refers relates to bonds which were authorized some time ago, probably before the beginning of the distress period. Those bonds have not been sold; and, frankly, there will be great difficulty in selling a large bond issue under the present conditions of the bond market. I do not expect to go into that in great detail. The Senator is probably better informed about it than I am.

But it does seem appropriate to say that during the last two years there has been what to me is an unaccountable decline in the price of bonds, even the very best private bonds, and there was during 1929 a diversion of investments from bonds to stocks which culminated in the disaster that occurred on the stock market a little more than a year ago.

I am not able to say what legislation the State will enact or what measure of relief may be relied upon from the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas; but I do know that, granting that it shall do all that we may hope for, there is requirement for the measures that have been presented here and which have received the approval of the Senate.

The President in his statement this afternoon expresses disappointment that one branch of the Congress and some Members of the Senate are not willing to leave this matter entirely to the Red Cross. He said that it is our customary way of dealing with such problems, and that it is a departure from sound principles to permit the Federal Government to take any part in meeting a situation like that which now exists.

Mr. President, has President Hoover forgotten how he came here and asked the Congress to appropriate \$25,000,000 for drought relief in Russia? Has the President of the United States reached the conclusion that there is something particularly virtuous in giving aid to starving Soviets, but that it is entirely damnable to show the same consideration to starving Americans?

Has the President forgotten that he came here and urged the Congress to appropriate \$100,000,000 for the relief of Belgians and other Europeans at a time when he said the resources of the country were so completely exhausted that it was unfair to invoke the assistance of charity or the Red Cross; and that it was sound and just to require contributions from the Federal Treasury?

I have on another occasion pointed out that these appropriations which President Hoover, then citizen Hoover, so earnestly advocated and justified in argument were made at a time when many citizens in the country were enjoying large profits from business incident to the war activities of the Nation, and that they were better able then to meet the expenses incident to relieving starving humanity by private

charity than our citizens are now, when we all must realize that almost every community in the United States has been under the obligation for a prolonged period of raising funds and making contributions to meet the requirements of persons out of employment, of citizens who are in great distress.

There is a measure of injustice in demanding of the people of our country that they make charitable contributions for purposes of general relief. I am anxious to see the Red Cross drive succeed, and I am giving it all the assistance that I feel capable of giving. I know it has been said, and I think unfairly said, that any proposal that the Federal Government shall pay a part of the expense of this great task is a blow at the Red Cross.

Why, Mr. President, it was not considered a blow at the Red Cross just a few years ago when my eloquent and charming friend from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] asked the Congress of the United States to appropriate liberally for the relief of the friends and wards of the Government in Porto Rico. I recall that then the Red Cross did its part and the Federal Government did its part. There was no suggestion then from Mr. John Barton Payne or President Hoover or anyone else that such a policy and practice was calculated to dry up the sources of charity in the United States. It is unfair and unjust under present conditions to demand both of the people who are to be relieved and the people who are to relieve them that they contribute all of the funds that are to be provided to meet the requirements of the present disturbing condition.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. May I say to the Senator that the picture which he has painted this afternoon of conditions in the State of Arkansas, the efforts that the legislature is making in the face of great difficulties, and the number of people there who are starving and will receive aid from the Red Cross is one which must make everyone feel that this is an unusual and extraordinary situation in which the Federal Government should aid. I do not believe that there are many States that are in the same situation.

But I do not desire to interrupt the Senator to debate that matter. I merely rose because of his reference to Porto Rico in order to straighten out my own position in the matter in regard to Porto Rico.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Will not the Senator do that at some other time, because I am not seeking to make any attack upon my friend. I thought I was complimenting him. I would rather he would straighten out his own record at his own leisure. It is not a matter of very great concern to me.

Mr. BINGHAM. But the Senator misrepresented my position.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Oh, if I have done that, I apologize.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator misrepresents my position with reference to granting money to the Red Cross at that time to aid Porto Rico.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Oh, no; I did not say that.

Mr. BINGHAM. I so understood the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Oh, no; I said nothing of the kind. What I said in substance was that the Senator from Connecticut advocated an appropriation on the part of the Federal Government, which was made, a liberal appropriation, too, and at the same time the Red Cross did its share, and that there was cooperation between the Red Cross and the Federal Government. I could not understand and, I repeat, I can not understand why it is possible for the Red Cross and the Federal Government to cooperate in Porto Rico and impossible for each of them to do the best they can in the United States. When the Senator from Connecticut answers that question he will disclose more information than I think he possesses. [Laughter.]

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. With pleasure.

Mr. COUZENS. I would like to ask the Senator if there is any difference between the Senator's contention now and what was proposed when the commissions about which the President spoke got together and recommended the \$60,000,000 appropriation? In other words, if we were to comply with the recommendations of those commissions now, would the Senator be satisfied?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I have said from the beginning, in every speech I have ever made on the subject, that the people in distress would prefer loans to charity from the Federal Government, and it was only as a result of the refusal of the body at the other end of the Capitol to recognize their right to loans for food that I was prompted to insist upon supplementing the funds of the Red Cross with adequate appropriations to provide food in order that the people might escape the danger of starvation.

Mr. COUZENS. I do not think the Senator answered my question. In other words, if we were to appropriate \$60,000,000 recommended, in the aggregate including the \$45,000,000 and \$15,000,000 more, letting it be used as a loan for food for humans and for animals as well, would the Senator be satisfied?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have said since I began this discussion that, in my opinion, if that arrangement had been made in the beginning there would be little difficulty at the present time. If the Senator is prepared to offer that as a compromise of the existing controversy, I will be ready to answer him; but I do not think he ought to ask me to recede from the \$25,000,000 amendment upon the mere hope that somebody may offer the \$15,000,000 to be loaned, as we all understood was provided in the joint resolution of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I will reserve judgment on that question until some one makes a proposal that there is some opportunity to carry out. If the \$15,000,000 provision had gone through in the McNary joint resolution, as it ought to have gone through, there being no excuse for its failure, there probably would not have arisen the necessity for asking to supplement the Red Cross fund in so far as the drought-stricken region is concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Having read rather carefully the regulations and restrictions under which the \$45,000,000 will be loaned to farmers, which, in my judgment, will deprive many thousands of them of the opportunity to borrow under that measure, I am wondering whether any amount we might provide as a loan would ever reach the hungry people if the Department of Agriculture or any other agency threw around it the same restrictions that have been thrown around the seed, feed, and fertilizer appropriation?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is entirely true. The feed, seed, and fertilizer loan is not going to be very effective. Earlier in the day I attempted to establish that fact from evidence which has been placed in the Record. If it is necessary I will review that for just a moment before passing back to other phases of the subject.

The seed, feed, and fertilizer loan as it is being administered requires the farmer to give a first mortgage on his crop, and requires the landlord and the tenant to waive all claim to the crop in favor of the loan, which means that the ordinary farmer, five out of six of them I should say, will be unable to avail himself of the seed loan because he must reserve his crop for loans which will also include food. Now why the mind of the President can not grasp that fact, why the Secretary of Agriculture can not grasp that simple statement, I am unable to comprehend. It looks to me almost axiomatic that the farmer must live and his family must live while he is growing the crop, and that it is poor satisfaction to him to know that his mule or his cow is enjoying the luxury of food while he himself and his family are being deprived of that very necessary commodity. It is a strange arrangement. It is an unreasonable provision.

Then it is said that if a man makes any misrepresentations in order to get a loan he will be put in jail and fined a very large sum, which means that he must be very careful in securing and using the fund loaned under the seed and fertilizer law for the purposes contemplated by that act, and that he is in some danger of going to jail if he takes from his mule the corn purchased by the borrowed money and gives it to his wife or his baby. Has it come to a time when the principles upon which this Republic rests require measures of that character?

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am sorry to interrupt the Senator, but while he is reciting the conditions under which loans for feed would be made, I should like to remind him that people against whom judgments have been recorded, or on whose property mortgages have been placed, must have them waived before they can get any relief.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. I have received a number of telegrams in the last two days from chambers of commerce to the effect that the seed loan administration insists that the Federal land banks must waive foreclosure, and all mortgagees or claimants must waive any right to an interest in or a lien on the crop before a seed loan will be granted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Just one moment. That means that a large number of persons who are most in need of the seed and feed loans can not get them, because the land banks and other creditors probably can not make the waiver that is required. Now, I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Do I understand the Senator to say if any farmer who might be in need of seed under this appropriation already has a mortgage on his farm of record in the courthouse that the holder of that mortgage must go and release that mortgage of record, or must enter into a written agreement not to foreclose it while the crop is being raised before the farmer who applies for a loan can secure it?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; the holder of the mortgage must waive his lien and make it subordinate to the feed, seed, and fertilizer loan.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, under those conditions, that would apply to practically every farmer; because there are very few of them who do not have mortgages of record on their farms at this time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Last year there was not 1 farmer in 10 in the drought-stricken regions who was able to satisfy the mortgages he had made on last year's crop and the mortgage that he had placed on his land. So the result will be that unless the prior mortgagee, the man who actually already has a mortgage on the property, waives it or agrees not to foreclose, there can be no loans made.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CARAWAY. About all that can be expected, if the Government is to do anything for our people, is that they must become foreigners. If they move to Russia, then they can get relief.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Oh, yes. That reminds me of a little story which was printed in the Washington Herald from the pen of George Rothwell Brown. We all know him, and we all know that he is not unfriendly to the powers that be. George Rothwell Brown said—now listen:

The Red Cross refuses to accept \$25,000,000 from Congress for the relief of the destitute. There is not anything in it for the Albanian. This raises the question as to whether the Red Cross is an adjunct of the White House or an adjunct of the American people, as it seems chiefly concerned now in the relief of Mr. Hoover.

Mr. President, if I had made that statement, from limit to limit of this country the gentlemen in the press gallery would have sent the message, "ROBINSON is injecting politics; he is trying to play politics"; but that comes from the pen of a man who has been a Republican, God forgive him [laughter], ever since I first knew him.

One of these days, when time permits, I want to have something to say a little more in detail about the course the Red Cross has taken in this matter and something to say about the influences which prompted it to abrogate the function that has made its name great and glorious in periods of distress.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. Right on that point I desire to say that in January, 1919, when the present occupant of the White House, as Food Administrator, was, in a sense, importuning the Congress of the United States to appropriate \$100,000,000 to feed the distressed people of European nations, a proposition was made in the other branch of Congress to amend the bill so as to require that the expenditure of that money should be committed to the National Red Cross. The discussion over that proposition was very energetic and in like measure bitter. It occupied the attention of the House of Representatives for an entire week, and 117 Members of that body voted to take from the President of the United States, through Mr. Hoover, the right to expend the \$100,000,000 and commit its distribution to the Red Cross. Does the Senator from Arkansas recall whether or not the Red Cross then precipitantly adopted a resolution saying to the Congress of the United States that it would refuse to spend that money if committed to its care?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do recall that it did no such thing. My colleague the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] yesterday discussed the subject just referred to by the Senator from Virginia in its relation to the Russian appropriation. He did not, in so far as my memory goes, however, explain that the same thing that he said about the Russian appropriation had equal application to the large appropriation made for the benefit of all Europeans except those residing within the Central Empires. When the latter measure was presented to the House of Representatives—the measure appropriating \$100,000,000 from the Federal Treasury to feed foreigners, adopted at the urgent request of Mr. Hoover, who insisted then that it was unfair to rely on private charity and entirely just and proper to draw on the Federal Treasury—the present chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, Mr. Wood, of Indiana, offered an amendment. He thought the President ought not to make a distribution of that nature; but it never occurred to him, or to Representative SNELL, or to Representative TILSON, that it was unsound in principle to appropriate money from the Treasury to feed starving people even though they were foreigners and we owed no direct responsibility to them. The one thought that inspired their intense activities at that time was that the distribution ought not to be made by the President, but that it ought to be made by the American National Red Cross. At that time the Red Cross never raised its voice against distributing Federal funds. It was willing, apparently, to take \$25,000,000 of the money of the people of the United States and go across the sea and enter the soviet republics and administer to sufferers there the funds of the people of the United States.

When Mr. Wood presented the amendment to the joint resolution carrying an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for the relief of foreigners and insisted that the proper agency to make the distribution was the Red Cross, neither Mr. John Barton Payne nor anyone representing the Red Cross raised a voice in protest. When the Porto Rican incident arose, and it was expected that Federal money would be spent, along with moneys collected by volunteer contributions, no one then suggested that it was an unfriendly act to the Red Cross to ask its cooperation in such relief measures.

Mr. GLASS and Mr. BINGHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield first to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. I call attention to the fact that when Judge Payne appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate he took the position that should the Government appropriate a large sum of money for present relief there could be no other effective agency than the Red Cross for its expenditure.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And he stated that if the Congress asked the Red Cross to make the distribution his organization would comply with the request.

Mr. GLASS. Quoting from Judge Payne, he said:

If the Government, for instance, should make a large appropriation to be used for food, how on earth would anybody create an organization to administer that relief unless he should get some such organization as the Red Cross possesses?

I interrupt the Senator because to me, Mr. President, the most distressing aspect of this whole thing is the disclosure that the National Red Cross will permit itself to be used for purposes not designed in its charter or in the proper conception of its functions.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have a great deal of sympathy with the Senator's position regarding the refusal of the officials of the Red Cross to accept the money proposed to be appropriated, and I say personally, without representing anyone but myself, that I think it was a mistake on their part; I think that, as one of the great national agencies for the relief of distress, it was their duty to take any money which Congress may have appropriated and use it to the best of their ability and with all their organization and their capacity to do so.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BINGHAM. But in regard to the Porto Rican matter, the Senator has been misinformed, because the Red Cross did not at that time receive any money from the Government.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I never said that the Red Cross had received any money from the Government.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Oh, no; the Senator has simply misunderstood what all Senators about me here understood perfectly. I said that the Federal Government made an appropriation, and that the Red Cross used funds received from voluntary contributions, and that there was cooperation, and there is no reason now why there could not be the same cooperation.

I think that will satisfy my friend; and, supporting what the Senator from Connecticut has just said, although I had not intended to go into that phase of the subject this afternoon, just a day or two ago I received a letter from a college president in one of the States. It does not seem to me advisable to publish the name of that president. I have not his permission to use his letter in debate; but I am going to read some extracts from the letter in order to show how the action which the Red Cross has recently taken in refusing to distribute funds from the Federal Treasury is appealing to men of high intellectual and moral standing. This letter is similar to hundreds that have come to me within the last few days. It is dated January 29:

MY DEAR SENATOR ROBINSON: I read with amazement last night that the Red Cross had announced that it would not accept the administration of the proposed \$25,000,000 Government relief fund. There is no excuse for this action by the Red Cross. It is, as Senator COPELAND said, a crime against humanity.

Then I omit from the letter certain personal allusions in which the Senate would not be interested, and resume the quotation:

I regard the action of the central committee of the Red Cross as an unwarranted interference in the orderly progress of legislative measures through Congress in which they, as representatives of the Red Cross, had no interest whatever. They were merely to be the channels of administration. As individuals, they might be concerned about the relative efficiency of Government aid contrasted with private benevolence; but as representatives of the Red Cross they had no interest and should have been silent.

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

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. What happened? The Senator has hinted at it; but what happened between the time when Judge Payne was before our committee and the time when this announcement was made?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is just what I was about to discuss.

Mr. COPELAND. I am glad the Senator is going to discuss it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. But there is a lack of information on that subject. If the head of the Red Cross announced to a committee of the Congress that while the Red Cross did not invite Federal contributions for expenditure through its agencies, if the Congress did make appropriations for that purpose it would carry out the purpose, one would think that before changing that attitude some explanation would be given. The fact is that the attitude taken by the Red Cross was for the sole purpose of attempting to defeat the \$25,000,000 appropriation; to make it appear, if you please, that even though the appropriation were made, it would not be distributed or expended.

Ask yourself what happened to cause this change of attitude. There is only one power or influence on this round globe that could have driven Mr. John Barton Payne from the sane position that he occupied when he appeared before the committee to the position that he took when he announced that the Red Cross would not expend any Federal funds whatever; and that influence, in all probability, is the Chief Executive of this Nation, who is the President of the Red Cross.

Does not Mr. Payne owe the obligation to explain why one day he said, "Oh, yes; if you ask us to do it we will do it, though we do not wish to," and another day, a few days later, he said, "No matter what you provide, we will not accept one dollar of Federal money for distribution; our funds must come alone from voluntary contributions"?

The New York Telegram, in an editorial entitled "Save the Red Cross," comments on this course of the organization under its leadership; and this editorial and other editorials make important distinctions between the Red Cross as a whole and the group that sat around a board here in Washington and, probably under the influence and direction of the President of the United States, took an action which has shocked the entire Nation, and which has done more to impair the influence of the Red Cross than any act that any Senator or Representative could possibly perform. It is pointed out that there was no excuse for declaring that, even if Congress should make the appropriation, its action would be futile, no matter how badly the sum might be needed.

You remember that the provision under consideration expressly provides that it applies only to those who are unable to obtain food in any other way or from any other source. It left the executive or distributing agency entirely free to withhold expenditure or disbursement. It could have been expended only in the event the funds of the Red Cross were inadequate to meet the requirements of those in distress for want of food. With more than 1,000,000 persons on the Red Cross roll receiving doles, with three or four months ahead before there can be a great diminution in this number, and with the prospect that the number will greatly increase during that three or four months, we are told that we should fold our tents and leave the Capital and go home and assure the business world that there will be no extra session of Congress and leave these people to a peril which human language can not describe.

For my part, I do not intend to take that course, nor do I intend to encourage others to do so. Much as I should regret to be in Washington in an extra session of Congress this summer, rather than see an imperative duty neglected, I will gladly consent to sacrifice personal comfort.

I remember that just before the French Revolution began there was heard in a land of plenty the cry for bread. We

have in the granaries of the Federal Government almost 100,000,000 bushels of wheat; and yet 1,000,000 men, women, and children of your blood and mine are suffering for want of food!

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Before the Roman revolution, when the people became discontented and hungry, they were given a loaf of bread and a circus. Now we only give them a circus. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And a poor circus at that; a miserable one-ring circus, with no clown and no monkey. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to his colleague?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do.

Mr. CARAWAY. I think my colleague is mistaken about that. I think we have both the clown and the monkey; but I want to call my colleague's attention, if he will permit me, to this fact:

There sits in the gallery now a gentleman who is the engineer for a drainage district down in Arkansas. Some people have talked about the general situation and whether or not the people are willing to relieve their own necessities. That question was asked a minute ago. This drainage district, at the solicitation of the Red Cross, agreed to employ men. They are to get a dollar a day in food. If a man has a wife, he is permitted to work one day a week. If he has a wife and child, he can have two days' work a week. If he has a wife and three children, he can have three days' work a week. The longest, however, that any man may have work is five days a week. At a dollar a day for eight hours a day, doing the hardest work that men may do, 275 men, when the offer was made, came the first day. I am told, and I will have the figures before long, that the shortest distance walked was 3 miles, and up to 6 miles. So these men walked from 6 to 12 miles a day; they worked 8 hours a day; they got a dollar a day for it; and they did not have anything at noon. They had no lunch.

Then it was suggested by these drainage people that if the Red Cross would furnish the materials they would furnish the cooking utensils, and they would give these men a meal at 12 o'clock. That was done. They were given just what they could eat; and I was told not 20 minutes ago by the man who supervised it that many of them then pleaded for the privilege of taking home with them the grounds from the coffee-pots so that they might reboil them to make them into coffee, and that men who were permitted to work one day a week walked 6 miles back and offered to work the rest of the time in order that they might have merely a midday meal the rest of the week! Yet somebody says that these people are just unwilling to work, and that the people there are asking for relief because they are too lazy to work! That fact is available to them if they want to look into it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, it is the old, old story. How strange it is that men who count themselves wise refuse to learn from history! How strange it is that men who themselves enjoy abundance are so slow to realize the extremity and the necessity of fellow beings! Always the world has known poverty and sorrow, and always it will know that misery is incident to human existence. But, Mr. President, can we not learn some lesson from the experience of other peoples?

Can we not derive some profit from their sacrifice and their suffering? You tell me that it is inconsistent with sound principles of government to require the whole people to contribute to the relief of a large number who are in distress? You tell me that it is bad for our civilization to use Federal funds in saving the lives of those who owe our flag allegiance, and who, through no fault of their own, have come to suffer peril from want? It is the old, old story: If we remain indifferent, if we insist that the comparatively few who are disposed and able shall make voluntary con-

tributions for relief in cases of widespread calamity, and that the people as a whole shall be entirely exempt from any such responsibility, there may come a day when, with measured tread and deafening cry, millions of deserving men and women will advance shouting "Bread! Bread! Bread!" to the destruction of public institutions.

There is no more sacred obligation on government than to yield back to those who sustain it some share of their contribution when necessity requires that course.

The President cites the instance when President Cleveland vetoed a bill of this nature. Yet those who were associated with the President's political party in the Congress voted unanimously to override Mr. Cleveland's veto, and everyone knows that in the years that have come and gone since Mr. Cleveland's day the Federal Government has established numerous precedents in which it has appropriated Federal funds for the relief of its citizens. Such cases have been cited in this debate. At the time of the San Francisco fire or earthquake \$500,000 was immediately appropriated. Money was appropriated from the Federal Treasury in the case of the fire at Salem, Mass., and in the Porto Rican case, to which reference has already been made. Numerous precedents have been cited in the Senate to show that it is the established custom of the Government, whenever a disaster is far enough reaching, to make a Federal appropriation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, was not the appropriation for the people of San Francisco about \$2,700,000?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; the original appropriation was \$500,000, and there was not one word from any Senator or Representative in opposition to the appropriation. There was not a word in opposition to the appropriation in the case of the fire in the city of Salem. Yet there were thousands of homes which could have made provision for those who were temporarily deprived of shelter by the fire. That situation could easily have been handled by charity. But the Federal Government elected to make an appropriation, and no one raised a voice in protest.

Now we hear that it is unreasonable and unjust, so unreasonable and so unjust that those who oppose this appropriation and other relief measures will permit an extra session of Congress, although they seem to think that that is the worst thing that can happen to the country.

Very well. Let them take their share of responsibility, and let us who want adequate relief legislation take our share of the responsibility, and, please God, the Government will still survive for some time yet to come.

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

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have concluded, but I will retain the floor and yield to the Senator.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I do not know whether this, among other precedents, has been cited in the course of the debate, which I have not been able to follow because of duties elsewhere, but I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in the Taft administration, in 1909, Congress appropriated the sum of \$800,000 to relieve the destitute people of Italy by providing for them food, clothing, medicines, and other necessary articles.

There is one single phase of that action which perhaps was never paralleled before. So insistent were the American people, through their representatives in Congress, upon affording that relief that the bill itself says:

In the execution of this act the President is requested to ask and obtain the approval of the Italian Government.

In other words, the Italian Government itself was too proud to ask this country for relief, and this country, through Congress, asked the Italian Government to permit it to afford the relief.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, what is the moral to be drawn from the measure which the Senator from Virginia has just cited? What is the inevitable conclusion, when we recall that our President insisted that it was righteous and virtuous to appropriate money for foreigners in Russia and in Belgium and in other foreign lands, but now insists that it is shameful and ruinous to appropriate moneys for our own people? It means that in such a conception of duty and of government one must be a for-

signer and owe no allegiance to the Stars and Stripes if he is to secure sympathy and kind treatment from the United States.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, the President's statement has frequently been referred to this afternoon, and I think it ought to be inserted in the *RECORD* in full in connection with the debate. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the *RECORD*.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Of course I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

FEBRUARY 3, 1931.

The President said:

"Certain Senators have issued a public statement to the effect that unless the President and the House of Representatives agree to appropriations from the Federal Treasury for charitable purposes they will force an extra session of Congress.

"I do not wish to add acrimony to a discussion, but would rather state this case as I see its fundamentals.

"This is not an issue as to whether people shall go hungry or cold in the United States. It is solely a question of the best method by which hunger and cold shall be prevented. It is a question as to whether the American people on one hand will maintain the spirit of charity and mutual self-help through voluntary giving and the responsibility of local government as distinguished on the other hand from appropriations out of the Federal Treasury for such purposes. My own conviction is strongly that if we break down this sense of responsibility of individual generosity to individual and mutual self-help in the country in times of national difficulty and if we start appropriations of this character we have not only impaired something infinitely valuable in the life of the American people but have struck at the roots of self-government. Once this has happened it is not the cost of a few score millions but we are faced with the abyss of reliance in future upon Government charity in some form or other. The money involved is indeed the least of the costs to American ideals and American institutions.

"President Cleveland, in 1887, confronted with a similar issue, stated in part:

"A prevalent tendency to disregard the limited mission of this power and duty should, I think, be steadfastly resisted, to the end that the lesson should be constantly enforced that though the people support the Government, the Government should not support the people.

"The friendliness and charity of our countrymen can always be relied upon to relieve their fellow citizens in misfortune. This has been repeatedly and quite lately demonstrated. Federal aid in such cases encourages the expectation of paternal care on the part of the Government and weakens the sturdiness of our national character, while it prevents the indulgence among our people of that kindly sentiment and conduct which strengthens the bonds of a common brotherhood."

"And there is a practical problem in all this. The help being daily extended by neighbors, by local and national agencies, by municipalities, by industry, and a great multitude of organizations throughout the country to-day is many times any appropriation yet proposed. The opening of the doors of the Federal Treasury is likely to stifle this giving and thus destroy far more resources than the proposed charity from the Federal Government.

"The basis of successful relief in national distress is to mobilize and organize the infinite number of agencies of self-help in the community. That has been the American way of relieving distress among our own people, and the country is successfully meeting its problem in the American way to-day.

"We have two entirely separate and distinct situations in the country: the first is the drought area; the second is the unemployment in our large industrial centers, for both of which these appropriations attempt to make charitable contributions.

"Immediately upon the appearance of the drought last August I convoked a meeting of the governors, the Red Cross, the railways, the bankers, and other agencies in the country and laid the foundations of organizations and the resources to stimulate every degree of self-help to meet the situation which it was then obvious would develop. The result of this action was to attack the drought problem in a number of directions. The Red Cross established committees in every drought county, comprising the leading citizens of those counties, with instructions to them that they were to prevent starvation among their neighbors and, if the problem went beyond local resources, the Red Cross would support them.

"The organization has stretched throughout the area of suffering, the people are being cared for to-day through the hands and with sympathetic understanding and upon the responsibility of their neighbors who are being supported in turn by the fine spirit of mutual assistance of the American people. The Red Cross officials, whose long-devoted service and experience is unchallenged, inform me this morning that except for the minor incidents of any emergency organization no one is going hungry and no one need go hungry or cold.

"To reinforce this work at the opening of Congress I recommended large appropriations for loans to rehabilitate agriculture from the drought, and provision of further large sums for public

works and construction in the drought territory which would give employment in further relief to the whole situation. These Federal activities provide for an expenditure of upward of \$100,000,000 in this area and it is in progress to-day.

"The Red Cross has always met the situations which it has undertaken. After careful survey and after actual experience of several months with their part of the problem they have announced firmly that they can command the resources with which to meet any call for human relief in prevention of hunger and suffering in drought areas and that they accept this responsibility. They have refused to accept Federal appropriations as not being consonant either with the need or the character of their organization. The Government departments have given and are giving them every assistance. We possibly need to strengthen the Public Health Service in matters of sanitation and to strengthen the credit facilities of that area through the method approved by the Government departments to divert some existing appropriations to strengthen agricultural credit corporations.

"In the matter of unemployment outside of the drought areas important economic measures of mutual self-help have been developed, such as those to maintain wages, to distribute employment equitably, to increase construction work by industry, to increase Federal construction work from a rate of about \$275,000,000 a year prior to the depression to a rate now of over \$750,000,000 a year, to expand State and municipal construction—all upon a scale never before provided or even attempted in any depression. But beyond this, to assure that there shall be no suffering, in every town and county voluntary agencies in relief of distress have been strengthened and created, and generous funds have been placed at their disposal. They are carrying on their work efficiently and sympathetically.

"But, after and coincidentally with voluntary relief, our American system requires that municipal, county, and State governments shall use their own resources and credit before seeking such assistance from the Federal Treasury.

"I have indeed spent much of my life in fighting hardship and starvation both abroad and in the Southern States. I do not feel that I should be charged with lack of human sympathy for those who suffer, but I recall that in all the organizations with which I have been connected over these many years the foundation has been to summon the maximum of self-help. I am proud to have sought the help of Congress in the past for nations who were so disorganized by war and anarchy that self-help was impossible. But even these appropriations were but a tithe of that which was coincidentally mobilized from the public charity of the United States and foreign countries. There is no such paralysis in the United States, and I am confident that our people have the resources, the initiative, the courage, the stamina, and kindness of spirit to meet this situation in the way they have met their problems over generations.

"I will accredit to those who advocate Federal charity a natural anxiety for the people of their States. I am willing to pledge myself that if the time should ever come that the voluntary agencies of the country together with the local and State governments are unable to find resources with which to prevent hunger and suffering in my country I will ask the aid of every resource of the Federal Government, because I would no more see starvation amongst our countrymen than would any Senator or Congressman. I have the faith in the American people that such a day will not come.

"The American people are doing their job to-day. They should be given a chance to show whether they wish to preserve the principles of individual and local responsibility and mutual self-help before they embark on what I believe is a disastrous system. I feel sure they will succeed if given the opportunity.

"The whole business situation would be greatly strengthened by the prompt completion of the necessary legislation of this session of Congress, and thereby the unemployment problem would be lessened, the drought area indirectly benefited, and the resources of self-help in the country strengthened."

THE RED CROSS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there was published in the *Commercial Appeal* on Saturday, January 31, 1931, a very important editorial entitled "Shall the Red Cross be Made a Political Football?" I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the *RECORD* as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

SHALL THE RED CROSS BE MADE A POLITICAL FOOTBALL?

If there is one thing in the make-up and course of conduct of President Hoover to be remarked above his strange genius for doing the wrong thing at the right time and the right thing at the wrong time, it is his obtuse obstinacy in doing things to strengthen the opposition to himself. In his handling of the tariff and farm-relief legislation, in his casting of the World Court into the maelstrom of political complications, in his introduction of the Wickersham report at a time when Congress was already entangled with many complications, and in his stubborn recessions from an untenable and almost inhuman position on drought relief he has alienated on occasions the support of both friends and foes.

However, nothing he has done has been so absolutely inexcusable as his cruel position in refusing food and other necessities to the human victims of the drought. Of all men, he was the last who might be expected to turn a deaf ear to the agonized

cry of human distress. He had come to the attention of his own country and the world through the liberality with which he dispensed the money and the food supplies furnished by his own country to the war-stricken Belgians and others. He had been advertised as the great humanitarian and the international Samaritan in relieving the distress of many nations and peoples.

But when it came to the matter of furnishing food to his own people he took a stand against appropriating one cent and was only forced from that brutal position by riots of the hungry and by reports of Red Cross agents that there were many starving mouths which must be filled. And even then he continued his unexplainable opposition to a Government appropriation for the prevention of starvation. He set out to substitute the hazards of voluntary contributions for the certainty of a Federal appropriation, and in doing so shaved the amount from \$15,000,000 to \$10,000,000, despite the insistence of those familiar with the situation that even the larger amount was too small.

The result has been a demand by the United States Senate for a Federal appropriation of \$25,000,000 to be spent through the Red Cross. Granted, for the sake of argument, that this amount is too large, which is not granted at all by its proponents, the fact remains that the expenditure of the money was to have been made through the national organization which has handled all other national and international situations demanding relief. Surely the Red Cross could be depended upon to spend the money wisely and judiciously without waste or stint. It had been trusted with all other appropriations, and it could certainly be trusted with this.

By taking counsel with the Senate President Hoover might have effected an agreement whereby the whole amount of voluntary and Federal contributions would have been limited to the \$25,000,000. But it is not recorded that he sought such an agreement. He has opposed the Federal appropriation by every means in his power. It has even come to the point where the chairman of the Red Cross appeared before a congressional committee to voice the opposition of himself and his organization. On its very face this activity of Chairman Payne was dictated by the President himself, which very logical assumption brings against the Nation's Executive the charge of projecting the Red Cross into the mire of politics.

It was bad enough to make a political issue of the hunger and distress of American citizens, but it is infinitely worse to make a political football out of the organization which was constituted for humanitarian work on any and all occasions. The evil of a political handling of a situation wherein human lives are at stake will pass with the passing of this situation, but the evil of smearing a permanent relief body with the mud of politics will unhappily abide through other similar situations. If possible, the use of the Red Cross to bolster the position of any branch of Government in a political row is more infamous and insidious even than the creation of a political mix-up that may cause human suffering and anguish.

AMENDMENT OF WORLD WAR VETERANS' ACT

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I have some communications in which certain amendments to the World War veterans' act are urged. I ask that these be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the communications will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The communications are as follows:

AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY,
DEL VALLE-Y-MARES POST, No. 29,
Bernalillo, N. Mex., January 28, 1931.

Senator S. G. BRATTON,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: As requested by Mrs. J. W. Chapman, department president, a meeting was held January 25 to discuss about amendments so that disabled veterans and widows and children of World War veterans receive pension. Our unit is much in favor that these amendments pass.

Yours very respectfully,

Mrs. A. S. TRUJILLO, Unit President.

VAUGHN, N. MEX., January 24, 1931.

Senator SAM G. BRATTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Local American Legion auxiliary unit to-day adopted resolution urging that Senators and Congressmen of New Mexico take immediate action leading to passage of amendment to World War veterans' act, giving pensions to widows and orphans, etc.

Any help you can give toward the passage of the amendment will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,

UNIT TO WAYNE JOHNSON POST, No. 53,
LILLIAN LONE, Secretary.

TULAROSA, N. MEX., January 23, 1931.

HON. SAMUEL G. BRATTON,
Member United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Mescalero Post, No. 48, Chapter of the American Legion Auxiliary, indorses the request for immediate action on

the amendment to the World War veterans' act giving pensions to widows and orphans and service-connect all disabled veterans suffering from chronic diseases up to January 1, 1925. Also urge the passing at once of reasonable hospital construction program providing for hospitalization for all veterans.

We trust that you as Senator from New Mexico will support this program.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. PAUL L. PICKINGER,
President American Legion Auxiliary, Mescalero Post, No. 48.

BACA AND SANTISTEVAN POST, No. 71,
Costilla, N. Mex.

Mr. SAM G. BRATTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRATTON: We, the Unit Auxiliary of Baca and Santistevan Post, No. 71, apply a petition to have immediate action on amendment World War veterans' act giving pension to widows and orphans and all disabled suffering from chronic constitutional diseases up to January 15, 1925.

Also to pass at once hospital construction program providing hospitalization for all veterans.

We, the unit auxiliary, do depend on your services.

Yours truly,

Mrs. J. F. QUINTANA,
Unit President.
Mrs. DEMETRIO DEHERRERA,
Unit Secretary.

Mrs. J. F. Quintana, Mrs. J. C. Sanchez, Mrs. Demetrio Deherrera, Mrs. Jose B. Barela, Mrs. Ramon De Herrera, Mrs. J. T. Santistevan, Mrs. Adolfo Valdez, Mrs. Meliton Deherrera, Mrs. Remigio Espinoza, Mrs. Senslonite De Herrera, Mrs. J. T. Rivero, Mrs. F. Arellano, Mrs. Max Archuleta, Mrs. Tovas Maes, Mrs. Juan Roybal, Mrs. Dio Vallegos, Mrs. J. T. Gallegos, Mrs. Benito Segura, Mrs. Ursulita Segura, Mrs. Horacio Lovato, Mrs. Alfredo Arellano, Mrs. Domitilio Mederia, Mrs. Manuel Trujillo, Mrs. Ray Santistevan, Mrs. Julian Pactilla, Mrs. Luis Santistevan.

ERNEST A. MICHEL

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my statement in the matter of the ethics of Attorney General Mitchell upon the candidacy of Ernest A. Michel to be United States district judge of Minnesota, and also to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Itasca County Independent, Grand Rapids, Minn., of Friday, January 30, 1931.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ETHICAL ATTORNEY GENERAL, MR. MITCHELL

(Statement of Senator THOMAS D. SCHALL in the matter of the ethics of Attorney General Mitchell upon the candidacy of Ernest A. Michel, the choice of the entire Minnesota delegation for United States district judge of Minnesota.)

The Attorney General's only excuse for not approving Ernest A. Michel for United States district judge of Minnesota is, under his own statements and letters, that Michel has handled at times personal-injury cases and that, therefore, his standard of ethics is not what Mr. Mitchell thinks should be that of a Federal judge. I wonder if Mr. Mitchell's standard of ethics as indicated by the facts recited below is higher than that of Mr. Michel, whom he is presuming to condemn, ignoring the advice of the entire Minnesota delegation and the elective State officials, nearly 700 lawyers, a score of judges headed by the supreme court chief justice of Minnesota. Incidentally, Mr. Mitchell, though a native of the State, has never seen fit to submit his ambitions for office to the electors of Minnesota, but his friends made a political issue of Michel's appointment in the recent election, and insisted that if I was elected Michel would be appointed. The referendum went against Mitchell, and he now contests it through the newspapers. I have always believed that this was a representative Government, not a dictatorship.

In the case of Flannery, as Administrator of the Estate of Mary T. Hill v. Willcuts, Collector of Internal Revenue (which is reported in 25 Fed. (2d) 951), the tax officials required the administrator of the Hill estate to pay to the Government the sum of \$1,000,000 on the ground that certain transfers had been made and engineered before the death of Mary T. Hill, widow of the late James J. Hill, with the idea and intent of avoiding payment of inheritance taxes.

These transfers were made by the Hon. William D. Mitchell, who is now the Attorney General of the United States.

Upon the Government's action to recover this \$1,000,000 the United States District Court for the State of Minnesota directed that the Hill estate pay to the Government \$1,000,000, on the ground that these transfers were made in violation of the revenue act of 1918.

During the hearing before the United States District Court of Minnesota our present Attorney General, Mr. Mitchell, testified as follows:

"During the years 1919, 1920, and 1921 and for some time prior thereto I acted as attorney for Mrs. Mary T. Hill, of St. Paul, widow of the late James J. Hill. In that capacity I drafted, as her attorney, all of the indentures of trust or trust agreements exe-

cuted by her during and after the year 1919, including the so-called grandchildren's trust, executed November 25, 1919, and the so-called children's trust, signed July 19, 1920.

"* * * The records and accounts of this office [his law office] show that, commencing May 19 and for a period of several days thereafter, I gave my entire time and attention to drafting the children's and grandchildren's trusts."

Upon appeal the circuit court of appeals, one of the three judges dissenting, reversed the Minnesota district court, holding that the gifts in question did not constitute a part of Mrs. Hill's taxable estate. When this decision was rendered Mr. Mitchell had been advanced to the position of Solicitor General of the United States, and it rested solely with him to say whether the case should be appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. The United States district attorney of Minnesota wrote a strong letter to the Solicitor General, urging that an appeal be taken. It never was. This ended the matter and the Government did not collect the million dollars which the United States District Court for the State of Minnesota said was due it. The various transfers and agreements by which payment of this \$1,000,000 was avoided were drawn by the highly ethical William D. Mitchell, who is now the Attorney General of the United States. Apparently he did his work efficiently and well, because the Government did not get the million dollars.

Undoubtedly Mr. Mitchell had no qualms of conscience nor any strong feeling that the ethics of his profession would require that instead of making the trust agreements that he made that he have Mrs. Hill execute a will under the terms of which the same results could have been brought about. Had a will been executed, the Government would have received approximately the million dollars which the United States District Court for the State of Minnesota held it should have received. By reason of making the trust agreements the "right-thinking" Attorney General of the United States was able to so arrange the disposition of a portion of Mrs. Hill's estate so that the million dollars in question was not paid to the Government.

There is no question but that this conduct is ethical. It is highly unethical for a lawyer to tell some injured person he can recover damages against a corporation. It seems to all depend on which side you are on and the amount involved. If it is a million dollars it is all right. If the amount is five or ten thousand dollars for a personal injury it is all wrong.

The minds of "right-thinking" lawyers function in a peculiar manner. Maybe the Attorney General is right. In any event it is a certainty that Uncle Sam did not get the million dollars. As to the fee the Attorney General received for drawing these documents, we are not informed.

It seems to me that under any standard of ethics the Solicitor General should have seen to it that the question was laid before the Supreme Court for final decision. It was his duty as Solicitor General, and his alone, if for no other reason than that he had drawn the instruments which were intended to and did deprive the Government of its lawful revenue. The case was one which only the Supreme Court could settle, since the circuit court was divided and the district court had decided in favor of the Government. Clearly it was Mr. Mitchell's duty under any standard of ethics to see that the case was presented to the Supreme Court.

[Article appearing in Itasca County Independent, Grand Rapids, Minn., Friday, January 30, 1931]

DISCUSSED SOME POLITICS—MINNEAPOLIS MAN, HERE ON BUSINESS, SCORES ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL

Truman Pierson, international president of the Mississippi River Scenic Highway System, talked a little politics while in Grand Rapids to-day. He said:

"Minnesota, with a Democrat holding the title of Attorney General in President Hoover's Cabinet, is having a hard time of it securing the much-needed services of an additional Federal judge. Mr. Mitchell, of St. Paul, supposedly speaking for Mr. Hoover, openly defies the wishes of the State of Minnesota as so clearly recorded by the recommendation of United States Senators SCHALL and SHIPSTEAD, the 10 Congressmen from the State, and some high-up State officials as well.

"Much is made of keeping politics out of the judiciary by Mr. Mitchell who quite fails to cover the fact that he is playing politics with the choice of Minnesota for the Federal judgeship, Ernest A. Michel, of Brookside, Minn. His master stroke of willfully defying the people and playing politics with the judgeship is his statement issued this week evidently timed to have bearing on the so-called secret poll of the lawyers of the State, which poll is to close January 29 and puts Michel at a decided disadvantage in that it lines him up against the field, the ballots simply calling for the answer to the question, 'Are you for or against Michel?' Mr. Pierson said:

"I have been traveling about the State considerably of late and the impression I have received is that regardless of what the lawyers of the State think about it, one way or another, the great masses of the people have sovereign rights to their opinions in regard to the selection of judges. The feeling is that they, the people, as so ably represented in Washington by the present delegation in both upper and lower Houses of Congress, have spoken for Michel. Who, then, is Mr. Mitchell that he comes into the picture in opposition to the will of the people? Many are asking this, and in Duluth and the range country I have been receiving some answers the past few days. Summed up, they indicate that

while Michel may not be a corporation lawyer, may not be approved by the Steel Trust or the railroads, for example, nevertheless his whole life has been 43 years living close to the common people. While not, therefore, had Mr. Michel realized that out in this western country the people have reclaimed their government, at least with men, it appears to us that Mr. United States Attorney General Mitchell, of St. Paul, Minn., has an idea that no judge should be appointed for Minnesota without the advice and consent of the gentleman from St. Paul, who just does not jibe with the rest of the people of his State.

"Summed up, the prevailing opinion among laymen I have met is that Senator SCHALL should not be swayed from his position despite the Minneapolis Journal, its anvil chorus of State adherents, and obstacles set in the way of what is best for the people of all of the State who after all have as much right to interest themselves as any select group or special interest.

IMPROVEMENT OF INLAND WATERWAYS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, while we are talking about relief legislation and doles I want to call the attention of the Senate to the dole system through which the Government of the United States has for more than 10 years conducted a violent assault upon the money income of the people of more than 22 States, in the passing and application of the transportation act, resulting in freight rates so high that it forms a substantial reason for the reduction in income to agriculture, particularly of the States of the Mississippi Valley. Through the raising of freight rates, the Government has provided doles for the benefit of railroad security holders.

One source of relief from this attack upon the income of that section of the country apparent at this time is through the completion of the urgently needed inland waterway system.

I want to present for the RECORD a letter from James E. Smith, of St. Louis, former president of the Mississippi Valley Association, who is known, I think, to most of the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. This letter was written in April, 1925, stating the association's position on the question of the Government of the United States issuing bonds for the purpose of financing the completion of the inland waterways on a basis that will save millions of dollars in contracts and will complete the waterway system which, through this piecemeal legislation, we have been carrying on for the past 25 or 30 years without completion and without any practical results to the people of that part of the country.

I ask that the letter be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS, April 17, 1925.

Mr. HERMAN MUELLER,

*Traffic Director St. Paul Association of
Public and Business Affairs, St. Paul, Minn.*

MY DEAR MR. MUELLER: The Mississippi Valley Association is strongly advocating a Federal bond issue plan for the earliest completion of all the adopted river and harbor projects of the United States. This plan as formulated by the Mississippi Valley Association is contained in H. R. 9730, introduced by Hon. Stephen G. Porter, of Pennsylvania, copy of which is inclosed. To summarize: The six outstanding provisions of this bill are as follows:

(1) For the first time in the history of our waterway improvements, it puts the development of our rivers and harbors on a sound business basis.

(2) For the first time, it affords assurance that all approved projects, with few exceptions, will be completed within five years.

(3) It provides the means for their completion at the maximum economical rate, thereby obtaining construction economies not otherwise possible, and eliminating the needless wastes which our established policy has involved.

(4) It spreads the cost over a period sufficient for the bulk of it to be paid at the time the benefits are being obtained from the improvements and by the people who are deriving such benefits.

(5) It reduces the current drain on the Treasury at the time when the financial burden is so severe and the need for economy so great.

(6) As this bill applies to all adopted projects throughout the United States, the scope of its benefits is nation-wide.

We inclose with this letter a copy of a recent address delivered in the House by Hon. C. A. Newton, of Missouri, which clearly and forcefully emphasizes and details the arguments set forth above.

We shall be grateful for any consideration you may give this proposed plan. We are hopeful that it will receive universal approval.

Yours respectfully,

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION,
JAMES E. SMITH, *President*.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I want to quote from the last annual report of the Mississippi Valley Association convention, held at St. Louis, Mo., last November. They petitioned Congress that—

In financing the scheduled program as herein outlined it takes such measures as will provide the funds required by direct appropriations or other suitable financial arrangements which will enable the Government, and so the people of the United States, to obtain all the benefits incident to comprehensive contracts and continuing operation and construction.

The association has not receded from its declared policy, and it still believes that "the benefits incident to comprehensive contracts and continuing operation and construction" can not reasonably be expected from uncertain budget appropriations unless supplemented now by "other suitable financial arrangements."

I ask also to have included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a resolution passed by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress meeting in the city of Washington last December.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We urge, therefore, as a sound national policy the completion of all present authorized projects within the shortest possible time, not exceeding a period of five years from the date of adoption. Necessary additional appropriations should be made promptly as new projects are authorized and adopted. In view, therefore, of increased authorization of additional projects in the last river and harbor bill, and also because of the general economic situation, we urgently call upon the United States Congress to provide such necessary increase of funds as will carry out in good faith the 5-year program. Such a policy will be an aid to both our agriculture and our industry and will relieve unemployment by providing the continued operation and construction of important public works.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, there is a bill before the Committee on Commerce providing for a bond issue in the amount of \$500,000,000, the money to be used for the completion of this program within five years, this sum to be raised by an internal loan, and to be used in addition to all other appropriations for the purpose of completing the now authorized river and harbor program.

I respectfully call to the attention of Members of the Senate to this project, and ask their consideration of it with other measures which may be called up for relief in any proposed relief program.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE AT SISTERSVILLE, W. VA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4665) extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Sistersville, Tyler County, W. Va., which was, on page 1, line 10, to strike out "1930" and insert "1931."

Mr. GOFF. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ADVANCE PLANNING OF PUBLIC WORKS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5776) to provide for the advance planning and regulated construction of public works, for the stabilization of industry, and for aiding in the prevention of unemployment during periods of business depression, which were, on page 1, line 4, to strike out "1930" and insert "1931"; on page 2, line 23, after the word "office," to insert "of"; on page 4, line 7, after the word "to," where it appears the second time, to insert "it by"; and on page 7, line 16, to strike out "estimate" and insert "estimates."

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, in the absence of my colleague [Mr. WAGNER], who is in a committee room in another part of the Capitol, and with his approval, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

"THE WATER CURE"

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD a very interesting and instructive article by the Secretary of the Interior, the Hon. Ray Lyman Wilbur, appearing in the February number of *World's Work*. The subject of the article is water, its various uses and applications in the Western States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE WATER CURE

(By Ray Lyman Wilbur—As Told to William Atherton Du Puy)

The western third of the United States grapples always with one stern fact that does not assail areas farther east. A limiting influence exists in the block of States between Kansas and the Pacific, Canada, and Mexico—a region 1,000 miles wide and 2,000 miles long—that clips the wings of its possibilities. Because of it plant life is inclined to languish there, animals appear but fleetingly, and human habitations group themselves only in occasional clusters. Out West there is a shortage of water.

The 1,000 miles immediately to the east, nursed in the arms of the Mississippi, deep spread with alluvial soil, equitably rationed as to rain and sunshine, draw greater wealth from mother earth than does any other area in the world. The stretch on the Atlantic, adequately watered but less productive agriculturally, nourishes an industrial multitude.

There are 11,000,000 people in the western belt, 57,000,000 in the middle-western belt, and 52,000,000 in the eastern belt. And population and production are low in the westernmost strip only because it is short of that water which man needs to quench his thirst, lave his cuticle, and make his rutabagas grow.

Long ago this region settled up to the natural water line; it since has been able to grow only as man, exercising his ingenuity, raised that level. In two-thirds of the Nation water and to spare is always available. Little thought need be taken of it. But in the West it is the one element by which development is measured, and it will remain so through all the years to come. It is life beyond meridian 100.

Only in occasional spots in this great area is there enough rainfall to produce dependable crops without irrigation. Nature's sprinkling pots bring from 6 to 12 inches of precipitation a year, whereas in Connecticut they deliver 45 inches, in Indiana 40, and in Georgia 48.

WHERE RAINFALL ISN'T ENOUGH

There is a rainy strip along Puget Sound. Moisture-laden winds from the Pacific, climbing the Sierra Nevadas of California, create banks of snow against which the valleys below may draw checks. Generally, however, the natural water line is only high enough to sustain a pastoral civilization.

This rainfall water line was reached decades ago. Ninety-six per cent of this area must resign itself to these limited gifts of the clouds and forever remain sparsely populated and of low productivity. But there are exceptions. An area of 30,000,000 acres, as big as the State of New York, is so disposed that it can get more of the precious water of the waste lands than falls upon it. Kissed by irrigation, an unbelievable fecundity comes to it.

When water makes all the difference between barren desert, where the solitary saguaro stands sentinel, and carloads of strawberries in the early spring, it is obviously a matter of primary importance. Stripped of its lesser essentials, the problem of the West is water. When and where and how much may the water line be raised?

Take the Yakima Valley, in the State of Washington, for instance, as an element in the 4 per cent of western land that may be irrigated. The Yakima River is born of the snows on the east slope of the Cascade Range. Its tributaries water high crystal lakes and lead down to join the main stream, which flows 175 miles to join the mighty Columbia through an open valley where volcanoes of the past have piled ashes 200 feet deep rich with plant food. Little rain fell here, and nothing but sagebrush grew. Man came, diverted the stream flow, built up the Sunnyside division to the water line, created homes for 10,000 people. The Government looked over the ground, threw dams across the mouths of the crystal lakes, stabilized the stream flow below, took out more canals.

The result: One hundred thousand people living on 600,000 irrigated acres in an area where almost none found homes before. And such homes! They cluster among the apple orchards where a production yielding \$200 per acre per year is not unusual. There is that in the volcanic ash, the sunshine, and dry weather that gives these apples a rosinness of cheek, a firmness of flesh, and a keeping quality that have carried them into the market places of Yokohama, Rio de Janeiro, Cairo, and Danzig on the Baltic. The baled hay and the big unrivaled baking potato of these farms feed nonagricultural activities all about. A city of 30,000 people and a score of thrifty towns exist where sagebrush but yesterday was supreme.

Far to the south, in the burning deserts of Arizona, as a dot in a waste that is unbroken between San Antonio and Los Angeles, lies Salt River Valley, Eden of the borderland. Here in the beginning an erratic stream came out of the mountains, sometimes ran a roaring torrent but mostly seeped languidly into thirsty sands. Inspired by the Government's need for hay for Army mules, some rugged frontiersman, back in the seventies, led a ditch from Salt River onto the desert and demonstrated the stu-

pendous yields where water is wedded with the desert silt. Ditches became canals, these multiplied themselves, Salt River Valley grew up to the water line which they established and boasted 20,000 people.

But the water supply was irregular, and floods ripped out diversion dams. The Government, 25 years ago, began its first great demonstration of welding mountains together, impounding flood waters, distributing them as needed, stabilizing the behavior of torrents, setting them to spinning turbines, developing communities under this new influence.

The enterprise has transformed this cactus-studded desert solitude into an intensively farmed, unbelievably productive, wide-awake, progressive, cosmopolitan, thrifty community that has no counterpart in all the world. Living here are 130,000 people, 67,000 of them in Phoenix, the metropolis of the Colorado River Basin. Yields from this irrigated land are such as to warrant values as high as \$2,000 an acre. Farming such lands has called forth a skill beyond the appreciation of tillers of eastern acres. Early lettuce goes out in refrigerated train loads. Single acres produce 700 boxes of grapefruit. Alfalfa, heritage of the early Spanish fathers, yields six crops a year. Date trees ripen their honeyed fruit in the city parks. Long-staple Egyptian cotton surpasses that picked along the Nile. Life in all its phases is in superlatives, and fairy stories come true daily.

BRIGHAM YOUNG—IRRIGATION PIONEER

The Snake River winds its tenuous way through Idaho and Oregon, carrying much water and inviting man to apply his ingeniousness to it. He has responded by raising the water level in the Snake Valley, and as a result 250,000 people live where before there was nothing of value at all.

Where the Rio Grande runs through New Mexico the early Spaniards developed a ditch here and there and built scattering adobe homes. The Government threw the most massive of its concrete dams across the Rio Grande at Elephant Butte, stored the floods, induced a steady flow—and brought prosperity to peaceful, semi-Latin communities that fringe the river for 150 miles.

But ahead of all of these was Brigham Young, who, traveling with his caravan on the way to Utah, told Jim Bridger, Indian scout, that he intended to plant a farming community beyond the mountains. Bridger pooh-poohed the idea and offered a thousand dollars for the first ear of corn that was grown.

It was July 24, 1847, and the plains were parched when these pioneers, after crossing Immigration Canyon, came out into Salt Lake Valley and unhitched their teams on the brink of a merry little stream afterward known as City Creek. That same afternoon they took their plows off their wagons and broke some of this dry desert land. The very next day the stream was diverted, the plowed land irrigated, and a batch of potatoes planted. This, it seems, was the first bit of irrigation ever undertaken by Anglo-Saxons.

LOS ANGELES GROWS UP

Here in the Great Basin wastes, out of which no stream finds its way, grew the first of the communities born of water under the hands of this race. Various streams coming out of the Wasatch Mountains were diverted and used for irrigation. Later a dam was thrown across the mouth of Utah Lake, 25 miles away. It was converted into a reservoir and tapped by canals which irrigated fertile fields below. Scores of expedients have been used to add to the water supply of the Salt Lake Valley. Each has contributed to the prosperity of this oasis and made additions to the population possible. To-day 200,000 people live in this region, which would have supported but a handful had man not taken thought of water and led it here to serve his purposes.

The classic example of how communities mount step by step as the water line is raised is furnished by the Los Angeles district. Here the Spanish settled 150 years ago and developed a pastoral civilization of a few thousand; the rainfall was not sufficient for crop production. Americans who followed increased the water supply by diverting the Los Angeles River into irrigation ditches and by pumping from shallow wells. By 1910 the population had run up to 200,000. It looked as though this community might provide water for drinking, for sprinkling lawns, and for Saturday-night baths for 50,000 or so more; but the end was in sight.

It was then that Los Angeles reached out beyond its own watershed, far across the Mohave Desert, 250 miles to the point where the Owens River, fed by the snows of the Sierras, was wasting itself into a brackish lake. Los Angeles diverted this stream and led it through the longest aqueduct in the world into her own front yard, there to multiply the crops of oranges, bungalows, and settlers. Because of this water, brought into the area where it could serve its maximum purpose, 2,000,000 people have been added in 20 years to the Los Angeles area. But the population is again approaching the water line. The capacity of the aqueduct can be increased, and probably 500,000 more people can be adequately supplied. That maximum will doubtless be reached in five years, for the population is increasing at the rate of 100,000 a year.

The Los Angeles district thus faces a predicament. In Imperial Valley, not far away, below sea level in a desert as absolute as exists anywhere in the world, nestles another community, born of water, that is likewise in a predicament. It grew of irrigation from the mad Colorado, and now that stream threatens to break from the sand-built ridge upon which it rides and engulf its child. The Government, fortified by its own rich experience and that of private enterprise, accepts the challenge of this great stream to come and shackle it.

A TRIPLE BENEFIT DERIVED

This flighty Colorado, which drains seven States, swells to mighty, muddy floods at certain seasons and subsides into insignificance at others. It carries twelve times as much water down its channel as does the Rio Grande, eighteen times as much as does the Salt River. The Hoover Dam, now under construction at Black Canyon, will store ten times as much water as does Elephant Butte, sixteen times as much as Roosevelt, and twenty-four times as much as the combined reservoirs of the Yakima. It is costing eleven times as much as the Rio Grande project, fourteen times as much as Salt River, and eight times the money spent on the Yakima. It is estimated that it will so raise the water line in the Southwest as to provide homes down there for four or five million more people.

When the Government built Roosevelt Dam it thought little of power. It was stupendously surprised when it found that it could sell enough of it to pay out the whole enterprise. It repeated its demonstration at Shoshone, at Minidoka, at Guernsey, Boise, and elsewhere. It became power conscious and figured with a pencil on the possibilities in the proposed Boulder (now the Hoover) Dam. It found that the power generated, though sold at a moderate price, will in 50 years pay out the entire project, together with interest on the money. Irrigation and flood control will be a gift. Bona fide contractors came forward and signed on the dotted line for amounts that would guarantee all repayments. The Government needed only to contribute its credit. Eventually it will have an income from this power that should turn back into the Treasury four or five millions a year.

This dam of titanic proportions, 200 feet higher than Washington Monument, the biggest thing of its kind ever undertaken in this world, is being slipped into the gorge. The largest artificial lake in existence will rise back of it, 100 miles long, 500 feet deep. Four-mile long, 50-feet wide tunnels are being driven through the canyon walls and will feed the power penstocks that spin dynamos. Electricity will ride away on the wires and bring cheap power to one whole corner of a nation. Tropically productive communities, of from 40,000 to 100,000 population, will spring up, sending to market such fruits and vegetables as can be grown no place else in the Nation.

A river full of water will be taken 260 miles across the plains, lifted over a mountain range, and plunged down onto the coastal plain about Los Angeles to raise the water line still more and permit an otherwise impossible growth of population. An adequate supply will be made available to all the communities between Los Angeles and San Diego, sitting on the Mexican border, where millions may come to live with irrigated rose gardens about their homes and with irrigated trees dropping ripened fruit into their laps. There will no longer be floods and Imperial Valley can give itself with impunity to playing the rôle of limited tropical-fruit basket to a great nation.

PROTECTING THE WATERSHEDS

Hoover Dam does not end the list of development enterprises in the West. The control of the Columbia River in the Oregon-Washington region is a bigger problem than that presented by the Colorado. The lower Rio Grande offers a dam site in the Big Bend country between Texas and Mexico that is international and might raise the water line all the way to the mouth of the stream. The Sacramento River, in California, calls loudly for comprehensive control. Sixty or seventy projects, scattered all over the West, have been presented to the Reclamation Service and invite development. Private enterprise is utilizing many more. The magic that lies in the storage of water in the dry country causes concrete giants to grow where nothing else will, and the conquest of floods that run to waste in a land of thirst has but begun.

The storage of these flood waters is not the sum total of contributions that may be made toward raising the water line in the arid West. That whole region between the Great Plains and the Pacific needs to be considered from the watershed standpoint.

When rain falls on land that is covered with vegetation it is held, soaks in, finds its way slowly into streams, contributes to an equitable flow down their courses. When it falls on bare hillsides it runs off quickly, tears the unprotected surface as it goes, results in destructive erosion, produces floods, fills waterholes and river bottoms with mud, goes to waste. These facts have become well understood. In the dry country, however, they have not called forth the constructive action they deserve.

WASHINGTON'S CHANGING ATTITUDE

The chief contributor to this failure of the watershed properly to contribute to equitable stream flow has been the Government itself. The Government, still the greatest landowner in the West, controls 300,000 square miles of public land out there—an area greater than the State of Texas, than that eastern stretch of States between Tennessee and Maine. This is land that is not sufficiently productive to attract settlers. It includes desert land, mountainous country, rolling plains covered with grass in varying degrees. When white men came buffalo ranged knee deep in verdure over much of it, and elk and antelope fed in millions through its mountain parks.

But the Government has stuck to its "open range" policy. Whoever would might bring his herds and flock onto public lands and graze them at will. In the end so many came that the range was nipped clean and the grasses disappeared, the best first, until finally next to nothing remained. Rains fell and cut great gullies in hurrying away from where they were needed to vast repositories of the deep, where they would serve no purpose at all.

Desolation increased. Conditions are bad and growing worse west of meridian 100.

Twenty-odd years ago President Roosevelt created a commission to study the public-land question. It reported that the usefulness of these areas was being destroyed by overgrazing, and it recommended control looking to the restoration of the range. Despite that finding, little or nothing has been done toward protecting or restoring the range. Now Congress has provided for a new commission to make a similar study in the light of two decades more of practical experience.

President Hoover has asked, also, that this commission give him an opinion on the advisability of turning public lands over to the States in which they are located. Those States, it would seem, would have a more direct interest in their proper administration than a distant, central government. Besides which, these are local problems out beyond the Rockies, with which Massachusetts and Maryland have little to do. The States most interested have put 30 Representatives in Congress out of a membership of 435. The 405 are apathetic and uninformed as to these western problems. Might it not be well to crowd a little self-government back on these States?

A NEW UNIT IN GOVERNMENT?

Much of the legislation involved was passed decades ago, when conditions were very different from what they are now. The reclamation act, for example, contemplated the irrigation of public lands in undeveloped regions. To-day there is but little irrigable public land, and western communities have grown to a point where they are able to participate in local undertakings. Incidentally such undertakings as those of reclamation, requiring organized action on the part of members of the community, provide unusual training in common action for the benefit of all. The West's experience in community development, supplemented by a quarter of a century of study and cooperation from the Federal Government, has left a rich heritage. The time has come when the local communities and the States themselves should take over many details that have hitherto been handled from Washington.

At just this point there appears another type of problem that seems to call for the development of a new unit in government. It is exemplified in the problem of the control of the Colorado. This is not primarily a national problem, for it concerns only the Southwest. It is more than a State problem, for a whole group of Commonwealths are interested in it. It is properly a regional problem. The National Government has certain interests in it, as has the individual State. But being regional it should be handled, and in fact is being handled, by the group of States affected. An experience is here being accumulated for which, in future, applications may be found that need not necessarily be limited to the West.

THE JONES LAW AND THE MAGNA CHARTA

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, Senator Clarin is one of three Filipinos who have served continuously as legislators from the first opening of the Philippine Assembly.

He is chairman of the committee on finance, has been a member of various important committees, and at different times acted as president pro tempore of the Philippine Senate.

He is a man of fine ability, understands the aspirations of his people; he has always presented them as being unitedly in favor of Philippine independence.

The following speech is interesting historically. It is another assurance that all classes of the Philippine people have interpreted the Jones law as a national promise made by the American people. They count upon its fulfillment. An entire generation of Philippine children have been taught this in their schools and elsewhere. They have come to rely upon it and, in my opinion, as an American citizen, having investigated the historical aspect of this subject, they are entitled to rely upon it.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, while the enemies of our national emancipation are doubting the value and merit of the preamble of the Jones law, on the other hand there are among us those who consider this law as the Magna Charta of the Filipinos, in allusion probably to the English Magna Charta. Mr. President, as I take opportunity to speak on this occasion, I do so with the intention of discussing the preamble of the Jones law by sustaining and affirming that this preamble, as well as the very law, can compare favorably with the Magna Charta of England, to which much importance is attached in the sphere of political rights. To make good this assertion, it is necessary to touch upon the process of the passage of the Jones law as well as of the Magna Charta, and to study the significance and reach of either one and the vicissitudes which both legislations have undergone after acquiring their legal existence. I shall therefore speak first of the Magna Charta.

The whims and excesses tantamount to despotism committed by King John, from the time he wore the crown of William the Conqueror, were of such nature that the terrifying specter of misery hovered constantly over the heads of the oppressed people. Composed of heterogeneous elements that were asserting their own

rights by reason of ethnology and history, the subjects of the English Crown, under the weighty pressure of their misfortunes, laid aside their internal hatred toward each other that they might fuse their sentiments in the cause of common sufferings, enabling themselves in this way to bring about the nucleus of a compact clothed with sufficient force to deal with the sovereign power on the strength of equality. The nobility, in common understanding with the clergy, headed the movement of protest against the monarch's abuses, and although this, in the beginning, evaded to take cognizance of the exposition of grievances which had been presented to him, later, however, was compelled to accede to their demands in view of the attitude taken by the nobility. The document sanctioned by King John to this effect is known in history as the Magna Charta. Despite the measures that had been taken, at the suggestion of Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, to guarantee the stability of the constitutional conquest, King John soon violated his obligations prescribed by the famous document, by announcing his stand through the force of the terms. As the barons had appraised the significance of the delicate situation due to the determination of the King, reinforced morally by the no less support of Pope Innocentius III, implored the help of Philip II, King of France, by offering to his son Louis the Crown of England. The war having been declared between the barons and the King, with the intervention of Philip II in favor of the former, death cut short the career of the English King, the scepter passing thereafter to the hands of his son, Henry III, who was then 10 years old. Although the regents of the King under age negotiated a peace on the part of the Crown, with the insurgent elements on the basis of the recognition of the citizens' reclaimed rights, under certain restrictions, and although years after, Henry acknowledged the Magna Charta in a most solemn manner, "as man, as Christian, as gentleman, and as duly anointed and crowned king that he was," later on, however, this English sovereign, following the nefarious and reproachable policy of his father with regards to the Magna Charta, gave cause to a bloody war between the nobles and the Crown.

The nobles, headed by Count Leicester, received the whole-hearted support of the people, making them partakers of the fundamental rights allowed in the constitutional document, before the time of the armed struggle broke out, thereby obtaining signal victories over the army of King Henry. But due to some differences which later on popped up among those who had sustained the armed protest, its cause became weakening; and when pessimism seemed to possess them, with the hopes of reconquering their rights granted in that famous document were all given up. Henry III, thinking probably that with his victories he could not maintain the moral peace in his kingdom upon the enforcement of obedience of the people to his authority by means of force, changed forthwith radically his attitude by ratifying in its whole entirety the rights recognized in the Magna Charta. These are the historical salient features of the inauguration of England's Magna Charta. Although this document did not contain any political concession which could be considered at present as of paramount importance, save the limitation of power of the royalty concerning the subsidies of war, it served notwithstanding as the basis whereby the conquests of the people would become more extensive up to the formation of the English Parliament, which, as it has been functioning, is the invulnerable bulwark of the people's freedom in Great Britain and at the same time is the supreme and unlimited source of the power of the nation, the creator of all positive right; in such a way that, in the presence of the unquieting and menacing aspect of the fall of powerful thrones in the European countries and before the ultraradical ideas which acquired there an overwhelming success, during and after the Great War, it was said that the English king had made it understood that at any time the country would shift to a republican form of government he would be willing to respect the popular will, abdicating his crown, which for centuries his glorious forebears had been displaying with pomp and magnificence.

From the events which preceded the promulgation of the Jones law, the beginning and origin of which we have to search at the pre-American epoch, I shall now proceed to prove the gist of my speech.

The uneasiness and the maltreatments which the Filipinos received during the Spanish hegemony leading to the revolt against Spain's sovereignty did not find any satisfaction in the pact of Biak-na-bato, so that upon the declaration of the Hispano-American War the country saw in it the best opportunities to carry into effect the realization of its national aspirations. And as the Filipinos needed the cooperation of the Americans that they might be freed, these in turn saw in the Filipinos a good chance for the perpetration of their military purposes in this part of the Far East, where for three centuries the Iberian lion haughtily ruled under the ægis of the Castilian banner.

If, indeed, that pact between the supreme leader of the Philippine revolution and Admiral Dewey was not reduced in written form as regards our independence, which fact later gave way to subterfuge and misrepresentations that amounted to the negation of its existence, there is, however, a strong and irrefutable presumption in favor of the real existence of that pact, inasmuch as it would be absurd to suppose that the Filipinos expelled the Spaniards from their country just to put the Americans in the country in their stead, as their new masters. Furthermore, if we are going to take into consideration that when the Filipinos took their arms in 1896 against Spain they had already aspired to their freedom and independence, aside of the fact that during the time we allied ourselves with Americans we never did anything that could constitute an estoppel against our national aspiration. When the city of Manila surrendered to the American forces, with

the cooperation and help of the Filipinos, strained relations among the Filipino and American soldiers took place in view of the fact that the latter pretended to establish in these islands their sovereignty, to which the Filipinos vehemently objected. This question resulted in the outbreak of hostilities between the Americans and Filipinos, and notwithstanding the fact that that armed struggle resulted in our physical collapse, it did not, however, subdue the fighting spirit of the islanders so as to give up their supreme ideal. On the other hand, the President of the United States, as well as high official representatives in these islands, used to inject in us the hope that some day we would also be independent; and thanks to this policy the country did not see fit to be pessimistic and hopeless; on the contrary, many of its leaders cooperated with the government duly organized here to bring about peace by employing at times vital measures as well as the arts of persuasion toward those who preferred to be on the battlefields creating public disorder after the great majority of the Filipinos had already reconciled themselves with their fate in acknowledging the sovereignty of Uncle Sam.

As I have previously stated, although the Filipinos did not give up their ideal, despite the fact that their arms did not triumph, very little opportunity did we have to make our campaign in behalf of our national cause in the United States before the establishment of the Philippine Assembly. The proindependence manifestations exercised their own sphere of influence within the confines of the Philippines at that time; but once the Philippine Assembly, under the wise leadership of Speaker Osmeña, was invested with the popular character our independence campaign received more impetus, not only here but also in the United States. During the existence of the Philippine Assembly there were resolutions passed that faithfully interpreted the people's sentiments in their appeal to the Congress of America for the granting of freedom. To this effect the Philippine Resident Commissioner at Washington, who was representing the Philippine Assembly, did voice the longings of the islanders for their independence in the American Congress. The proindependence campaign which from 1912 was espoused by the other commissioner that represented the Philippine Commission, found good response in Congress and in the administration since 1913, and thanks to these favorable circumstances the Jones law was approved in 1916, the preamble of which is as follows:

"Whereas it was never the intention of the people of the United States in the incipency of war with Spain to make it a war of conquest or for territorial aggrandizement; and

"Whereas it is, as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize the independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein; and

"Whereas for the speedy accomplishment of such purpose it is desirable to place in the hands of the people of the Philippines as large a control of their domestic affairs as can be given them without, in the meantime, impairing the exercise of the rights of sovereignty by the people of the United States, in order that, by the use and exercise of popular franchise and governmental powers, they may be the better prepared to fully assume the responsibilities and enjoy all the privileges of complete independence."

Although in the Jones law, as it was approved, the Clark amendment authorizing the country to attain its freedom within four years after the approval of said law, was eliminated, the Filipinos received it nevertheless with warm signs of rejoicing, because they saw in the preamble the guaranty of the acquisition of their national freedom, aside the facts that it contained dispositions showing a decided forward step in the conquest of democracy and popular liberties. It is to be noted that the spirit of the people was about to reach its lowest ebb due to the friction encountered between the Philippine Commission and the Philippine Assembly when the former was integrated by a majority of American members. The climax of the populace's jubilee was staged when Manuel L. Quezon, the then resident commissioner, returned to this country after President Wilson had sanctioned that legislative measure that bore constitutional character. On this occasion all Provinces sent their official representatives to Manila to receive with befitting honors the bearer and the conqueror of our Magna Charta. By virtue of the Jones law was organized a more autonomous government with two colegislative chambers the members of which are elected by popular franchise, and with departmental secretaries who, save the secretary of public instruction, are appointed by the governor general with the consent of the senate.

The Jones law's precepts being transcendental, it is not my intention at present to deal with them extensively inasmuch as they are not the object of controversy between those who sustain it and those who fight our national freedom's cause; and granting that there was a time that some efforts were made whereby this law would be amended so as to restrict the privileges of both colegislative bodies, above all that of the senate, referring to their executive functions, these reactionary tendencies at any rate did not meet with the American Congressmen's approval; and at present we may rest assured that this agitation is practically a dead issue which has already marched stealthily and silently to the graves of the forgotten.

One of the points that bears similarity between the Magna Charta and the Jones law is the fact that both are concessions granted by sovereigns—the English King and the American Commonwealth. The former was given in behalf of the subjects of the English Crown and the latter in behalf of an American colony. King John was compelled to grant the Magna Charta to his vassals due to the menacing attitude of his subjects who no longer tolerated the royal tyranny; on the other hand, the Jones law, with its preamble,

was given to us by the Congress of the United States of America with the President's sanction, through a spontaneous act when he heeded and took cognizance of the demands of freedom of the Filipinos, as formulated by their legitimate representatives in time of peace and order.

When the American Congress expressed in the aforementioned preamble that "it was never the intention of the people of the United States in the incipency of the war with Spain to make it a war of conquest or for territorial aggrandizement, but, on the contrary, it is, as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize the independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein," that high legislative body wished to make amends for the wrong it had inflicted upon the Filipino people when the Americans asked of them their help to down Spain during the war. The American Congress in this part of the preamble seems to presume that there was an understanding between the Americans and the Filipinos as the latter had acted. President Wilson's declaration, in sanctioning the Jones law, manifesting that he was rejoicing over the adoption of such a measure, as he had understood that the Filipinos were losing faith in the Americans, affirms my assertion.

Several years after the passage of the Jones law some one tried to challenge the spirit of the preamble; others based their objection on the fact that the preamble does not form part of the law and consequently it does not bind the United States; while others believed that the promise of independence expressed in the preamble has been the most unfortunate act Congress had ever enacted, taking into consideration America's interests in the Far East and the fact that we need above all to develop economically and that we are also exposed to any foreign aggression, and that we failed, when, under the Harrison régime, we were given greater participation in the government management of our own domestic affairs. Mr. President, history repeats itself. We saw that King John, despite the fact that he had authorized the Magna Charta, did not hesitate later on to ignore it, and Henry III, after his oath, followed also in the footsteps of his father. This conduct of the two sovereigns of England is another case in parallel in which there exists a common point of comparison between the Jones law and the Magna Charta, with the sole difference that the enemies of the former are not the very authors thereof. Fortunately enough the detractors of the Jones law preamble do not represent the true public opinion of the American Commonwealth, in which we trust for its righteousness and for its sacred principles dedicated to the tenets enunciated in the Declaration of Independence. What is to be deplored up to the present time is that this great, magnanimous country has not as yet expressed its sovereign attitude toward the Filipinos' cause.

Inasmuch as I have already mentioned the motives upon which rests the objection to the Jones law preamble, I shall endeavor now to refute same.

Taking for granted that this preamble does not form part of the Jones law, it is however an incontrovertible fact that it constitutes a moral promise of the American people to the Filipinos, a promise which bears a stronger significance than that of a treaty. On the other hand, treaties are made with the understanding and common accord of both contracting parties, and in the United States it is imperative that treaties should receive the Senate's approval before they can be considered binding and valid. The Jones law, right at the start when the Filipinos accepted it and supported it, assumed the aspect of a moral compact between two countries; and the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States having concurred thereto in its approval, with the President's sanction, it is beyond doubt that this compact has a much stronger moral force than a treaty, in the approval of which the lower Chamber does not take part. I say that the Filipino people accepted and supported it through their Resident Commissioner at Washington, because the Philippine Assembly, the provincial boards, and municipal councils adhered to the Jones law by means of approved resolutions. In many nooks and corners of the islands people gathered in solemn meetings to adopt resolutions of adhesion to be sent directly to the American Congress and to Representative Jones, author of the law, while it was under consideration of that high legislative entity. Furthermore, as I have said just a minute ago, its approval was enthusiastically received by the country with uproarious demonstrations of joy, and the fact that we also organized, on our own accord, an armed force to be placed at the disposal of the United States during the World War, it was thereby made manifest the Filipinos' gratefulness to America on account of the passage of the Jones law and specially on account of its preamble. If the Jones law has a stronger moral force than a treaty, I may assert that it has much stronger moral force even than those treaties entered into in consequence of international war, in which there is a victorious party and a conquered one. And to be more explicit, I shall dare say that the Jones law, with its preamble, has stronger moral obligation on the part of the United States than the treaty celebrated in Paris to end the Hispano-American war has on the part of Spain. In that treaty Spain was forced to accept by circumstances the terms imposed by the winning nation, and, once it was all over, Spain, however, did not care a bit to contest it. I now believe, Mr. President, that those persons who intend to undermine the moral obligation contracted by the American people toward us by virtue of the Jones law, are taking advantage of our weakness and unheeding the dictates of their conscience, for their reasonings bear the very character as the excuses of a bad payer.

If the preamble of the Jones law is a moral obligation contracted by the American people toward the Filipinos who have given their assent thereto, it is not only therefore a stronger moral force than a treaty, as I have said already, but it would remain binding, even should the American Congress declare null and void the Jones law, lest the Filipinos express their acquiescence to the annulment and abolition thereof. If an ordinary contract is a law between the contracting parties and it can not be declared void without the mutual consent of the makers thereof, I therefore maintain that these governing principles upon which are based the eternal precepts of morality and justice promulgated by conscience are perfectly applicable to the obligation contracted by the American Nation toward the Filipino people.

Even if we were to take from the Jones law that aspect of a moral treaty between the United States and the Philippines, and were we to suppose that the American Congress did pass that law with its preamble without any intervention of the Filipinos in the course of its preparation, nor even of their adherence to that law before or after its passage, yet under these circumstances the preamble is not subject to abolition in so far as affects the declaration of the American Congress that in waging war against Spain it was not its intention to pursue territorial aggrandizement, but, on the other hand, it is and it always has been the intention to relinquish its sovereignty in the Philippines and recognize its independence as soon as a stable government can be formed. And, given the case that the American Congress should ever abolish or declare null and void the law in its entirety, still that part of the preamble I have recently cited will remain in force without affecting at all the abolition and annulment of the Jones law. The reason for it is simple enough: That portion of the preamble to which I refer has the earmark of a confession of purpose which impelled the United States to wage war against Spain and to take possession of these islands. This confession having been made in the solemn manner by the American Commonwealth, through its Congress, how, then, can it be withdrawn without besmirching the honor of America as a nation and without becoming the greatest laughingstock before history and universal conscience? The Congress of the United States can abolish the Jones law, but the part of its preamble concerning the declaration of purposes of the Nation in waging war against Spain and taking possession of the Philippine Archipelago will remain intact, for there is no human power that can destroy it. What the American Nation declared to be a truth through its Congress in 1916 can not be asserted as a falsehood through the very Congress to be constituted in years to come. To sustain it otherwise would be to legitimize and sanctify perjury.

If a person interested in a case brought before the courts of justice makes a willful declaration concerning some facts, but later on, upon seeing that his declaration can be prejudicial to his own interests, withdraws it or changes it radically, how will this person appear before the public—above all, before righteous neighbors? How in the world will his posterior declaration merit credence so as to rebut his former statements? And how can that person be acquitted when against him a charge of perjury is presented?

The American people, which considered as a scandal and an indignity the German Chancellor's statement at the beginning of the World War to the effect that treaties are mere scraps of paper, can not have a Congress which, abusing the weakness of a small country, commits the injustice of violating a sacred obligation contracted toward this nation before the eyes of the world and commits a flagrant contradiction in declaring historical facts which affect its integrity and decorum as a people; otherwise such an act would be a blot and stigma on the history of a big country, which, upon gaining its freedom from the British yoke, proclaimed the sublime principles of democracy and liberty. The American Nation which applauded the declaration of its President, in marshaling its armies on the fields of battle against the Central Powers so as to make the world safe for democracy, could not consent to the perpetuation of a similar attack upon the honor and dignity of nations.

The question whether the compact and the declaration of purposes expressed in the preamble of the Jones law ought to have been inserted or not is no longer a subject of controversy from the moment that American Congress so disposed. The juridical principle that asserts, "In whatever manner a man pledges himself to an obligation, he remains bound to it," can be exactly applied to the obligations contracted by a country with another; and the objection based on the fact that concession of Philippine independence might affect America's interests in the Orient can not prevail over this moral compact and intrinsic force of the preamble of the Jones law, aside of the fact that we are ready to make those adjustments with America which equity demands for the very same interests.

It is asserted that we must fortify ourselves militarily and develop economically before we may consider ourselves free and independent. This condition, however, is not contained in the preamble of the Jones law; consequently, it is rather unjust to require it of us as a previous condition of our independence. Besides, we can not fortify militarily our country nor can develop it economically on a greater scale while we remain under the sovereignty of the Americans. In the first place, because the American naval and military forces in this part of the globe will not consider such an act with kind eyes, and who knows if this particular step will give rise to a conflict between the Americans and the Filipinos? Incident to this contingency, the consequence

thereof would be disastrous on our part in all respects, because it is a well-known fact that the string snaps at its weakest point, and we are, unfortunately, the weakest point. In the second place, we can not develop economically because we need foreign capital, and what happens at present is that the American money magnates are loath to come here in view of the uncertainties of our political status, and on our part we are also apprehensive of the entry of American capital while we are subject to the sovereignty of the United States, lest the invading capital gobble us up entirely. Viewing the matter in the light of the common saying that the Americans "got us by the neck," economically and politically speaking, we are indeed at a very decided disadvantage to struggle economically and politically with our masters. The example of the countries around the Caribbean Sea is disquieting. But why require of us such onerous prerequisites? Is there an independent nation at present in the world which from the beginning of its national existence or from the time it severed relations with its mother country was already militarily and economically organized in the manner we are required to show up? The very American Nation was not in similar condition when it got its independence. At any rate, America had less inhabitants than the Philippines and its commerce was weak, nay, much weaker than ours at the present time; and it would have not attained its apex of greatness and prosperity had it continued under the protection of British sovereignty, with the régime existing when the thirteen Colonies revolted. The authority of the hero of Bagumbayan, Dr. Jose Rizal, is also brought into play to justify the motives of submitting us to an economic development as the first step toward our freedom; but to this argument I shall reply that when Rizal emitted his opinion in this wise the islands were not so progressive as they are now. "Distingue tempora et concordabis jura" is an old maxim among the Latins, and I beg leave to repeat it on this occasion.

There is another objection to the effect that when we were allowed to exercise a greater control in our domestic affairs during the Harrisonian régime, we failed miserably. This objection lacks ground. Its supporters will never be able to adduce concrete facts to make good their arguments, for we, on the other hand, can cite the statement of Governor Harrison, made in the United States after the establishment of a government here in conformity with the Jones law that that government functioned better than many State governments. President Wilson in his message to the Congress of America certified that a stable government existed here in accordance with the requirements of the Jones law preamble, and recommended to Congress the granting of independence as promised in that preamble. Perhaps to counteract the impression produced by that presidential message upon American public opinion, President Harding appointed the Wood-Forbes Commission to investigate the management of the government under the Harrisonian administration. That mission did not find irregularity of serious nature in the participation of the Filipinos in the government; it did, however, find that the Philippine National Bank, under a Filipino's management, had lost several millions, and on this point rests the accusation which is now flung at us in the sense that we had failed when we were given the chance of administering our internal affairs. This charge is rather unjust, because the Philippine National Bank, a semi-official institution, does not form part of the Philippine government. Furthermore, why make the whole country responsible for this failure in a banking institution? Are not failures of this type common in other countries that are independent, and yet has such an accusation ever been launched? Without touching upon the scandals committed by State governments, has not similar anomaly been unearthed in the Navy Department of the Federal Government in which was involved a malversation of funds amounting to \$140,000,000? Have we not been regaled with the news of recent happenings concerning the Teapot Dome disgrace wherein several members of the Cabinet were equally held responsible? Did not ex-President Coolidge publish articles defending the present administration of the Federal Government? This means to say that everywhere there is "something rotten in Denmark"; and it would be the height of folly to hurl accusations at our capacity to run our own government whenever similar irregularities are committed in this country.

Mr. President, we ought not to be frightened by the numerous forms of campaign leveled upon our heads by our enemies that try to make a failure out of the noble intentions of the United States expressed in the preamble of the Jones law; on the other hand, we must maintain ourselves undaunted in the struggles within the legal ground trusting in this preamble; and as Henry III of England voluntarily ratified and respected the Magna Charta, it is to be hoped that the magnanimous United States will not do less than that English monarch, because above all the obligation contained in the preamble of the Jones law is the product of a spontaneous act of the Congress of America. As to the rest, the provisions of the Jones law preamble are certainly very clear and explicit as regards the intention of giving us our independence, whereas in the Magna Charta which gave rise to the formation of the British Parliament, there is not even a hint concerning the creation of the legislative body, and yet the limitation of power of the British Crown with respect to the taxes for purposes of war, which compelled the King to recur to the representatives of the nation for its approval, served as the basis of the British Parliament; and as the Magna Charta of England is the source of the happiness of its people for having obtained their freedom by means of this historic document, so we also armed by this expectation fully hope that the Jones law preamble will be the instrument of our final redemption.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 16415) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The clerk will proceed to read the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Fess	King	Sheppard
Barkley	Fletcher	La Follette	Shipstead
Bingham	Frazier	McGill	Shortridge
Black	George	McKellar	Smith
Blaine	Gillett	McMaster	Smoot
Blease	Glass	McNary	Steiwer
Borah	Glenn	Metcalf	Stephens
Bratton	Goff	Morrison	Swanson
Brock	Goldsborough	Morrow	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Gould	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Hale	Norbeck	Trammell
Bulkley	Harris	Norris	Tydings
Capper	Harrison	Nye	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hatfield	Oddie	Wagner
Carey	Hawes	Partridge	Walcott
Connally	Hayden	Patterson	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Hebert	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Heflin	Pine	Watson
Cutting	Howell	Pittman	Wheeler
Dale	Johnson	Ransdell	Williamson
Davis	Jones	Reed	
Deneen	Kean	Robinson, Ark.	
Dill	Kendrick	Schall	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION FOR TO-MORROW

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, there were submitted this morning from the Committee on Interstate Commerce the names of the three Power commissioners whose nominations had been recommitted to that committee. I inquire of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNary] whether we might not at this hour to-morrow, 4 o'clock p. m., have an executive session for the purpose of considering those nominations and other matters on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think it eminently fair that some notice be given of an executive session. I agree with the Senator that we might have an executive session to-morrow at the hour suggested, provided that will give time to make final disposition of the matter.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am inclined to think so. I do not think there will be any extended debate on it.

Mr. McNARY. Also for the consideration of other matters on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think so.

Mr. McNARY. I am agreeable, and at 4 o'clock p. m. to-morrow I shall move that we proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator is apprehensive that business on the Executive Calendar will not be dispatched if the motion is made at that hour, I would suggest 3 o'clock instead of 4 o'clock.

Mr. McNARY. That is satisfactory to me.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill. The sooner the bill is enacted into law, of course, the sooner its provisions will go into effect. It is estimated that the bill will furnish employment up to the 1st of July for 25,000 or more men. In other words, if we get it through to-day, it means an additional day's work for 25,000 men between now and the 1st of July.

I feel that I should present the conference report at this time and ask for its immediate consideration. Let me say that it is a full agreement except that there are seven or eight amendments which the House conferees, under their rules, have to take back to the House, so they are reported

necessarily in disagreement; but, as I have said, there is a tentative agreement that the House conferees will ask the House to agree to those amendments.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I want to make a statement in reference to the report and the bill before any action is taken upon it. I believe there is not a Senator on either side of the Chamber who would justify or uphold the action of those representing the body at the other end of the Capitol in reference to one particular item in the bill. I do not think that the language itself would meet the approval of any Member of this body.

This is an emergency measure. Certain amounts in the bill were appropriated to meet the desperate condition of unemployment throughout the country. Amongst those were certain appropriations relating to naval projects on the part of the Government. There was under contemplation and is now before the Committee on Naval Affairs the question of our quota under the naval agreement as to certain vessels that should be constructed. In conference with the Secretary of the Navy I asked him with reference to the navy yard at Charleston, S. C., the only naval station south of Norfolk on a coast line of 3,500 miles, facing the Caribbean, the south Atlantic, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Panama Canal, south of the boneyard of the Atlantic, which is Cape Hatteras with her shoals and dangerous currents that extend for hundreds of miles out into the ocean. I asked the Secretary of the Navy if the Charleston Navy Yard might not be allowed to bid for the construction of certain destroyers. He promptly answered that it would be allowed to do so.

It developed that the superstructure of certain of the ways, having been constructed of wood, they are unfit now for the work for which they were constructed. The Bureau of Yards and Docks took every station on the Atlantic seaboard and the Pacific coast and provided for emergency work to aid the unemployed and to provide adequate facilities for carrying on our naval activities. It is a curious fact that in the bill, as the text will show, every naval station was provided for except the navy yard at Charleston, S. C., for which not a penny was appropriated; there was not even any reference to it. It was not estimated for by the Budget Bureau nor was it provided for by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, when my attention was called to this fact, I went before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. The Secretary of the Navy happened to be present, and also Admiral Parsons, who is the head of the yard and dock activities of the Navy Department. When I called attention to the omission the Secretary of the Navy seemed a bit surprised that that item had been overlooked or had been left out, and before the committee he indorsed the proposition that ways at the Charleston yard should be provided for and provided for now. He used language that was rather suggestive, to the effect that it was nothing but justice that this yard should partake of the emergency appropriation.

In addition to that, Admiral Parsons, who, as I stated, was present, and to whom the Secretary of the Navy referred, saying that perhaps he could better state the situation than he, the Secretary, unequivocally indorsed it. He went further than my suggestion before the committee in that respect. He said, "I do not think that under our policy it would be wise to construct the wooden ways," and that in the different navy yards they had been superseded by concrete ways which were practically permanent.

The question was asked: In case of need, in an emergency, in case of war, what about the use of the ways at the Charleston Navy Yard? He said they would be very necessary; and, not only that, but that they were essential in the construction of destroyers, for which Charleston had been promised an opportunity to bid.

It was also developed that the equipment of that yard was ample for the construction of destroyers, but all that would amount to nothing if the ways were not put into proper form, not only for the construction of destroyers but, according to testimony of Admiral Parsons, for lighter craft, such

vessels as heretofore have been built and launched at the navy yard at Charleston.

The committee on the part of the Senate unanimously incorporated the provision in the bill. I felt that as the injustice, as the Secretary of the Navy had pointed out, had been brought to the attention of my colleague in the Senate, and the provision had been incorporated, it would find no difficulty in being incorporated by the representatives in the other branch of Congress. The conferees on the part of the House, however, according to the information I have, steadfastly refused to allow the item to remain in the bill, although it involved only \$150,000 for the only navy yard on a coast line of 3,500 miles. North of Hatteras, to Portsmouth, N. H., a distance of 700 miles, there are 7 navy yards and 14 dry docks. If those were spaced according to miles, there would be a dry dock every 50 miles and a navy yard every 100 miles. South of Hatteras, on a coast line of 3,500 miles, there is but one navy yard. While there is an emergency appropriation for every navy yard north of Hatteras, there is not one dollar of such appropriation for the lone navy yard to the south of Hatteras.

Mr. President, if we are to provide for the employment of the unemployed, why discriminate against the only navy yard on the South Atlantic, and the Gulf coast, too, for that matter? I understand that the major objection was that the item was not estimated for by the Budget Bureau. I am not going to discuss this afternoon the question of the Budget Bureau. I do not believe there is a Senator on this floor who would not vote that the same treatment be accorded to the people who need employment in Charleston as is accorded to those who are employed in the other navy yards, even though the navy yards were as thickly placed on the South Atlantic and Gulf coast as they are on the North Atlantic. Why discriminate?

This afternoon I called on the Secretary of the Navy and asked him if he would not see the officers of the Budget Bureau and have this item estimated for, as I have been informed that if that bureau would submit an estimate perhaps the objection would be removed.

Mr. President, I do not want to be a dog in the manger; my opposition does not assume that aspect. It is simply a question of my duty not to my section alone—though, of course, I have a duty there—but to all sections to endeavor to have observed a decent regard for fair play. While appropriations have been made for all the navy yards on the West coast and on the East coast north of Cape Hatteras, for the only navy yard on all the southern coast, including the Gulf coast, not one penny is proposed to be appropriated.

The Secretary of the Navy himself, in the presence of the committee, and in the presence of the Senator who has charge of this bill used the significant language that, even if there were not an emergency, the appropriation would be just, and Admiral Parsons indorsed it and backed it up as being a necessity in order that there might be utilized the only harbor of refuge that would be available in case of accident to any of our vessels in the South Atlantic, the Gulf, or the Caribbean, without endangering them by being towed or trying to go under their own power around Cape Hatteras.

It is not pleasing to me, and it does not argue very well for the powers that be, that I and the representatives of the southern section of the country must stand here and plead for ordinary decent treatment in a matter that is national. We do not propose to defend our country sectionally; we did not do it in the World War. The boys from South Carolina have a record of which I am proud and which is equal, if not superior, to that of any who helped to break through the Hindenburg line and bring the first ray of hope to a beleaguered world. We may have some very great faults, but, thank God, the lack of spirit and bravery is not one of them.

For the 22 years that I have been a member of this body I have tried to take a national view of national questions. What, Mr. President, do you suppose my feelings are when I have to stand before the Senate and plead against sectional legislation?

I have asked Admiral Parsons and the Secretary of the Navy to appear before the Budget Bureau and request an

estimate for this item. They are now doing that, and I am going to ask the Senator who has the conference report in charge to withhold its consideration until noon to-morrow, when I am promised a report; not, in case the report is favorable, that I shall insist on the item being incorporated in this bill, but I want to ascertain whether or not the Budget Bureau is going to put me in an attitude where I can with some degree of confidence ask that the item may be incorporated in the second deficiency bill or in the naval appropriation bill. I am entitled to that consideration at the hands of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I have not taken up the time of the Senate with matters which were not essential. I appear now under a feeling of resentment. If this thing were done accidentally or through oversight, then, of course, it would relieve me of the feeling I have; but if it were done in a designed, calculating manner, then, Mr. President, I will, out of self-respect, out of regard for my country at large and for my section of the country in particular and for my State, have to do the best that I can to keep this sort of thing from happening.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Was the request made of the Budget Bureau to incorporate this item in the bill?

Mr. SMITH. After the Secretary of the Navy had indorsed it and Admiral Parsons, who had charge of yards and docks, to which the item pertains, had said that it would be looked after, I thought I had gone far enough to point out to the committee what had been done, and the committee unanimously incorporated the item in the bill.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. And no point of order was raised against it when the bill was before the Senate?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, no.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. So that the amendment was adopted by the Senate?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. I do not think a point of order against the amendment would have been sustained, because it was considered by a standing committee and incorporated by the committee in the bill; but no point of order was raised; it was adopted by this body as were the other amendments and went to the other House.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Now, may I ask the Senator this question: Under the procedure this item may be incorporated in another or second deficiency bill?

Mr. SMITH. It may be.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Or it may be added to and incorporated in the naval appropriation bill?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. But to have it placed in either the second deficiency bill or the naval appropriation bill, does the Senator understand that it is necessary to have an estimate by and the approval of the Budget?

Mr. SMITH. That is what I understand. I understand that perhaps the conferees on this bill would not have had this difficulty had there been an estimate by the Budget.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I am directly interested in procedure because I have an item which went out upon a point of order, and I wanted to have the matter cleared up.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President and Senators, I do not want to give way to just how I feel. I want to talk about this matter dispassionately. We are responsible, as legislators, for providing the law and the money to put the law into effect for the common defense, and the upkeep of those things that do defend our country.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. JONES. A moment ago the Senator submitted a proposition to me. I sympathize with the Senator's position; and, as I say, the conferees on the part of the Senate held out for this item just as long as they felt there was any possible hope for it. As a matter of fact, it was the last item that was finally dealt with in conference. So I

feel that the Senate conferees have done all that they could for the Senator's item.

Now, I want to appeal to the Senator on this phase of the matter:

As I said a while ago, it was estimated that the items incorporated in this bill and agreed to by the conferees will furnish labor for the unemployed to the extent of about 25,000 men between now and the 1st of July. In other words, every day that we delay here in the Senate means the loss of a day's work for 25,000 men. Under all the circumstances, I know that the Senator does not want to have that occur.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I state to the Senator that it is not very consoling to those in my section who want to enjoy the largess of our Government to be sacrificed while 25,000 men elsewhere are being taken care of? I do not think I would be just to myself and to the people employed in and around the Charleston yard to say, "Because the Budget for some reason did not estimate for you, although you were indorsed by the Secretary of the Navy and by the admiral who has this matter in charge, and by the Senate committee, I am going to let the other 25,000 men begin work at once. I yield because it is very urgent that somebody should get relief, but not you—not you."

No, Mr. President. I will tell you: I think I would be indorsed by my colleagues if I should ask the Senator just to allow this matter to go over until I hear from the Secretary of the Navy; and he promises to let me hear from him by 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I can not think that the laborers at the Senator's yard would say, "Because we can not get a day's work we are going to keep 25,000 of our comrades out of a day's work." They would not say that. Of course, they would regret that they do not get it, too.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I do not want to go into that phase of the matter at all, for the reason that unless there are grounds upon which the discrimination can be defended Congress has no right upon the premises before us to deny the laborers in that navy yard participation in an emergency matter that is as needful in the Charleston yard, perhaps more needful, than in any other yard on the Atlantic seaboard. It is very little to ask.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, how much is the item?

Mr. SMITH. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars. While millions are appropriated elsewhere, \$150,000 is asked there. That was Admiral Parsons's estimate for permanent concrete ways. I am only asking the Senator for this slight delay, not to prejudice the bill. It is going to pass, perhaps; but I am sure he and the other Members of the Senate who have charge of this bill will, if the Budget estimates for the item, do what they have done in this case, but with better means of sustaining it, if it is put on another bill.

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

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I had an item which went out on a point of order; and I understand that it may be in order later on if the Budget estimates and reports it.

I personally sympathize very much with the views expressed by the Senator from South Carolina. I feel that the Senator is entirely right in the position he takes; but may I suggest that if the item which concerns him may be taken care of in the second deficiency bill or in the naval appropriation bill, relief can be found in that way. Therefore, I venture to express the thought that he would not succeed by holding up this conference report and sending it back to the conferees, or asking them further to consider it, and that he may obtain relief in the way suggested, as I hope to obtain it.

Mr. SMITH. Whether I shall have to try, with what friends I may muster here and at the other end of the Capitol, to have this item incorporated in legislation is going to depend entirely upon whether or not the Budget will estimate for it. Had I dreamed that the indorsement of

the Secretary of the Navy and the admiral would be unheeded at the other end of the Capitol, and that they were going to use as an occasion—perhaps not the cause, but as the occasion—of their objection to the item that it was not estimated for, I should have sought to have that done. But after the indorsement of the Secretary of the Navy and of the admiral I thought they would look after the matter, since they had committed themselves to it, and never gave myself any further concern until I heard that it was violently objected to on the part of the House.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. On the merits?

Mr. SMITH. It could not have been on its merits, for I take it that they have good common sense over there.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH. I do.

Mr. GLASS. It has been explained to the Senator from South Carolina that the objection was largely technical, because the matter had not been estimated for, and the conferees did not want to start the precedent of putting in the bill matters that had not been estimated for. The Senator has been assured by his colleagues on this side at least, and I think on the other side, and the conferees on the bill, that if an estimate comes up the matter will be included in the next deficiency bill, the framing of which will be begun the latter part of this week.

Mr. JONES. Or the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. GLASS. Or the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask the Senator from Virginia a question. Suppose the Budget absolutely refuses to send down an estimate. In that event, what remedy would I have?

Mr. GLASS. I do not see that there is any remedy for the Senator so far as this particular conference report is concerned.

Mr. SMITH. I am not talking about this conference report.

Mr. GLASS. The remedy the Senator would have then would be to try to include it, the opposition of the House to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. SMITH. Precisely; and then have the same objection to meet in those bills that is made in this one. If there were any other method by which I could have the item incorporated in the second deficiency bill or in the naval appropriation bill, I should be perfectly willing to let this bill go and try my chances with those two measures.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, of what advantage would it be to the Senator to obstruct the consideration of this bill when he has just exactly the same opportunity to override the refusal of the Budget in the next deficiency bill and in the naval appropriation bill itself?

Mr. SMITH. The idea is that if this is an emergency matter, and the project was incorporated here in order to put it on a parity with the other emergency items in this bill, this is the appropriate place for quick action on an emergent project.

Mr. GLASS. The Senate conferees were simply unable, as hard as they tried to do it, to convince the conferees of the other House to that effect.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the experience I have had with this bill is not very promising as to what may occur in the others, but I am going to make this statement:

As efforts are now being made—honestly, I believe—to get an estimate from the Budget, I am going to allow this bill to pass; but, so help me God, if there is no estimate made, and I have not an opportunity with the estimate back of the item to include it in the other bills, I shall call on my friends who have so valiantly stood by this item this time to help me see that justice is done before this session of Congress shall have adjourned.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, and will the Senator stand by me and help me similarly?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; for I want to state here and now that I have been greatly encouraged by the attitude of the Senator from California in all matters with which I have

tried to impress the Senate. I think he is a man of extraordinarily high intelligence, because of his appreciation of what I have had to say.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I present the conference report and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the conference report? The Chair hears none, and the report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15592) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations 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 17, 24, 32, 33, 34, 37, 48, 74, 85, 86, 91, 92, 95, and 109.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 87, 88, 89, 90, 94, 98, 101, 102, 104, 106, 107, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, and 137, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$96,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000," and in line 7 strike out "\$103,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$57,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Forest Service: For construction of improvements for the protection and administration of the national forests, including telephone lines, fire breaks, dwellings, offices, miscellaneous small structures, and for fences and water-development projects for range control and other purposes and for combating epidemic insect infestations on the national forests adjacent to Yellowstone National Park and threatening the park timber and invaluable timber stands in northern Idaho, \$354,800."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Bureau of Biological Survey: For construction, repair, alteration, and improvement of buildings and other structures, dams, fences, telephone lines, roads, installation of electricity and water system, cold-storage plants, septic tanks, and for surveying wild-life refuges, and so forth, in connection with bird and game reservation and other field activities in Arizona, Arkansas, California, Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, or elsewhere, and for the control of injurious predatory animals and rodents, \$300,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"Tuberculosis building: For the construction and equipment of the second floor of the tuberculosis building, \$120,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 8, 11, 15, and 18 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following respective amounts: "\$206,000, \$18,000, \$11,000, \$15,000" and in line 18 strike out the sum "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof the sum "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$4,420,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Navy yard, Washington, District of Columbia: Improvement of heating system, \$20,000; improvement of power plant, \$25,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Submarine base, New London, Connecticut: Replace building numbered 42 damaged by fire, \$50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"AIR CORPS

"Air Corps, Army: For construction and repair of technical buildings, \$504,800; and torque stands and repair of buildings and equipment, \$366,300; in all, \$871,100."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$471,005"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard: For construction of buildings and utilities at camps, \$1,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following: "\$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by such amendment insert the following:

"Cemeterial expenses: For general repairs at national cemeteries, \$131,712."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 4, 18, 27, 76, 79, and 105.

W. L. JONES,
REED SMOOT,
FREDERICK HALE,
CARTER GLASS,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

WILL R. WOOD,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
EDWARD H. WASON,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
J. P. BUCHANAN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations how much effort was made to sustain amendment No. 103. That is the amendment which provides for very necessary work to be done by the Quartermaster Department over in Arlington Cemetery.

Mr. JONES. I remember that matter. We urged it very strongly in conference. If I am permitted to give the reasons which actuated the House conferees, I will say that one of them stated that they felt that we are providing a very great amount of Government work around Washington City. That was one reason which actuated them. They felt that they could not accept that amendment under all the circumstances.

Mr. REED. I realize, of course, that the conferees can not get every Senate amendment agreed to, and I am not criticizing the conferees—

Mr. JONES. I appreciate that.

Mr. REED. This is the matter in which the War Department is very much interested. It is necessary for the completion of the work in Arlington Cemetery that the money should be appropriated. There must be an administration building there, and it seemed to the department and to those who pay a good deal of attention to the affairs at Arlington Cemetery that this was the best possible time to do it.

Mr. JONES. I would say this, too, that the House conferees felt that if they considered it of sufficient importance to get an estimate sent down to be included in the general deficiency bill, it could be considered in connection with that.

Mr. REED. The Senator does not think, then, that the matter is so far foreclosed that it could not be considered with possible success in the last deficiency bill?

Mr. JONES. I do not think so. Possibly I ought to say a word about the amendments on which we reported disagreement, but which I said the House conferees were taking back to the House. I will make a brief statement.

One amendment was with reference to the provision of salaries of Senators appointed to fill vacancies. The House conferees will recommend the provision as inserted in the bill in the Senate.

In reference to the Bureau of Reclamation, we put on an amendment suspending payments to the Treasury for five years. We have reached a tentative agreement on two years. That will give us plenty of time to work the matter out in a regular and proper way and take care of the situation as it is developed.

The provision for a vessel for Alaska the conferees have tentatively agreed upon.

With reference to the Lynchburg post-office situation, the House conferees are going to recommend to the House that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

With reference to the Public Health Service and rural sanitation, the House conferees are going to recommend to the House to adopt \$2,000,000 instead of \$3,000,000, as we passed it through the Senate.

With reference to the Shiloh National Military Park road, in which the Senator from Tennessee is very much interested, the House conferees have tentatively agreed to the provision as we put it into the bill, and will recommend its adoption in the House.

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

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was looking through the conference report to see what disposition had been made of the amendment I offered, and which was agreed to, about the \$3,000,000 for rural sanitation. Just as I finished I heard the Senator say something about that. What is the status of that?

Mr. JONES. We have tentatively agreed on \$2,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was that agreed to among the conferees?

Mr. JONES. There was a tentative agreement among the conferees, and the House conferees will recommend to the House that that sum be agreed to by the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator did not bring that in as a part of the conference report?

Mr. JONES. We had to bring in a disagreement on that amendment, because this was only a tentative agreement, and under the rules of the House, apparently, the House conferees have to take certain things back to the House. So we had to report a disagreement, but the understanding is that the House conferees will recommend the adoption of \$2,000,000 by the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JONES. I ask that we proceed with the independent offices appropriation bill.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16415) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to read the bill for action on the amendments of the committee.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Office of the President," on page 2, line 10, after the word "President," to strike out "\$96,180; in all, \$126,180" and insert "\$97,200; in all, \$127,200," so as to read:

Salaries: For Secretary to the President, \$10,000; two additional secretaries to the President at \$10,000 each; personal services in the office of the President, \$97,200; in all, \$127,200.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, these amendments the clerk is now about to read are simply amendments to carry out the average salary provision.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 22, to increase the total appropriation for the Executive Office from \$532,-380 to \$533,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the heading "Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission," on page 6, line 22, after the figures "\$50," to strike out "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay for the cost of widening and paving B Street NW., as provided in the approved project, except for such portions as may abut upon Government-owned property, and not in excess of 40 per cent of the cost of widening and paving of that portion of the said street which so abuts" and in lieu thereof to insert "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay for the cost of reconstructing and paving B Street NW., as provided in the approved project, except for such portions as may abut upon Government-owned property, and not in excess of 40 per cent of the cost of such repaving of that portion of the said street which so abuts."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Board of Mediation," on page 7, line 22, before the word "of," to strike out "\$186,685" and insert "\$187,045," and in line 23, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$141,500" and insert "\$141,860," so as to read:

For five members of the board, at \$12,000 each, and for other authorized expenditures of the Board of Mediation in performing the duties imposed by law, including personal services; contract stenographic reporting services without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); supplies and equipment; law books and books of reference; not to exceed \$200 for newspapers; periodicals; traveling expenses; rent of quarters in the District of Columbia, if space is not provided by the Public Buildings Commission, and rent of quarters outside the District of Columbia, \$187,045, of which amount not to exceed \$141,860 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 25, to increase the total appropriation for the Board of Mediation from \$188,185 to \$188,545.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Board of Tax Appeals," on page 9, line 14, before the word "of," to strike out "\$608,640" and insert "\$609,460," and in line 15, before the word "may," to strike out "\$546,839" and insert "\$547,659," so as to read:

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the work of the Board of Tax Appeals as authorized under Title IX, section 900, of the revenue act of 1924, approved June 2, 1924, as amended by Title X of the revenue act of 1926, approved February 26, 1926, and Title IV of the revenue act of 1928, approved May 29, 1928, including personal services and contract stenographic reporting services to be obtained by renewal of existing contract, or otherwise, rent outside the District of Columbia, traveling expenses, car fare, stationery, furniture, office equipment, purchase and exchange of typewriters, law books and books of reference, periodicals, and all other necessary supplies, \$609,460, of which amount not to exceed \$547,659 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 19, to increase the total appropriation for the Board of Tax Appeals from \$653,640 to \$654,460.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Efficiency," on page 10, line 2, before the word "of," to strike out "\$199,770" and insert "\$200,970," and in line 3, before the word "may," to strike out "\$193,720" and insert "\$194,920," so as to read:

For chief of bureau and other personal services in the District of Columbia; contract stenographic reporting services; contingent expenses, including traveling expenses; supplies, stationery; purchase and exchange of equipment; not to exceed \$100 for law books, books of reference, newspapers and periodicals; and not to exceed \$150 for street-car fare; in all, \$200,970, of which amount not to exceed \$194,920 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 7, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Efficiency, from \$200,270 to 201,470.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Civil Service Commission," on page 10, line 10, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$849,570" and insert "\$872,430," so as to read:

Salaries: For three commissioners and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$872,430.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I ought to say, in justice to the Senate, that there is an addition to the field force provided in the amendment, as well as a salary increase. One of the commissioners urged that they be removed from the classification law. We did not feel that we ought to make an exception in their case, because if we should do that we would be asked to make exceptions in a great many cases. So we left the commissioners' salaries unchanged.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 11, after the word "force," to strike out "\$557,540" and insert "\$566,840," so as to read:

Field force: For salaries of the field force, \$566,840.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 6, before the word "of," to strike out "\$27,840" and insert "\$28,080," and in line 7, before the word "may," to strike out "\$23,840" and insert "\$24,080," so as to read:

For examination of presidential postmasters, including travel, stationery, contingent expenses, additional examiners, and investigators, and other necessary expenses of examinations, \$28,080, of which amount not to exceed \$24,080 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 14, to increase the total appropriation for the Civil Service Commission, from \$1,644,542 to \$1,676,942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Commission of Fine Arts," on page 12, line 25, before the word "of," to strike out "\$9,475" and insert "\$9,695," and on page 13, line 1, before the word "may," to strike out "\$6,200" and insert "\$6,420," so as to read:

For expenses made necessary by the act entitled "An act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," approved May 17, 1910 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 104), including the purchase of periodicals, maps, and books of reference, and payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and secretary of the commission in attending meetings and committee meetings of the commission either within or outside of the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the commission, \$9,695, of which amount not to exceed \$6,420 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 5, to increase the total appropriation for the Commission of Fine Arts, from \$9,775 to \$9,995.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Employees' Compensation Commission," on page 13, line 18, to strike out "\$522,980" and insert "\$526,380," so as to read:

For three commissioners and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including not to exceed \$1,000 for temporary experts and assistants in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$8 per day, and for personal services in the field; for furniture and other equipment and repairs thereto; law books, books of reference, periodicals; stationery and supplies; traveling expenses; fees and mileage of witnesses; contract stenographic reporting services without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); rent at the seat of government and elsewhere; and miscellaneous items, \$526,380.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 11, to increase the total appropriation for the Employees' Compensation Commission from \$4,730,480 to \$4,734,380.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Board for Vocational Education," on page 15, line 20, before the word "of," to strike out "\$94,380" and insert "\$95,280," so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: For carrying out the provisions of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories," approved February 5, 1929 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 20, secs. 15b, 15c), \$95,280, of which amount not to exceed \$68,500 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 25, before the word "of," to strike out "\$77,960" and insert "\$77,980," and in the same line, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$56,880" and insert "\$57,000," so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: For making studies, investigations, and reports regarding the vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons and their placements in suitable or gainful occupations, and for the administrative expenses of said board incident to performing the duties imposed by the act of June 2, 1920 (U. S. C., title 29, sec. 35), as amended by the act of June 5, 1924 (U. S. C., title 29,

sec. 31), and the act of June 9, 1930, including salaries of such assistants, experts, clerks, and other employees, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, as the board may deem necessary, actual traveling and other necessary expenses incurred by the members of the board and by its employees, under its orders; including attendance at meetings of educational associations and other organizations, rent and equipment of offices in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, purchase of books of reference, law books, and periodicals, newspapers not to exceed \$50, stationery, typewriters and exchange thereof, miscellaneous supplies, postage on foreign mail, printing and binding, and all other necessary expenses, \$77,980, of which amount not to exceed \$57,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, at the end of line 11, to strike out "\$14,740" and insert "\$15,000," so as to read:

Cooperative vocational rehabilitation of disabled residents of the District of Columbia: For personal services, printing and binding, travel and subsistence, and payment of expenses of training, placement, and other phases of rehabilitating disabled residents of the District of Columbia under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the vocational rehabilitation of disabled residents of the District of Columbia," approved February 23, 1929 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 29, secs. 47-47e), \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Power Commission," on page 20, line 11, after the word "periodicals," to strike out "\$255,695" and insert "\$256,495," and in line 12, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$212,620" and insert "\$213,420," so as to read:

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the work of the Federal Power Commission as authorized by law, including traveling expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings which in the discretion of the commission are necessary for the efficient discharge of its responsibilities; contract stenographic reporting services, and not exceeding \$1,000 for press-clipping service, law books, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals, \$256,495, of which amount not to exceed \$213,420 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, including five commissioners at \$10,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 18, to increase the total appropriation for the Federal Power Commission from \$260,195 to \$260,995.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Radio Commission," on page 21, line 10, before the word "of," to strike out "\$465,380" and insert "\$466,820," and in line 11, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$365,880" and insert "\$367,320," so as to read:

For five commissioners, at \$10,000 each per annum, and for all other authorized expenditures of the Federal Radio Commission in performing the duties imposed by the radio act of 1927, as amended, including personal services, contract stenographic reporting services without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), printing and binding, rental of quarters in the District of Columbia, newspapers, periodicals, reference books, law books, special counsel fees, supplies and equipment, which may be purchased without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$25, traveling expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings which in the discretion of the commission are necessary for the efficient discharge of its responsibilities, and other necessary expenses, \$466,820, of which amount not to exceed \$367,320 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Trade Commission," on page 22, line 6, before the word "of," to strike out "\$1,731,766" and insert "\$1,745,986," and in line 7, before the word "may," to strike out "\$1,316,924" and insert "\$1,329,144," so as to read:

For five commissioners, at \$10,000 each per annum, and for all other authorized expenditures of the Federal Trade Commission in performing the duties imposed by law or in pursuance of law, including secretary to the commission and other personal services, contract stenographic reporting services to be obtained on and after the approval of this act by the commission, in its discretion, through the civil service or by contract, or renewal of existing contract, or otherwise, supplies and equipment, law books, books of reference, periodicals, garage rental, traveling expenses, including not to exceed \$900 for expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the commission, at meetings concerned with the work of the Federal Trade Commission, not to exceed \$300 for

newspapers, not to exceed \$200 for newspaper clippings, foreign postage, and witness fees, and mileage in accordance with section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission act, of which \$150,000 shall be immediately available, \$1,745,986, of which amount not to exceed \$1,329,144 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, including witness fees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 12, to increase the total appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission from \$1,761,766 to \$1,775,986.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Accounting Office," on page 22, line 17, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$4,052,620; in all, \$4,062,620" and insert "\$4,118,320; in all, \$4,128,320," so as to read:

Salaries: Comptroller General, \$10,000; for Assistant Comptroller General and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$4,118,320; in all, \$4,128,320.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 12, to increase the total appropriation for the General Accounting Office from \$4,297,620 to \$4,363,320.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "George Washington Bicentennial Commission," on page 24, line 22, after the word "acts," to strike out "fiscal year 1931," so as to read:

For carrying out the provisions of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the comprehensive observance of that greatest of all historic events, the bicentennial of the birthday of George Washington," approved December 2, 1924 (43 Stat. 671), and all other activities authorized by the act entitled "An act to enable the George Washington Bicentennial Commission to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans," approved February 21, 1930 (46 Stat. 71), including personal services without reference to the classification act of 1923, as amended, and civil-service regulations, traveling expenses, furniture and equipment, supplies, printing and binding, rent of buildings in the District of Columbia, and all other expenditures authorized by the above acts, \$338,195, to be available until expended, for each and every object of expenditure connected with the celebration notwithstanding the provisions of any other act relating to the expenditure of public moneys, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the executive committee, or such person as may be designated by him to approve vouchers.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Washington would let this amendment go over. I presume we will shortly be concluding our business for the day, anyway. I do not know that there will be any objection to the amendment, but some discussion of this provision may involve this amendment.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator thinks it will involve any amendment which there might be a desire to discuss, I am perfectly willing that it should go over.

Mr. NORRIS. I am satisfied the Senator will do what is right about it, but so as to avoid any possibility of anybody else objecting, I would prefer having the amendment go over unacted on.

Mr. JONES. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to make the same statement about the amendment on page 25, line 9, under the heading of "Housing Corporation." I would like to have that go over.

Mr. JONES. I suppose the Senator would also want to have the amendments on pages 26 and 27 go over?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; all amendments relating to the Housing Corporation.

Mr. JONES. I had hoped we would be able to dispose of those this afternoon. Would the Senator want to take some little time?

Mr. NORRIS. I think there will be some Senators who are not here now who will want to participate in the debate on some of those things. I would not want to have them taken up without calling for a quorum.

Mr. JONES. They may be passed over then.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments will be passed over without prejudice.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission," on page 27, line 14, before the word "of," to strike out "\$3,090,900" and insert "\$3,113,280," and in the same line, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$2,569,160" and insert "\$2,591,000," so as to read:

For 11 commissioners, at \$12,000 each; secretary, \$9,000, and for all other authorized expenditures necessary in the execution of laws to regulate commerce, including one chief counsel, one director of finance, and one director of traffic at \$10,000 each per annum, traveling expenses, and stenographic reporting services to be obtained on and after the approval of this act by the commission, in its discretion, through the civil service or by contract or renewal of existing contract, or otherwise, \$3,113,280, of which amount not to exceed \$2,591,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, exclusive of special counsel, for which the expenditure shall not exceed \$50,000; not exceeding \$3,000 for purchase and exchange of necessary books, reports, and periodicals; not exceeding \$100 in the open market for the purchase of office furniture similar in class or kind to that listed in the general supply schedule; and not exceeding \$139,000 for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 10, before the word "of," to strike out "\$1,504,420" and insert "\$1,507,000," and in line 11, before the word "may," to strike out "\$252,840" and insert "\$255,000," so as to read:

Regulating commerce: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to enforce compliance with section 20 and other sections of the act to regulate commerce as amended by the act approved June 29, 1906 (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 20), and as amended by the transportation act, 1920 (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 20), including the employment of necessary special accounting agents or examiners, and traveling expenses, \$1,507,000, of which amount not to exceed \$255,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 2, before the word "of," to strike out "\$534,660" and insert "\$539,460," and in line 3, before the word "may," to strike out "\$94,340" and insert "\$95,000," so as to read:

Safety of employees: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to keep informed regarding and to enforce compliance with acts to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads; the act requiring common carriers to make reports of accidents and authorizing investigations thereof; and to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate and test appliances intended to promote the safety of railway operation, as authorized by the joint resolution approved June 30, 1906 (U. S. C., title 45, sec. 35), and the provision of the sundry civil act approved May 27, 1908 (U. S. C., title 45, secs. 36, 37), to investigate, test experimentally, and report on the use and need of any appliances or systems intended to promote the safety of railway operation, inspectors, and for traveling expenses, \$539,460, of which amount not to exceed \$95,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 16, before the word "of," to strike out "\$48,260" and insert "\$48,380," and in line 17, before the word "may," to strike out "\$34,880" and insert "\$35,000," so as to read:

Signal safety systems: For all authorized expenditures under section 26 of the act to regulate commerce as amended by the transportation act, 1920 (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 26), with respect to the provision thereof under which carriers by railroad subject to the act may be required to install automatic train-stop or train-control devices which comply with specifications and requirements prescribed by the commission, including investigations and tests pertaining to block-signal and train-control systems, as authorized by the joint resolution approved June 30, 1906 (U. S. C., title 45, sec. 35), and including the employment of the necessary engineers, and for traveling expenses, \$48,380, of which amount not to exceed \$35,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 13, before the word "of," to strike out "\$504,865" and insert "\$508,885," and in line 14, before the word "may," to strike out "\$79,880" and insert "\$80,000," so as to read:

Locomotive inspection: For all authorized expenditures under the provisions of the act of February 17, 1911, "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" (U. S. C., title 45, sec. 22), as amended by the act of March 4, 1915, extending "the same powers and duties with respect to all parts and appurtenances of the locomotive and tender"

(U. S. C., title 45, sec. 30), and amendment of June 7, 1924 (U. S. C., title 45, sec. 27), providing for the appointment from time to time by the Interstate Commerce Commission of not more than 15 inspectors in addition to the number authorized in the first paragraph of section 4 of the act of 1911 (U. S. C., title 45, sec. 26), and the amendment of June 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 822, 823), including such legal, technical, stenographic, and clerical help as the business of the offices of the chief inspector and his two assistants may require, and for traveling expenses, \$508,885, of which amount not to exceed \$80,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 3, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$3,554,368" and insert "\$3,583,588," so as to read:

Valuation of property of carriers: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out the objects of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof," by providing for a valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject thereto and securing information concerning their stocks, bonds, and other securities, approved March 1, 1913 (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 19a), including one director of valuation at \$10,000 per annum, one supervisor of land appraisals, one supervising engineer, one supervisor of accounts, and one principal valuation examiner, at \$9,000 each per annum, and traveling expenses, \$3,583,588: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia if suitable space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, every amendment in the bill from this point on relates to average-salary provisions. I ask unanimous consent that they may be agreed to en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and all the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The first of the amendments agreed to en bloc was, on page 31, line 20, to increase the total appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission from \$9,412,473 to \$9,475,593.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics," on page 32, line 22, before the word "of," to strike out "\$1,028,070" and insert "\$1,030,790," so as to read:

For scientific research, technical investigations, and special reports in the field of aeronautics, including the necessary laboratory and technical assistants; contracts for personal services in the making of special investigations and in the preparation of special reports; traveling expenses of members and employees, including not to exceed \$500 for expenses, except membership fees, of attendance upon meetings of technical and professional societies; office supplies and other miscellaneous expenses, including technical periodicals and books of reference; equipment, maintenance, and operation of the Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory; purchase, maintenance, operation, and exchange of motor-propelled, passenger-carrying vehicles; personal services in the field and in the District of Columbia; in all, \$1,030,790, of which amount not to exceed \$1,550 may be expended for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (46 Stat. 818), and not to exceed \$116,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 8, to increase the total appropriation for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, from \$1,051,070 to \$1,053,790.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Personnel Classification Board," on page 34, line 16, after the word "devices," to strike out "\$218,850" and insert "\$220,830," so as to read:

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the work of the Personnel Classification Board, as authorized by the classification act of 1923, as amended, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, telegrams, telephone service, printing and binding, law books, books of reference, periodicals, stationery, furniture, office equipment, other supplies, street-car fares (not exceeding \$100), purchase and exchange of typewriters and labor-saving devices, \$220,830.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital," on page 35, line 6, before the word "including," to strike out "\$2,793,250" and insert "\$2,847,490," so as to read:

For personal services in the District of Columbia, \$2,847,490 including not to exceed \$25,000 for intermittent and seasonal employees at per diem rates of compensation to be fixed by the director.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 21, to increase the total appropriation for the office of Public Buildings and

Public Parks of the National Capital from \$5,541,445 to \$5,595,685.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Smithsonian Institution," on page 38, at the end of line 21, to strike out "\$38,644" and insert "\$38,764," so as to read:

For expenses of the general administrative office, Smithsonian Institution, including an additional assistant secretary at \$9,000 per annum during the present incumbency, compensation of necessary employees, traveling expenses, purchase of books and periodicals, supplies and equipment, and any other necessary expenses, \$38,764.

The next amendment was, on page 39, at the end of line 3, to strike out "\$54,060" and insert "\$54,180," so as to read:

International exchanges: For the system of international exchanges between the United States and foreign countries, under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution, including necessary employees, and purchase of necessary books and periodicals, and traveling expenses, \$54,180.

The next amendment was, on page 40, at the end of line 2, to strike out "\$37,620" and insert "\$37,680," so as to read:

Astrophysical Observatory: For maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory, under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution, including assistants, purchase of books, periodicals, and apparatus, making necessary observations in high altitudes, repairs and alterations of buildings, preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations, traveling expenses, and miscellaneous expenses, \$37,680.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Museum," on page 40, line 11, to strike out "\$154,580" and insert "\$155,060," so as to read:

For cases, furniture, fixtures, and appliances required for the exhibition and safe-keeping of collections; heating, lighting, electrical, telegraphic, and telephonic service, repairs and alterations of buildings, shops, and sheds, including approaches and all necessary material; personal services, and traveling and other necessary incidental expenses, \$155,060.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 21, after the word "periodicals," to strike out "\$618,890" and insert "\$621,050," so as to read:

For continuing preservation, exhibition, and increase of collections from the surveying and exploring expeditions of the Government, and from other sources, including personal services, traveling expenses, purchasing and supplying uniforms to guards and elevator conductors, postage stamps and foreign postal cards and all other necessary expenses, and not exceeding \$5,500 for preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publications, and not exceeding \$3,000 for purchase of books, pamphlets, and periodicals, \$621,050.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Gallery of Art," on page 41, line 2, after the word "expenses" to strike out "\$45,220" and insert "\$45,400," so as to read:

For the administration of the National Gallery of Art by the Smithsonian Institution, including compensation of necessary employees, purchase of books of reference and periodicals, traveling expenses, uniforms for guards, and necessary incidental expenses, \$45,400.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Printing and binding," on page 41, line 16, before the word "of," to strike out "\$1,153,804" and insert "\$1,156,924," and in line 17, before the word "may," to strike out "\$903,871" and insert "\$906,991," so as to read:

Total, Smithsonian Institution, \$1,156,924, of which amount not to exceed \$906,991 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The next amendment was, under the heading "United States Geographic Board," on page 43, at the end of line 10, to strike out "\$9,178" and insert "\$9,238," so as to read:

For salaries and expenses of the United States Geographic Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia, and for stationery and office supplies, \$9,238.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 13, to increase the total appropriation for the United States Geographic Board from \$10,678 to \$10,738.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "United States Shipping Board shipping fund," on page 47, line 4,

before the word "act," to insert "appropriation," so as to read:

Provided further, That the unexpended balances of the sums made available by the independent offices appropriation act, 1930, for reconditioning and operating ships for carrying coal to foreign ports shall continue available for the same purposes for the fiscal year 1932.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Veterans' Administration," on page 50, line 8, after the word "administering," to strike out "\$110,228,707" and insert "\$111,078,587," so as to read:

Administration, Medical, Hospital, and Domiciliary Services: For all salaries and expenses of the Veterans' Administration, including the expenses of maintenance and operation of medical, hospital, and domiciliary services of the Veterans' Administration, in carrying out the duties, powers, and functions devolving upon it pursuant to the authority contained in the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to consolidate and coordinate governmental activities affecting war veterans," approved July 3, 1930 (46 Stat., 1016), and any and all laws for which the Veterans' Administration is now or may hereafter be charged with administering, \$111,078,587:

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 17, to increase the total appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, from \$866,012,732 to \$866,862,612.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 18, to increase the total appropriation carried in the act from \$1,052,768,140 to \$1,053,872,344.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, there is a committee amendment on page 34, line 1, which I now offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 34, line 1, after the word "services," insert the following:

And without reference to civil service rules and the classification act of 1923, as amended.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, just what does that mean?

Mr. JONES. I do not believe myself in the suspension of the civil service rules unless it seems to be absolutely necessary. I have a letter from Colonel Grant with reference to this situation reading as follows:

With further reference to Senate hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill, the following language was eliminated on the floor of the House from the item for the National Capital Park and Planning Commission:

" * * * and without reference to civil-service rules and the classification act of 1923, as amended; * * * "

This commission will be required to purchase \$4,000,000 worth of property during the next fiscal year as provided in the Capper-Cramton Act and the employment of technical and real-estate experts who have many years experience under local conditions is necessary for economical purchases. The Civil Service Commission does not maintain a register of this class of personnel and indeed it would prove difficult to establish such a register. This commission employs some experts in this work under existing authority and to be required to recognize at this time and await civil-service approval would obviously be a handicap.

Furthermore, outside the District of Columbia the available maps are not adequate and it would not be safe to make purchases without an official survey and better mapping of the topography. In order to start this work promptly survey parties have been organized under the foregoing authority, and to disorganize these parties now in the midst of their work would manifestly be very harmful to their work.

It is, therefore, respectfully requested that the Senate Appropriations Committee consider the advisability of reinstating this language.

I think the Senator will appreciate the situation.

Mr. COUZENS. For how long a period are these people to be employed?

Mr. JONES. He says within the next year.

Mr. COUZENS. And for what purpose?

Mr. JONES. For the acquiring of lands in the District for governmental purposes.

Mr. COUZENS. Does it extend beyond the period of this appropriation bill?

Mr. JONES. Oh, no; the provision only affects this appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would be very difficult for civil-service employees to value land in the District. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I offer another committee amendment, on page 48. This is a provision exactly in accordance with a similar amendment adopted on the War Department appropriation bill with reference to purchases in the United States, changed only, of course, to conform to this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the amendment be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, strike out lines 18 to 22, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That in the expenditure of appropriations in this act for the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, the said corporation shall, when in its discretion the interest of the Government will permit, purchase for use, within the limits of the United States, only articles of the growth, production, or manufacture of the United States, notwithstanding any existing laws to the contrary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 49, after line 6, insert the following:

The authority granted to the United States Shipping Board by the second deficiency act, fiscal year, 1928, to enter into contracts to make loans from the construction loan fund is hereby increased from \$150,000,000 to \$185,000,000.

Mr. JONES. I may offer a short explanation of this amendment. In the deficiency appropriation act, passed about eight days after we passed the shipping act in 1928, it was provided that contracts for these loans should not be made beyond \$150,000,000, instead of \$250,000,000, as provided in the act itself. That has all been contracted except some \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000. If we make no provision of this kind, they could not contract up to the \$35,000,000 provided in the bill. The amendment practically covers that amount.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. It is a committee amendment approved by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, after line 17, insert as a separate paragraph the following:

No part of the funds of the United States Shipping Board or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall be available for the maintenance of a sea service bureau.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter addressed by Andrew Furuseth to the chairman of the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

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

The letter is as follows:

JANUARY 6, 1930.

HON. EDWARD H. WASON,
Chairman Subcommittee on Independent Offices,
Committee on Appropriations, House of
Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN OF THE COMMITTEE: Inclosed please find copy of general petition dated November 15, 1929, relating to the abolition of appropriation for the sea service bureau, operated by the Shipping Board.

The inclosed petition was prepared before the report of the Shipping Board was available, and therefore deals only with the past.

On pages 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, and 122 of the Annual Report of the United States Shipping Board, fiscal year ended June 30, 1929, there are additional new facts, or comparatively new, which are herein respectfully brought to your attention, because by these facts the reasons for the abolition of the bureau are seriously reinforced. On page 42 the report says:

"It is obvious that with the gradual transfer of the publicly owned fleet to private American ownership, as a result of the Shipping Board's vigorous sales policy, the board finds itself concerned more and more with marine and dock labor employed in connection with privately owned American vessels. During the fiscal year 1928 the board sold all its remaining services on the Pacific, and

during the year covered by this report it has also disposed of its passenger lines on the Atlantic. This latter transaction takes it entirely out of ocean passenger service and at the present writing (June 30, 1929) leaves the Government operating but 17 cargo lines, 4 of which it is hoped may be sold in the near future."

Notwithstanding that no Government-owned vessels are operated from Pacific ports, there are two sea service bureaus operated at Seattle and Portland, in duplication of the shipping commissioners' offices operated according to law in these places. The reason given by the bureau for operating these offices, and others, is that the shipowners desire it. The shipowners' reason—if they were to tell the truth—is that the bureau is doing the work previously done by the crimps and doing it at Government expense, since it can not now be safely done by the crimps at the seamen's expense. This is the shipowners' reason everywhere. The sea service bureau helps them to disregard the law in the manner stated in a circular sent to Senators and Members of Congress in 1928, and found on page 2 of the seamen's petition of November 15, 1929.

On page 122 it is stated that the board operated 135 vessels, 11 of which have been sold and are now in process of delivery, so that 224 vessels will now be operated. To find the men for those vessels—men of the kind desired by the shipowners—sea service employment offices are being operated in 12 ports where there are shipping commissioners' offices, which under Government control, will furnish the men without cost but, of course, in accordance with law made by Congress.

On page 47 the bureau states that it has placed 65,906 seamen on vessels. Among these seamen it reports 28 masters who, of course, are placed by the owners or managers; 359 deck officers, who are always placed by the owners, the port captain, or by the masters; 10 chief engineers, who are always placed by the owners or operators; and 531 officers in the engine department, which officers are usually placed by the owners, the port engineers, or the masters. The masters, by the way, under the law, are to place all the men under them on the vessels in their proper ratings.

The report, on page 47, further says that the bureau has placed 20,599 able seamen on vessels.

The supervising inspector general stated in 1928, in answer to an inquiry made, that in 1927, 16,633 able seamen were needed for inspected vessels (p. 3 of petition). We thus find from the report that the Sea Service Bureau has, in the 12 ports in which it operates, placed 3,966 more able seamen than in 1927 were needed to man all the inspected vessels trading from all the ports of the country, including the Great Lakes.

Using round figures, approximately correct, the Shipping Board operates 225 vessels. Of the 235 operated on page 122, eleven are reported sold and in process of delivery, so that 225 would be fair for the present. These vessels trade to Europe, South America, and the Far East, making on an average eight trips per year. Each vessel employs eight able seamen, including the boatswain, and we thus get 14,400 able seamen employed by those vessels for each year, if new able seamen are employed at the beginning of each trip. This gives about 175 per cent of a turnover. If we subtract 387 deck officers and 541 engineer officers, among whom the turnover is small, then 1,444 petty deck officers, and 5,200 petty engineer officers, among whom the turnover would be about the same as among the able seamen, and add to this figure the 14,400 able seamen, we will yet have about 40,000 persons to fill the places of the remaining crew. This would be impossible but for the fact that a very large number of men employed in the coastwise and intercoastal trade are placed by the Sea Service Bureau. The number of men placed in foreign-going vessels and in vessels engaged in the coastwise and intercoastal trade is not segregated in the report, but that the latter number is very considerable is plain from the figures given above, and the turnover indicated both in the foreign and in the coastwise places of employment filled on ships by the Sea Service Bureau is so great that it is impossible, under this system, to develop efficient men to man our merchant marine.

From a national defense point of view, vessels are an asset, but vessels without efficient men to man them are a liability that grows with the number of vessels. Whether this question of the Sea Service Bureau and system used by it is approached from a safety point of view or from a national defense point of view, it fails entirely to accomplish the purpose declared by Congress, and I respectfully submit that it should be abolished.

Most respectfully yours,

ANDREW FURSETH.

Charles Wilson, being duly sworn, deposes and says: I am a citizen of the United States, 62 years of age, 5 feet 8 inches, weigh 165 pounds, in excellent health, and in possession of all my faculties.

I have been following the sea for a livelihood in the steward's department for 35 years, and for the last 25 years I have been acting in the capacity of a chief steward. Since 1920 I have been almost continually employed by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation as chief steward on ships operated by it through operators from Galveston and New Orleans, on vessels operated by their operators, the Lykes brothers. I have been employed on the steamships *Youngstown*, *Marne*, *Nishmaha*, and others.

My last employment was for the Consolidated Navigation Co., operators for the Fleet Corporation, on the steamship *Winona Country*, running out of Baltimore to England.

On the 24th day of October, 1927, I wrote the following letter to Captain McCaulder, who is the head agent of the Fleet Corporation in Baltimore:

S. S. WINONA COUNTY,
Manchester, England October 24, 1927.

Captain McCaulder,
United States Shipping Board, Baltimore.

DEAR SIR: I herewith respectfully beg to inform you that on joining this vessel as chief steward in Baltimore last September I experienced a lot of opposition from the sea service bureau in regard to getting good reliable men for my department. At the request of Mr. Agello, the port steward, I engaged the cooks and messmen beforehand, knowing them to be sober and trustworthy men who had sailed with me on other vessels. At the S. S. B., however, Captain Hagues told me that I had nothing to do with picking my men; it was up to him to send the men needed on board. Yet I know for a fact that the chief steward of the S. S. *Eastern Dawn* that very day was permitted to pick his men at the S. S. B. This rather astonished men, as I always enjoyed the privilege to pick good, capable men while sailing out of Galveston, New Orleans, Boston, and New York. In these ports the S. S. B. cooperates with the steward and this is the only way to get decent and efficient men on board. There are in Baltimore a class of men who only join these ships for no other purpose than going on a good spree when they get across. They are either on board drunk or absent altogether. I have two of these specimens on board now. It has always been my aim to keep these undesirables off these ships, as they are only a disgrace to the country in general and to the merchant marine in particular. I fail to see what possible objection the S. S. B. can have to a man trying to employ respectable men in preference to drunkards and wasters. Any scheme that keeps these undesirables off the ship ought, to my way of thinking, only be too welcome. I brought this vital matter to your notice for no other purpose than to try and stop the hiring of men that are entirely unfit for the work.

If you think that my complaint in this matter is justified I shall esteem it a favor if you would permit me to call upon you personally on our return to Baltimore.

I beg to remain, dear sir, yours faithfully,

CHAS. WILSON, Chief Steward.

The facts contained therein are true.

In the 18th day of January, 1928, I was given the following letter of recommendation from the master of the said steamship *Winona County*:

FLEET CORPORATION,
STEAMSHIP "WINONA COUNTY,"
Baltimore, Md., January 18, 1928.

To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that Charles Wilson has served on the above-named vessel from September 22, 1927, to present date, and I have found him reliable and capable man; attentive to his duties at all times and strictly sober, and will recommend him to anyone in need of his service.

R. B. ATHERTON,
Master Steamship "Winona County."

I have other letters from masters of other vessels, equally testifying as to my good character and ability. As a result of this letter I was relieved of my position and told that I was not wanted any longer.

I was discharged by the Consolidated Navigation Co., the operator of the Fleet Corporation, by the marine superintendent, Dutton. Through the port steward for the Consolidated Navigation Co. I was informed that the reason for my discharge was because I had written this letter and for no other reason. I shall continue to seek employment on any other vessels where I can find employment.

I wrote to Mr. Axtell, an attorney, when I was in Baltimore to ascertain if I had any cause of action because of my improper discharge. I have been informed that I have no case, because I had not signed on for a new voyage and then discharged. I was not permitted to sign for a new voyage.

I am making this affidavit at the request of Mr. Axtell, in order that facts therein contained may be made public, may be filed with the committee in Congress, who may be interested in the matter, and brought to the attention of the head of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation or any others who are interested in the American merchant marine.

I wrote the letter simply because I thought that they would appreciate it and because I assume that maybe having to do with the operation of American vessels they would be interested in improving the service. I find that such is not their case—in this instance at least.

CHAS. WILSON.

Sworn to before me this 28th day of February, 1928.
(Copy signed but not sworn to. Original used elsewhere.)

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Washington expect to conclude the consideration of the appropriation bill to-night?

Mr. JONES. No, Mr. President; we can hardly finish to-night.

Mr. McNARY. Then I desire to move a recess.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the motion for just a moment?

Mr. McNARY. Certainly.

WRITINGS OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Library I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 5724) authorizing the George Washington Bicentennial Commission to print and distribute additional sets of the writings of George Washington, and I submit a report (No. 1450) thereon.

In explanation of the bill let me say that in making provisions for publication of Washington's writings, which are now in progress of publication, the first two volumes having already been printed, we made requirement that there was to be no distribution until the final volume was published. There will be 25 or 27 volumes in all. We are told that the Printing Office will scarcely have space to store the volumes up to the time the work is completed, which will be probably four years from now. That is one feature of the law that had to be changed.

Then, it is desired to have printed a thousand volumes for distribution rather as advertising. The director of the centennial wants to print those at his own expense. He could not do it without our giving him leave to do it. I have incorporated in the bill an amendment to the law permitting him to do that. These two changes in the law are approved by the committee unanimously. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, can the Senator tell us what method of distribution of the other copies will be used?

Mr. FESS. There will be 25 copies given to the Congressional Library. There will be a copy to each of the members of the Cabinet, to each Senator, to each Member of the House of Representatives, and then there are to be 2,500 copies sold at actual cost.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, as I understand from the Senator's statement there is a provision in the bill allowing somebody to print 1,000 copies at his own expense.

Mr. FESS. Yes; the director wants to do that.

Mr. NORRIS. Where is it to be done?

Mr. FESS. In the Government Printing Office.

Mr. NORRIS. What is he going to do with those copies?

Mr. FESS. They are to be distributed by the commission.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator think it proper to let an official do that in that way?

Mr. FESS. He wants to do it and he can not do it unless we agree to it.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that, but he is going to use the Government Printing Office and Government machinery.

Mr. FESS. He gets nothing out of it. He wants to do it for the commission.

Mr. NORRIS. Is he going to sell the copies?

Mr. FESS. No; he turns them over to the commission. He wants to print them himself. We provided for a certain number and he wants to add 1,000 copies.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection if they go to the commission in its official capacity.

Mr. FESS. That is what is to be done with them.

Mr. NORRIS. I understood the Senator to say that the official as an individual was going to have 1,000 copies printed.

Mr. FESS. It is to be done for the commission.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator about the probable cost of the printing?

Mr. FESS. I do not know what the estimated cost is. There is an appropriation of \$56,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, if it is printed by the Government as a public document, it is then frankable.

Mr. FESS. No. There is a distribution fixed, 1 copy to the President, 1 to the Vice President, 1 to each member of the Cabinet, 1 to each Senator, 1 to each Member of the House of Representatives, 25 to the Congressional Library, and so on. Then there are 2,500 copies to be sold at actual cost by the Government.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Under the proposed bill are the volumes to be distributed as they are issued?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. What is the nature of the document?
Mr. FESS. The complete writings of George Washington.
The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was read, considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to enable the George Washington Bicentennial Commission to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans," approved February 21, 1930, is amended by striking out all preceding the last sentence therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"That the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of George Washington established by the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the comprehensive observance of that greatest of all historic events, the bicentennial of the birthday of George Washington,' approved December 2, 1924 (hereinafter referred to as the commission), is authorized and directed to prepare, as a congressional memorial to George Washington, a definitive edition of all his essential writings, public and private (excluding the diaries), including personal letters from the original manuscripts or first prints, and the general orders, at a cost not to exceed \$56,000 for preparation of the manuscript. Such definitive edition shall be printed and bound at the Government Printing Office and shall be in about the same form as the already published diaries of George Washington and shall consist of 25 volumes, more or less. There shall be 6,000 sets of such edition, 4,500 of which shall be sold by the Superintendent of Documents (1) at a cost of \$50 per set for sets sold to public libraries and institutions and societies of learning, and (2) the remainder of the 4,500 sets, at a cost equal (together with the receipts from the sets sold to such libraries, institutions, and societies) to the total cost under this section of preparing the manuscript and printing and binding the entire edition. The commission shall, upon the publication of each volume of the remaining 1,500 sets, distribute copies of each such volume as follows: Two each to the President, the library of the Senate, and the library of the House of Representatives; 25 to the Library of Congress; 1 to each member of the Cabinet; 1 each to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; 1 to each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner; 1 each to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives; and 1 to each member and officer of the commission. Every such recipient eligible to receive any volume or volumes of such writings at any time prior to the issue of the final volume (but not later than December 31, 1935) shall be entitled to receive a complete set of such writings. The remaining sets, if any, shall be distributed as the commission directs, including such number of sets as may be necessary for foreign exchange. The usual number for congressional distribution and for depository libraries shall not be printed."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of such act of February 21, 1930, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The 1,000 extra copies (heretofore privately printed) of the first volume of such writings shall be considered to have been authorized by the commission, and the commission may accept a donation of such extra copies for distribution for reviews, advertising, and for such other promotional purposes as it may deem advisable. If the commission shall direct the Superintendent of Documents to sell any such extra copies of the first volume, he shall offer the same for sale at a cost per copy equal to the cost per copy of the first volume as computed under clause (2) of the third sentence of this section. Such extra copies shall be the only copies of any volume of the set distributed or sold separately."

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 4, 1931, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 3 (legislative day of January 26), 1931

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE

Bromley Wharton, of Philadelphia, Pa., to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 11, with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa., in place of George O'Brien.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Arthur V. Cashion to be postmaster at Eudora, Ark., in place of A. V. Cashion. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Arch B. Smith to be postmaster at Osceola, Ark., in place of A. B. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Omer B. Ewing to be postmaster at Scranton, Ark., in place of O. B. Ewing. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

CALIFORNIA

Edna J. McGowan to be postmaster at Belmont, Calif., in place of E. J. McGowan. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Ethel R. Nance to be postmaster at Coachella, Calif., in place of E. R. Nance. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Henry Metzler to be postmaster at Fowler, Calif., in place of Henry Metzler. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

James C. Tyrrell to be postmaster at Grass Valley, Calif., in place of J. C. Tyrrell. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Bert W. Miller to be postmaster at Hiltz, Calif., in place of B. W. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Emerson B. Herrick to be postmaster at Lodi, Calif., in place of E. B. Herrick. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Charles G. Brainerd to be postmaster at Loomis, Calif., in place of C. G. Brainerd. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Charles S. Graham to be postmaster at Pleasanton, Calif., in place of C. S. Graham. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Richard J. Doyle to be postmaster at St. Mary's College, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Sherman G. Batchelor to be postmaster at San Bernardino, Calif., in place of S. G. Batchelor. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Leonard G. Hardy, jr., to be postmaster at South San Francisco, Calif., in place of L. G. Hardy, jr. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Anna R. Armstrong to be postmaster at Woodland, Calif., in place of A. R. Armstrong. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

COLORADO

William A. Russom to be postmaster at Bristol, Colo., in place of W. A. Russom. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Earl E. Ewing to be postmaster at Colorado Springs, Colo., in place of E. E. Ewing. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1931.

John L. Nightingale to be postmaster at Fort Collins, Colo., in place of J. L. Nightingale. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Theodore Stremme to be postmaster at Gypsum, Colo., in place of Theodore Stremme. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

CONNECTICUT

Burton Hodge to be postmaster at Roxbury, Conn., in place of Burton Hodge. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

HAWAII

William I. Wells to be postmaster at Haiku, Hawaii, in place of W. I. Wells. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Kenichi Masunaga to be postmaster at Kealia, Hawaii, in place of Kenichi Masunaga. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Alexander Moir to be postmaster at Papaikou, Hawaii, in place of Alexander Moir. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

IDAHO

Willis M. Sears to be postmaster at Albion, Idaho, in place of W. M. Sears. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1930.

George F. McMartin to be postmaster at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, in place of G. F. McMartin. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

ILLINOIS

Robert B. Marshall to be postmaster at Capron, Ill., in place of R. B. Marshall. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Samuel H. Lawton to be postmaster at Delavan, Ill., in place of S. H. Lawton. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

William D. Chambers to be postmaster at East Moline, Ill., in place of W. D. Chambers. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Edward S. Breithaupt to be postmaster at Gifford, Ill., in place of E. S. Breithaupt. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Richard W. Miller to be postmaster at Hamilton, Ill., in place of R. W. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Fannie Hicks to be postmaster at Ivesdale, Ill., in place of Fannie Hicks. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Lester B. McAllister to be postmaster at Oak Park, Ill., in place of W. A. Spickerman. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1929.

Fred A. Sapp to be postmaster at Ottawa, Ill., in place of F. A. Sapp. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

George S. Faxon to be postmaster at Plano, Ill., in place of G. S. Faxon. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

David S. Cossairt to be postmaster at Potomac, Ill., in place of D. S. Cossairt. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

William H. Fahnestock to be postmaster at Rushville, Ill., in place of W. H. Fahnestock. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Joseph C. Painter to be postmaster at Stronghurst, Ill., in place of J. F. Mains, deceased.

George J. Duncan to be postmaster at Villa Grove, Ill., in place of G. J. Duncan. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Sylvester H. DePew to be postmaster at Zion, Ill., in place of S. H. DePew. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

INDIANA

Albert O. Cripe to be postmaster at Alexandria, Ind., in place of A. O. Cripe. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Lewis A. Graham to be postmaster at Decatur, Ind., in place of L. A. Graham. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

IOWA

Lloyd M. Poe to be postmaster at Blockton, Iowa, in place of L. M. Poe. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Benjamin H. Todd to be postmaster at Ida Grove, Iowa, in place of B. H. Todd. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Charles B. Abbott to be postmaster at Imogene, Iowa, in place of C. B. Abbott. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Oscar W. Larson to be postmaster at Odebolt, Iowa, in place of O. W. Larson. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Calvin L. Sipe to be postmaster at Sioux Rapids, Iowa, in place of C. L. Sipe. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Paul F. Wilharm to be postmaster at Sumner, Iowa, in place of P. F. Wilharm. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Joseph C. Allen to be postmaster at Zeoring, Iowa, in place of J. C. Allen. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

KANSAS

Isaac A. Robertson to be postmaster at Alma, Kans., in place of I. A. Robertson. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Jesse M. Foster to be postmaster at Clifton, Kans., in place of J. M. Foster. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Edward R. Dannefer to be postmaster at Cuba, Kans., in place of E. R. Dannefer. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Albert J. Deane to be postmaster at Fowler, Kans., in place of A. J. Deane. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Melvin F. Gardner to be postmaster at Greenleaf, Kans., in place of M. F. Gardner. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

James G. Frazer to be postmaster at Halstead, Kans., in place of J. G. Frazer. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Abe K. Stoufer to be postmaster at Liberal, Kans., in place of A. K. Stoufer. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Alta A. McCutcheon to be postmaster at Little River, Kans., in place of A. A. McCutcheon. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Raymond R. Norris to be postmaster at Marquette, Kans., in place of R. R. Norris. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Louis T. Miller to be postmaster at Ness City, Kans., in place of L. T. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Charles N. Wooddell to be postmaster at Nickerson, Kans., in place of C. N. Wooddell. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Luella Tapley to be postmaster at Quenemo, Kans., in place of Luella Tapley. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

George S. Robb to be postmaster at Salina, Kans., in place of G. S. Robb. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

KENTUCKY

James A. Leach to be postmaster at Beaver Dam, Ky., in place of J. A. Leach. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Thomas D. Jones to be postmaster at Clinton, Ky., in place of David Johnson, resigned.

Jewell S. Webb to be postmaster at Earlington, Ky., in place of J. S. Webb. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Samuel W. Crump to be postmaster at Glasgow Junction, Ky., in place of S. W. Crump. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Carl B. Marshall to be postmaster at Lewisburg, Ky., in place of C. B. Marshall. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Newell R. Downing to be postmaster at Mays Lick, Ky., in place of N. R. Downing. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Lottie P. Thompson to be postmaster at Sadieville, Ky., in place of L. P. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Raymond B. Dycus to be postmaster at Smithland, Ky., in place of W. C. Barnwell. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1930.

LOUISIANA

Charles E. Burch to be postmaster at Roseland, La., in place of C. E. Burch. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

MAINE

John A. Babb to be postmaster at Dixfield, Me., in place of J. A. Babb. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

MARYLAND

Irving S. Biser to be postmaster at Frederick, Md., in place of I. S. Biser. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

MICHIGAN

Elmer R. Fate to be postmaster at Bellaire, Mich., in place of E. R. Fate. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Orin T. Mallory to be postmaster at Blissfield, Mich., in place of O. T. Mallory. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

Gladys E. Gaskill to be postmaster at Delton, Mich., in place of G. E. Gaskill. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Sarah E. Beardsley to be postmaster at Garden, Mich., in place of Joseph Deloria, resigned.

Charles B. Curtis to be postmaster at Houghton Lake, Mich., in place of C. B. Curtis. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

MINNESOTA

Frank L. Lane to be postmaster at Bigelow, Minn., in place of F. L. Lane. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Walter N. Ostrom to be postmaster at Braham, Minn., in place of C. O. Hallstrom, removed.

Frank A. Lindbergh to be postmaster at Crosby, Minn., in place of F. A. Lindbergh. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

George W. Kiefer to be postmaster at Lewiston, Minn., in place of G. W. Kiefer. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

MISSOURI

Leeta F. Waggy to be postmaster at Adrian, Mo., in place of L. W. Warnken. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

William A. Edwards to be postmaster at Bagnell, Mo. Office became presidential April 1, 1930.

George L. Pemberton to be postmaster at Charleston, Mo., in place of G. L. Pemberton. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

George S. Lorimer to be postmaster at Hickman Mills, Mo. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Edwin H. Laubert to be postmaster at Mayview, Mo., in place of E. H. Laubert. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

NEBRASKA

Edwin H. Springer to be postmaster at Brady, Nebr., in place of E. H. Springer. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

William A. Gibson to be postmaster at Cedar Rapids, Nebr., in place of W. A. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

James M. Fox to be postmaster at Gretna, Nebr., in place of J. M. Fox. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Hiram B. Cameron to be postmaster at Herman, Nebr., in place of H. A. Riley. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Harry A. Riley to be postmaster at Spalding, Nebr., in place of H. A. Riley. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

NEW JERSEY

Timothy J. Nevill to be postmaster at Carteret, N. J., in place of T. J. Nevill. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Raymond F. Reihl to be postmaster at East Paterson, N. J., in place of S. L. Caruth, resigned.

Frederick C. Docker to be postmaster at Oxford, N. J., in place of F. C. Docker. Incumbent's commission expires February 9, 1931.

NEW MEXICO

Winnie E. Pittman to be postmaster at Cloudcroft, N. Mex., in place of C. E. Herndon, resigned.

NEW YORK

Roof D. Miller to be postmaster at Fort Plain, N. Y., in place of R. D. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

William D. Shepard to be postmaster at Geneseo, N. Y., in place of W. D. Shepard. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Carroll F. Simpson to be postmaster at Phoenicia, N. Y., in place of C. F. Simpson. Incumbent's commission expires February 9, 1931.

Earl P. Milks to be postmaster at Scio, N. Y., in place of G. M. Watson, removed.

Henry E. Johnston to be postmaster at Spencer, N. Y., in place of H. E. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1931.

Brainard W. Russell to be postmaster at Windsor, N. Y., in place of B. W. Russell. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

NORTH CAROLINA

Theron C. Dellinger to be postmaster at Crossnore, N. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mina H. Aasved to be postmaster at Carson, N. Dak., in place of M. H. Aasved. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Josephine M. Lierboe to be postmaster at Turtle Lake, N. Dak., in place of J. M. Lierboe. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1931.

OHIO

Henry W. Gruver to be postmaster at Miamisburg, Ohio, in place of H. W. Gruver. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

PENNSYLVANIA

George R. Fleming to be postmaster at Haverford, Pa., in place of G. R. Fleming. Incumbent's commission expires February 9, 1931.

Norman S. Helff to be postmaster at Hummelstown, Pa., in place of W. P. Landis. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1928.

Harry A. Borland to be postmaster at Indiana, Pa., in place of H. A. Borland. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

John S. Steinmetz to be postmaster at Richland, Pa., in place of J. S. Steinmetz. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1931.

Jane R. Lohmann to be postmaster at Trucksville, Pa., in place of J. R. Lohmann. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

RHODE ISLAND

William H. Godfrey to be postmaster at Apponaug, R. I., in place of W. H. Godfrey. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

TEXAS

Gertrude M. McCraney to be postmaster at Santa Rosa, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Frank A. King to be postmaster at Whitewright, Tex., in place of B. P. Brents, removed.

UTAH

Annie Palmer to be postmaster at Farmington, Utah, in place of Annie Palmer. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

VIRGINIA

Lawrence L. Jacobs to be postmaster at Hanover, Va., in place of L. L. Jacobs. Incumbent's commission expires February 19, 1931.

Charles F. Flanary to be postmaster at Jonesville, Va., in place of C. F. Flanary. Incumbent's commission expires February 19, 1931.

Grace H. Jenkins to be postmaster at Powhatan, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

John J. Kivlighan to be postmaster at Staunton, Va., in place of J. J. Kivlighan. Incumbent's commission expires February 19, 1931.

Dandridge W. Marston to be postmaster at Toano, Va., in place of D. W. Marston. Incumbent's commission expires February 19, 1931.

WASHINGTON

Charles R. Bockmier to be postmaster at Granite Falls, Wash., in place of C. R. Bockmier. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Maud E. Hays to be postmaster at Starbuck, Wash., in place of M. E. Hays. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Arthur A. Bousquet to be postmaster at Wenatchee, Wash., in place of A. A. Bousquet. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

WEST VIRGINIA

John B. Hilleary to be postmaster at Buckhannon, W. Va., in place of J. B. Hilleary. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

William M. Kidd to be postmaster at Burnsville, W. Va., in place of W. M. Kidd. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Carl A. Dehner to be postmaster at Chester, W. Va., in place of C. A. Dehner. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Walter O. Deacon to be postmaster at Hurricane, W. Va., in place of W. O. Deacon. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Oliver A. Locke to be postmaster at Milton, W. Va., in place of O. A. Locke. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

WISCONSIN

Herman Rau to be postmaster at Chilton, Wis., in place of J. H. Wagner, removed.

Frederick N. Lochemes to be postmaster at St. Francis, Wis., in place of F. N. Lochemes. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Wilbur H. Bridgman to be postmaster at Stanley, Wis., in place of W. H. Bridgman. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1931

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, Thou art the one and profound remedy for human weakness and human sin. As a loving Father, Thou standest at the door of every heart and, with Thy fullness, art ready to enter. How we thank Thee for the greatness and the permanence of that love with which Thou hast loved us. Accept our deepest gratitude and continue with us in our great needs and ballast our very souls with wisdom and patience. Rekindle in us those mighty enthusiasms which shall make these days great and equip us as the strong sons of God. Thou hast two thrones—one in the highest heavens and one in the lowliest heart. All that Thou requirest of us is a beautiful and a humble life that deals justly, loves mercy, and walks with God in the chosen path of our high calling. 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. 14040. An act to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to expedite work on the Federal building program authorized by the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, and acts amendatory thereof.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10166. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works at Philadelphia, Pa., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 722, Seventy-first Congress, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report on the enforcement of the prohibition laws of the United States.

PETER R. WADSWORTH

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Claims I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6668) for the relief of Peter R. Wadsworth, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,012.32, to be credited to the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians, for the purpose of discharging the obligations of Peter R. Wadsworth, former superintendent and special disbursing agent of the Consolidated Chippewa Indian Agency, Cass Lake, Minn., arising out of the failure of the First National Bank of St. Cloud, Minn., on June 17, 1925.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to pay, out of the money so credited, the unpaid claims of all Chippewa Indians against such agency arising out of such bank failure."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for discharging certain obligations of Peter R. Wadsworth, former superintendent and special disbursing agent of the Consolidated Chippewa Indian Agency."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in what particular does this change the House bill?

Mr. IRWIN. It is merely a matter of changing the language in the bill.

Mr. GARNER. Does it go any further than to appropriate a thousand dollars and odd?

Mr. IRWIN. It does not change the amount, \$1,012.32.

Mr. GARNER. What is the additional language? Does it authorize any future appropriation?

Mr. IRWIN. No; it simply changed the language to put it in a more parliamentary form.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE—LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF HOUSE

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House for one week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, is there any chance of getting any soldiers' legislation to pay now the adjusted-compensation certificates out of that committee?

Mr. HAWLEY. The committee is working very hard upon it, assembling the information. What the committee will do I am not authorized to state.

Mr. BLANTON. The ex-service men are appealing to the Members of the House from every State and district in the Union. They want to know what to expect, and we want to have some definite information to give them.

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

There was no objection.

PENSIONS

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 16744) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain

soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, and ask that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill and that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill.

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

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following bills referred to the committee:

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| H. R. 1617. Charity V. Waitman | H. R. 13754. Emma A. Boisseau. | H. R. 15236. Ella Andrews. |
| H. R. 3526. Sarah A. Colwell. | H. R. 13764. Gertrude Newton. | H. R. 15237. Elizabeth Kridler. |
| H. R. 3835. Gertrude K. Miller. | H. R. 13776. Sarah S. Ginn. | H. R. 15249. Ella Grove. |
| H. R. 7433. Anna Walker. | H. R. 13793. Nancy Napier. | H. R. 15301. Catherine Durling. |
| H. R. 7810. Emma C. Wright. | H. R. 13798. Sarah A. Clements. | H. R. 15302. Serena E. Robinson. |
| H. R. 8795. Porter H. Rogers. | H. R. 13800. Jennie E. Baetcke. | H. R. 15303. Mary J. McKee. |
| H. R. 9093. Lillah J. Davis. | H. R. 13823. Mary E. Brooks. | H. R. 15312. Anna Beckert. |
| H. R. 9320. Mahala Turner. | H. R. 13834. Christiana Kline. | H. R. 15314. Ora M. White. |
| H. R. 9520. Nanna Hooper. | H. R. 13836. Susan Keperling. | H. R. 15321. Sarah F. Lindley. |
| H. R. 9746. Catherine B. Strong | H. R. 13848. Mary M. Miller. | H. R. 15325. Susan E. Luckey. |
| H. R. 10619. Agnes Maydwell. | H. R. 13859. Julia M. Huff. | H. R. 15326. Samantha V. Lowe. |
| H. R. 11567. Olive H. Woods. | H. R. 13869. Louvenia F. Barger. | H. R. 15329. Alice Ferrin. |
| H. R. 12675. Annie E. Moorman. | H. R. 13871. Nancy J. Herring. | H. R. 15332. Sadie A. Coburn. |
| H. R. 13219. Martha J. Blanchard. | H. R. 13886. Martha J. Phillips. | H. R. 15338. Agnes S. Craig. |
| H. R. 13324. Hattie F. Clark. | H. R. 13888. Martha C. Parman. | H. R. 15381. Minnie Hedrick. |
| H. R. 13346. Selma Ward. | H. R. 13890. Joseph P. Ligon. | H. R. 15382. Cora D. Willett. |
| H. R. 13353. Sarah Conkel. | H. R. 13894. Zachariah T. Olbin, | H. R. 15388. Lovina Yarian. |
| H. R. 13355. Emily Coy. | alias Zachariah | H. R. 15389. Lena Van Anda. |
| H. R. 13356. Mary Dawson. | Olbin, alias Zach- | H. R. 15390. Lucy J. Shore. |
| H. R. 13357. Elizabeth Freshcorn. | ariah Olbin. | H. R. 15391. Catharine Stanford. |
| H. R. 13358. Nancy O. Hurt. | H. R. 13897. Mary E. Hoffman. | H. R. 15394. Sarah A. Thompson. |
| H. R. 13359. Mary J. Hunt. | H. R. 13898. Elizabeth Pansler. | H. R. 15401. Lucinda Shelton. |
| H. R. 13362. Addie McKee. | H. R. 13899. Martha J. Johnson. | H. R. 15403. Annie Killion. |
| H. R. 13364. Samantha Rucker. | H. R. 13905. Margaret Vaughn. | H. R. 15405. Mary Cardiff. |
| H. R. 13365. Mary E. Turner. | H. R. 13906. Molley Simmons. | H. R. 15407. Lulu H. Powers. |
| H. R. 13369. Theodore L. Wilson. | H. R. 13913. Louisa L. Fryman. | H. R. 15413. Sarah Weedon. |
| H. R. 13370. Bessie Carr. | H. R. 13927. Percy Renick. | H. R. 15414. Ann E. McKissick. |
| H. R. 13390. Laura E. Whitaker. | H. R. 13942. Olivia Harris. | H. R. 15438. Martha A. Peer. |
| H. R. 13392. Elizabeth Nixdorf. | H. R. 13945. Mary Clegg. | H. R. 15439. Emily S. Cravens. |
| H. R. 13394. Kate Merritts. | H. R. 13947. Susannah B. Simp- | H. R. 15442. Barbaretta Weekly. |
| H. R. 13401. Rachel Davis. | son. | H. R. 15459. Malinda Young. |
| H. R. 13409. Mary A. Crum. | H. R. 13950. Margaret McCoy. | H. R. 15468. Roxanna Jane |
| H. R. 13410. Harriet McDaniel | H. R. 13951. Agnes Sink. | Turner. |
| Cornell. | H. R. 13952. Catherine E. Wolf- | H. R. 16469. Amanda E. Larick. |
| H. R. 13412. Harriet W. Eador. | gong. | H. R. 16470. Jennie A. Wildy. |
| H. R. 13413. Joanna Jemima | H. R. 13963. Mary R. Butler. | H. R. 16471. Mary Schmidt. |
| Herron. | H. R. 13965. Oma D. Morgan. | H. R. 16477. Ella Sullivan. |
| H. R. 13419. Margaret A. Wells. | H. R. 13974. Margaret A. Belvel. | H. R. 15484. Margaret Plerson. |
| H. R. 13424. Emma Knott. | H. R. 13978. Genettie D. Harlan. | H. R. 15504. Maria Langhans. |
| H. R. 13431. McHenry Whitney. | H. R. 13980. America J. McCoun. | H. R. 15509. Emma Robinson. |
| H. R. 13452. Annie Hanes. | H. R. 13982. Catherine Johnson. | H. R. 15521. Clara G. Branch. |
| H. R. 13462. Amy J. Ray. | H. R. 13989. Patience Metcalf. | H. R. 15528. Mary Meier. |
| H. R. 13463. Amanda E. Walter. | H. R. 13992. Eliza J. Spohn. | H. R. 15530. Mary M. Hawkins. |
| H. R. 13467. Elizabeth E. Fickle. | H. R. 14011. Fanny Conner. | H. R. 15536. Sarah J. Weaver. |
| H. R. 13469. Louise B. Ogle. | H. R. 14014. Martha P. Hoffer. | H. R. 15537. Mary E. Bigley. |
| H. R. 13477. Rebecca Bonnell. | H. R. 14015. Alice Loughner. | H. R. 15542. Euphemia S. Coon. |
| H. R. 13486. Emma M. Shattuck. | H. R. 14016. Susan Marshall. | H. R. 15545. Sabina Tacey. |
| H. R. 13488. Cornelia E. M. Mc- | H. R. 14020. Susan Mitchell. | H. R. 15546. Jennie Marshall. |
| Ginnis. | H. R. 14025. Clara Ziegler. | H. R. 15557. Harriet A. Weeks. |
| H. R. 13499. Mary J. Miller. | H. R. 14101. William J. Coberly, | H. R. 15558. Sibyl A. Rowell. |
| H. R. 13503. Rhoda T. Dawson. | alias William Co- | H. R. 15574. Mary Jacobson. |
| H. R. 13504. Ruth H. Davis. | berly, alias Wil- | H. R. 15581. Elizabeth Sutton. |
| H. R. 13505. Tamzen B. Lippin- | liam Coberly. | H. R. 15625. Adda Laura Morri- |
| cott. | H. R. 14112. Mattie T. Gray. | son. |
| H. R. 13506. Mary E. Purnell. | H. R. 14145. Mary O. Miller. | H. R. 15633. Meta Tellkamp. |
| H. R. 13510. Helen Winton. | H. R. 14187. John Aldridge, alias | H. R. 15645. Melissa A. Moore. |
| H. R. 13512. Martha J. Graham. | John N. Aldridge. | H. R. 15681. Mollie Bouldin. |
| H. R. 13607. Hettie M. Davis. | H. R. 14198. Mary J. Hull. | H. R. 15703. Sarah Jones. |
| H. R. 13626. Hattie N. Peckham. | H. R. 14200. Ellah M. Cole. | H. R. 15704. Louisa Manterstock. |
| H. R. 13634. Laura Reen. | H. R. 14215. Hester L. Penrose. | H. R. 15788. Catherine Ruth- |
| H. R. 13635. Mary E. Knisley. | H. R. 14226. Charles Bell. | ford. |
| H. R. 13639. Rebecca J. Walker. | H. R. 14237. Henrietta Ray. | H. R. 15793. Almeda Leal. |
| H. R. 13642. S. Emeline Dewey. | H. R. 14305. Hattie A. Lemen. | H. R. 15802. Winnie A. Strayer. |
| H. R. 13655. Mary Frey. | H. R. 14329. Eliza I. Utter. | H. R. 15811. Martha Pack. |
| H. R. 13656. Mary A. Starry. | H. R. 14335. Mary J. Beckwith. | H. R. 15843. Sarah A. McDole. |
| H. R. 13657. Elizabeth Luty. | H. R. 14338. Eliza Martin. | H. R. 15882. Elizabeth F. Welch. |
| H. R. 13718. Sarah Delph. | H. R. 14353. Hattie M. Robbins. | H. R. 15909. Sarah E. Phillips. |
| H. R. 13719. Elizabeth Hargis. | H. R. 14357. Rachel E. Smith. | H. R. 15912. Joseph Morton Fin- |
| H. R. 13720. Mary P. Cummins. | H. R. 14365. Susan Ashley. | ney. |
| H. R. 13724. Kiziah Knowles. | H. R. 14366. Lizzie Downing. | H. R. 15920. Eleveann Albert. |
| H. R. 13725. Laura E. Hill. | H. R. 14374. Martha R. Brown. | H. R. 15935. Louisa C. Morehead. |
| H. R. 13726. Richard M. Williams. | H. R. 14375. Annie E. Tillinghast. | H. R. 15936. Emma C. Butler. |
| H. R. 13728. Eliza G. McWhorter. | H. R. 14381. Jennie Morrison. | H. R. 15978. Dora E. Hutchens. |
| H. R. 13730. Elizabeth Baker. | H. R. 14384. Mary E. Britton. | H. R. 16001. Mary E. Shirk. |
| H. R. 14427. Sarah C. Personett. | H. R. 14621. Mary E. Campbell. | H. R. 16002. Minnie G. Oakley. |
| H. R. 14431. Ella B. White. | H. R. 14622. Louisa V. Osbon. | H. R. 16016. Mary F. Becknell. |
| H. R. 14432. Mary A. Bowman. | H. R. 14625. Mary S. Greenamire. | H. R. 16018. Adelia H. Bishop. |
| H. R. 14434. Phebe Janet Clark. | H. R. 14633. Margaret E. Seydell. | H. R. 16020. Frederick C. Perry. |
| H. R. 14461. Augusta H. Briggs. | H. R. 14640. Lydia Bacon. | H. R. 16046. Sarah J. Libby. |
| H. R. 14469. Catharine Berry. | H. R. 14642. Elizabeth Wilson. | H. R. 16055. Louisa H. Emerson. |
| H. R. 14485. Alice Werner. | H. R. 14647. Emma J. Finkle. | H. R. 16106. Nellie N. Taft. |
| H. R. 14494. Ann Amelia Moore. | H. R. 14662. Mary A. Work. | H. R. 16121. Margaret S. Whirl. |
| H. R. 14495. Catherine Jones. | H. R. 14665. Hildia P. Hiatt. | H. R. 16134. Jane Alden. |
| H. R. 14521. Mary F. Stewart. | H. R. 14668. Nancy Wood. | H. R. 16142. Margaret A. Webster |
| H. R. 14523. Emma R. McDaniels. | H. R. 14670. Clementine Blewald. | H. R. 16146. Frances M. Paul. |
| H. R. 14594. Hannah M. Hamil- | H. R. 14736. Mary F. Shook. | H. R. 16175. Elizabeth Young. |
| ton. | H. R. 14741. Mary Carpenter. | H. R. 16224. Martha Hattery. |
| H. R. 14621. Mary E. Campbell. | H. R. 14746. Rebecca E. Smith. | H. R. 16233. Anna Gault. |
| H. R. 14622. Louisa V. Osbon. | H. R. 14747. Caroline Light. | H. R. 16311. Sallie Brown. |
| H. R. 14625. Mary S. Greenamire. | H. R. 14748. Mary Burke. | H. R. 16318. Margaret E. Maxwell. |
| H. R. 14633. Margaret E. Seydell. | H. R. 14753. Leticia A. Widener. | H. R. 16326. Alfaretta S. Bond. |
| H. R. 14640. Lydia Bacon. | H. R. 14758. Ellen Welch. | H. R. 16350. Jennie C. Wakefield. |
| H. R. 14642. Elizabeth Wilson. | H. R. 14760. Gennari Francis. | H. R. 16367. Cora B. Sollers. |
| H. R. 14647. Emma J. Finkle. | H. R. 14764. Permella J. Bratton. | H. R. 16391. Susan E. Allen. |
| H. R. 14662. Mary A. Work. | H. R. 14769. Fendora M. Terwilli- | H. R. 16582. Frances Adelia Hun- |
| H. R. 14665. Hildia P. Hiatt. | ger. | gerford. |
| H. R. 14668. Nancy Wood. | H. R. 14776. Laura Oram. | H. R. 16611. Virginia Hamilton. |
| H. R. 14670. Clementine Blewald. | H. R. 14778. Margaret Sherman. | |
| H. R. 14736. Mary F. Shook. | H. R. 14781. Jennie A. Smith. | |
| H. R. 14741. Mary Carpenter. | H. R. 14783. Ida Jacobs. | |
| H. R. 14746. Rebecca E. Smith. | H. R. 14784. Catherine A. Bailey. | |
| H. R. 14747. Caroline Light. | H. R. 14787. Sadie M. Corell. | |
| H. R. 14748. Mary Burke. | H. R. 14789. Adalaid Collins. | |
| H. R. 14753. Leticia A. Widener. | H. R. 14790. Harriet Austin. | |
| H. R. 14758. Ellen Welch. | H. R. 14791. Myrtle L. McDerm- | |
| H. R. 14760. Gennari Francis. | ott. | |
| H. R. 14764. Permella J. Bratton. | H. R. 14796. Miranda Q. Moore. | |
| H. R. 14769. Fendora M. Terwilli- | H. R. 14851. Julian E. Cooper. | |
| ger. | H. R. 14852. Ellen J. Ludlow. | |
| H. R. 14776. Laura Oram. | H. R. 14855. Sarah F. Downard. | |
| H. R. 14778. Margaret Sherman. | H. R. 14869. Jennie A. Whitney. | |
| H. R. 14781. Jennie A. Smith. | H. R. 14880. Sarah E. Dyer. | |
| H. R. 14783. Ida Jacobs. | H. R. 14903. Emma Gordon. | |
| H. R. 14784. Catherine A. Bailey. | H. R. 14946. Adaline Roberts. | |
| H. R. 14787. Sadie M. Corell. | H. R. 14956. Anna S. Duffner. | |
| H. R. 14789. Adalaid Collins. | H. R. 14958. Isabelle Williams. | |
| H. R. 14790. Harriet Austin. | H. R. 14961. Allie E. Fleming. | |
| H. R. 14791. Myrtle L. McDerm- | H. R. 14962. Sara P. Bowen. | |
| ott. | H. R. 14965. Elizabeth Mitchell. | |
| H. R. 14796. Miranda Q. Moore. | H. R. 14968. Anneliza Drake. | |
| H. R. 14851. Julian E. Cooper. | H. R. 14973. Hannah L. Biller. | |
| H. R. 14852. Ellen J. Ludlow. | H. R. 14977. C. Victoria North- | |
| H. R. 14855. Sarah F. Downard. | rup. | |
| H. R. 14869. Jennie A. Whitney. | H. R. 14978. Mary Lamphere. | |
| H. R. 14880. Sarah E. Dyer. | H. R. 14985. Louisa M. Tuttle. | |
| H. R. 14903. Emma Gordon. | H. R. 15022. Anna S. Joseph. | |
| H. R. 14946. Adaline Roberts. | H. R. 15028. Alice Mobley. | |
| H. R. 14956. Anna S. Duffner. | H. R. 15034. Jerome Deniston. | |
| H. R. 14958. Isabelle Williams. | H. R. 15041. Sarah E. Sabie. | |
| H. R. 14961. Allie E. Fleming. | H. R. 15045. Maria L. McDonald. | |
| H. R. 14962. Sara P. Bowen. | H. R. 15052. Jane E. Richardson. | |
| H. R. 14965. Elizabeth Mitchell. | H. R. 15053. Ella S. Pattison. | |
| H. R. 14968. Anneliza Drake. | H. R. 15081. Amelia Zimmerman. | |
| H. R. 14973. Hannah L. Biller. | H. R. 15089. Lydia M. Gilbert. | |
| H. R. 14977. C. Victoria North- | H. R. 15090. Bettie M. Poe. | |
| rup. | H. R. 15091. Lizzie C. Fussell. | |
| H. R. 14978. Mary Lamphere. | H. R. 15094. Margaret A. Curtis. | |
| H. R. 14985. Louisa M. Tuttle. | H. R. 15095. Amelia J. Prince. | |
| H. R. 15022. Anna S. Joseph. | H. R. 15104. Rachel E. Lukenbill. | |
| H. R. 15028. Alice Mobley. | H. R. 15111. Sarah A. Charles. | |
| H. R. 15034. Jerome Deniston. | H. R. 15123. Julia Hollowell. | |
| H. R. 15041. Sarah E. Sabie. | H. R. 15124. Anna P. Smith. | |
| H. R. 15045. Maria L. McDonald. | H. R. 15154. Minnie Beach. | |
| H. R. 15052. Jane E. Richardson. | H. R. 15168. Mary J. Green. | |
| H. R. 15053. Ella S. Pattison. | H. R. 15170. Benjamin R. Middle- | |
| H. R. 15081. Amelia Zimmerman. | ton. | |
| H. R. 15089. Lydia M. Gilbert. | H. R. 15171. Minnie Palen. | |
| H. R. 15090. Bettie M. Poe. | H. R. 15180. Nancy E. Trueblood. | |
| H. R. 15091. Lizzie C. Fussell. | H. R. 15185. Elizabeth Heath. | |
| H. R. 15094. Margaret A. Curtis. | H. R. 15186. Elizabeth A. Frets. | |
| H. R. 15095. Amelia J. Prince. | H. R. 15189. Hannah J. Donnell. | |
| H. R. 15104. Rachel E. Lukenbill. | H. R. 15190. Flora Myers. | |
| H. R. 15111. Sarah A. Charles. | H. R. 15195. Mary Hysle. | |
| H. R. 15123. Julia Hollowell. | H. R. 15196. Levorah Hawkins. | |
| H. R. 15124. Anna P. Smith. | H. R. 15203. Eliza R. Shockley. | |
| H. R. 15154. Minnie Beach. | H. R. 15209. Mary J. Siegfried. | |
| H. R. 15168. Mary J. Green. | H. R. 15211. Elnora L. Monroe. | |
| H. R. 15170. Benjamin R. Middle- | H. R. 15212. Mary J. Holden. | |

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 16626) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and so forth, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 16628, and that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill.

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

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the committee:

H. R. 1627. Emma W. Rice.	H. R. 8492. Roy L. Colvin.
H. R. 1976. Edward Lee.	H. R. 8518. Marigo J. Dafniotou.
H. R. 2221. William Gilpin.	H. R. 8587. Harvey B. Branstetter.
H. R. 2228. Bessie Hagar.	H. R. 8629. Elizabeth Housmann.
H. R. 2258. John Lorensen.	H. R. 8820. Waldo O. McCollum.
H. R. 2263. Dallas R. McClintock.	H. R. 8833. John W. Cole.
H. R. 2551. Warren J. Coleman.	H. R. 8900. George M. Harter.
H. R. 3049. Gabriel Boller.	H. R. 9165. Maggie E. Freeland.
H. R. 3160. Mabel M. Callahan.	H. R. 9214. Samuel Gwartney.
H. R. 3432. Mary E. Taylor.	H. R. 9275. William F. Sheean.
H. R. 3649. Nancy Ann Whitehead.	H. R. 9366. Mary Murphy.
H. R. 3878. Essie Hortobben.	H. R. 9461. William T. Moore.
H. R. 4036. Henry Meyers.	H. R. 9469. Thomas Yeager.
H. R. 4259. Andrew A. Menne.	H. R. 9470. John W. Hudson.
H. R. 4383. Catherine E. Cowhick.	H. R. 9544. Samuel Curry.
H. R. 4640. Olive B. Beall.	H. R. 9643. Alice E. Turner.
H. R. 4762. Neil Douglas Bromley.	H. R. 9662. William P. Myers.
H. R. 4770. Frank Miller.	H. R. 9813. Ada V. Awbrey.
H. R. 4828. Daisy Pelfrey.	H. R. 9882. Marie A. Abernathy.
H. R. 4837. Nannie Grubb.	H. R. 9945. Solomon Nally.
H. R. 4943. Mae A. De Barrows.	H. R. 10001. George H. Walker.
H. R. 4995. Seth J. Cleveland.	H. R. 10088. Henry T. Roddy.
H. R. 5014. Benjamin Coleman Read.	H. R. 10090. Rhoda A. Woods.
H. R. 5143. Sarah Holtsclaw.	H. R. 10096. Cordella C. Moore.
H. R. 5175. Ida W. Anchors.	H. R. 10116. David R. Majors.
H. R. 5240. William E. Murrah.	H. R. 10135. Morgan Cherry.
H. R. 5291. Roy Raymond Keeley.	H. R. 10247. Beverly A. Foster.
H. R. 5335. Anna Luch.	H. R. 10283. Katherine McDonald.
H. R. 5535. Jonathan Craig, alias Rolin Story.	H. R. 10349. Henry B. Gaylor.
H. R. 5555. Alexander Monroe.	H. R. 10350. Robert L. Aycock.
H. R. 5848. Thomas J. Harris.	H. R. 10367. Charles M. Smith.
H. R. 5958. Richard H. Gedda.	H. R. 10405. Peter G. Petersen.
H. R. 5963. James N. Stribling.	H. R. 10408. Wiley N. Johnston.
H. R. 6026. J. L. Baxter.	H. R. 10507. Carrie R. Pine.
H. R. 6067. Harry J. Bunton.	H. R. 10538. Romeo S. Montminy.
H. R. 6239. William J. Cobble.	H. R. 10551. William Henry Gray.
H. R. 6249. Constantine Witcofsky.	H. R. 10601. William Hargis.
H. R. 6434. James A. Nickell.	H. R. 10699. Melie M. Anderson.
H. R. 6521. William G. Jones.	H. R. 10702. Rufus M. Barnes.
H. R. 6753. Nellie Murray.	H. R. 10755. Rachel Bledsoe.
H. R. 7082. Paul C. Stoval.	H. R. 10848. Matilda Hunt.
H. R. 7110. John O. Collings.	H. R. 10861. Thomas E. Carson.
H. R. 7166. Hugh B. Mitchell.	H. R. 10867. Amanda M. Bailey.
H. R. 7169. Elvra O. Swearingen.	H. R. 10873. Addie Young.
H. R. 7217. James B. Taylor.	H. R. 10902. Fred E. Kunkel.
H. R. 7350. Charles S. Cooper.	H. R. 10927. Elizabeth M. Olson.
H. R. 7532. Sallie Gray Fowler.	H. R. 11002. Winifred B. Hodges.
H. R. 7689. Daniel O. Underwood.	H. R. 11016. John Flanagan.
H. R. 7737. Honorah Downey.	H. R. 11023. Amanda E. Wade.
H. R. 7771. William L. Sheldon.	H. R. 11064. Martha Eberlein.
H. R. 7834. Anna C. Tobias.	H. R. 11111. Loisa Blasis.
H. R. 7839. Emma E. Ferneling.	H. R. 11117. Lottie T. Miller.
H. R. 8026. Obeline Roy Martel.	H. R. 11209. Eunice C. McGarvey.
H. R. 8030. Thomas E. Cruess.	H. R. 11260. Wayne Ripatte.
H. R. 8074. Edward Everett Harding.	H. R. 11264. Ella Gill.
H. R. 8226. May Mandeville.	H. R. 11314. Alida T. Bruce.
H. R. 8254. Pearl Spangler.	H. R. 11462. Marian Redfield Healey.
H. R. 8274. Florence M. Fichtl.	H. R. 11539. Martha E. Sickel.
H. R. 8320. Hannah Green.	H. R. 11555. Rachel E. Stewart.
H. R. 8379. Annie Dale Lods.	H. R. 11612. Edwin H. McSloy.
H. R. 8411. Jacob J. Waltz.	H. R. 11643. Milton F. Morgan.
H. R. 8484. George L. Green.	H. R. 11658. John F. Graper.
	H. R. 11681. Mary V. Thorne.
	H. R. 11800. Charles M. Porter.
	H. R. 11832. Henry C. Potter.
	H. R. 11833. David Johnson.
	H. R. 11918. Elizabeth Ramsey.
	H. R. 11926. Lena Mann.

H. R. 11951. George E. Stevens.	H. R. 13902. Mary M. North.
H. R. 12016. Phillip Winckler.	H. R. 13910. Wiley M. Gott.
H. R. 12074. Mary T. Marks.	H. R. 13914. Augusta Schulte.
H. R. 12081. Jessie Murdock.	H. R. 13967. Ada Rominger.
H. R. 12089. George W. Musser.	H. R. 13968. William A. Helms.
H. R. 12120. James W. Hussey.	H. R. 13997. Mary A. Fradley.
H. R. 12124. Clara M. Schneider.	H. R. 14157. Josephine Wilson.
H. R. 12147. Alice Roberts.	H. R. 14159. Emma Von Minden.
H. R. 12182. Mary Buckley.	H. R. 14195. Ida Davis.
H. R. 12183. Calhoun Shearouse.	H. R. 14205. Nellie E. Hammer.
H. R. 12272. Roscoe C. Trusty.	H. R. 14207. Isabell A. Yandle.
H. R. 12281. August Bemmerer.	H. R. 14240. Albert W. Getchell.
H. R. 12292. Will Ralph Johnson.	H. R. 14351. Julia Mulkey.
H. R. 12372. John Miller.	H. R. 14371. Nettie Adams.
H. R. 12428. Bridget Keegan.	H. R. 14514. Jessie G. Bivens.
H. R. 12464. Albert F. Campbell.	H. R. 14528. Carl W. Jansson.
H. R. 12515. Zerah M. Bridges.	H. R. 14599. Fannie McClellan.
H. R. 12588. Judah Wormington.	H. R. 14661. James A. Hyden.
H. R. 12652. John D. Hoskins.	H. R. 14743. Mamie L. Eusebio.
H. R. 12688. Charles MacGregor.	H. R. 14770. Early G. Rodgers.
H. R. 12735. Nina Mehlberg.	H. R. 14774. Mary L. De Fabbio.
H. R. 12774. Grace O. Barmore.	H. R. 14777. Mary C. Rinderle.
H. R. 12784. Grace Fay Lobben.	H. R. 14848. Hannah Corbett.
H. R. 12786. Kemple Belanga.	H. R. 14871. Carrie Runner.
H. R. 12787. Ned Mitchell Harrison.	H. R. 14931. Harvey E. Rodgers.
H. R. 12813. Nelda S. Shearer.	H. R. 14988. David and Edith Stadtner.
H. R. 12817. George E. Manning.	H. R. 15059. Emma L. Zittel.
H. R. 12826. Ida Aviszus.	H. R. 15108. Martin E. Miller.
H. R. 12857. Miriam E. Hogue.	H. R. 15118. Maggie Gaddy.
H. R. 12863. Edith Stevens.	H. R. 15127. Ethel B. Sutherland.
H. R. 12932. John W. Griffin.	H. R. 15128. Edward Forte.
H. R. 12944. Alexander E. Brown.	H. R. 15177. Rosa Victoria Buck.
H. R. 13001. Mary E. Beggs.	H. R. 15201. Francis X. Mayer.
H. R. 13048. Rose M. Smith.	H. R. 15224. Marton O. Barnes.
H. R. 13071. Maryland Adams.	H. R. 15253. Lulu F. Hope.
H. R. 13232. Mary E. Anderson.	H. R. 15385. William Bell.
H. R. 13242. Foolish Bear.	H. R. 15445. Edna M. Garrity.
H. R. 13295. Mary M. Carr.	H. R. 15480. Emma Straub.
H. R. 13328. Elizabeth S. Parey.	H. R. 15544. Lucinda C. Abbott.
H. R. 13349. Richard E. Adams.	H. R. 15560. Mary L. Radel.
H. R. 13497. Bridget Gallagher.	H. R. 15714. Annie Williams.
H. R. 13667. Mary M. Walton.	H. R. 15721. Jane Carr Wood.
H. R. 13669. Dorsey Hickok.	H. R. 15818. Dora B. Karnes.
H. R. 13687. Sallie Miles.	H. R. 15914. Thomas L. Holcomb.
H. R. 13732. George Hammer.	H. R. 16032. Mabel Irene Patterson.
H. R. 13838. Ellis B. McNeeley.	H. R. 16060. Martin Hanson.
H. R. 13849. James F. Madden.	H. R. 16279. Grace A. Mael.
H. R. 13852. Olive R. Sanderlin.	
H. R. 13874. Ida L. Crandall.	

PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TREADWAY. On page 3746 and following pages of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD appears the report of an address made in the other branch of Congress yesterday in which certain Members of this branch are called by name and certain questions asked them. In view of this fact, I ask whether it is within the parliamentary rights of the Members of this branch to reply and to call Members of the other branch by name?

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts may be permitted to say anything about any Member of the other branch that he desires, and to say how he voted on the \$200,000 appropriation for Salem, Mass.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman from Massachusetts does not ask the gentleman from Arkansas as to how he shall proceed. I have submitted a parliamentary inquiry to the Speaker and that is all the privilege of the floor that I ask.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that whatever was said at the other end of the Capitol—

Mr. PARKS. Ought to have been said.

Mr. RANKIN. Was with reference to statements made by Members of this body on the outside. This identical question arose in this body a few years ago when the then Speaker of the House, Mr. GILLET, went, I believe, to New Haven, Conn., and made a speech attacking Members of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will pardon the Chair for a moment; but upon what does he found the point of order? Upon a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact I make the point of order against the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]. He rises here and undertakes to discuss what was said in the Senate.

Mr. SNELL. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Mississippi is not in order in making a point of order against the parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts propounded a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANKIN. He first made a statement to the effect that Members of the other body had attacked Members of this body, leaving the impression that it was in their official capacity.

Mr. SNELL. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Mississippi is not in order.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has no right, under the rules of the House, to rise and make any statement about what Members of the other body said.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not made a statement. He has asked a question of the Chair, and the Chair is about to answer.

Mr. PARKS. I insist that the Chair be very liberal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is quite out of order.

The Chair is ready to answer the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, may I cite a ruling to the Chair?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recently made a decision about this matter and has certain views about it.

Of course, it is very difficult to answer the question in a word or two. The Chair thinks it is of such fundamental importance that he will ask the indulgence of the House to refer to and repeat some of the things he said in a ruling made comparatively recently upon this subject.

On May 6, 1930, the question arose as to whether Members of the House could comment upon any statement made in the Senate reflecting in any way upon the motives or conduct of a Member of the House. On a previous occasion the Vice President, overruling a number of decisions which the Chair then quoted, which he will not quote now, held the technical question being whether Jefferson's Manual governs the proceedings of the Senate in this regard or in any other regard—

The Senate has not adopted Jefferson's Manual as a part of the rules of the Senate. It is left to the discretion of Senators as to what they may or may not say about the proceedings of the House in connection with the resolution under consideration.

Of course, that decision entirely nullifies Jefferson's Manual, there being no rules in either House specifically on this question.

With regard to the entire question of dealings between the House and Senate, and preserving some sort of sportsmanship and comity, the present occupant of the chair referred then and will refer again to two of the rules in Jefferson's Manual which govern this case if the rules apply.

In section 301:

It is highly expedient, says Hatsel, for the due preservation of the privileges of the separate branches of the legislature that neither should encroach on the other, or interfere in any manner depending before them, so as to preclude, or even influence, that freedom of debate which is essential to a free council. They are, therefore, not to take notice of any bills or other matters depending, or of votes that have been given, or of speeches which have been held, by the Members of either of the other branches of the legislature, until the same have been communicated to them in the usual parliamentary manner.

Then in section 364:

It is a breach of order in debate to notice what has been said on the same subject in the other House, or the particular votes or majorities on it there; because the opinion of each House should be left to its own independency, not to be influenced by the proceedings of the other; and the quoting them might beget reflections leading to a misunderstanding between the two Houses.

At that time the Chair held that whether these rules with regard to comity prevailed in the Senate or not they did prevail in the House, and if the Chair may be indulged, because he thinks it is perhaps worth while, he will read a few sentences from his decision on that occasion:

There would seem to be but two alternatives for us to adopt in dealing with this situation.

And precisely the same situation is before us now as was then.

If the House desired to retaliate, it might, by rule, provide that these rules in Jefferson's Manual relating to comity between the two Houses should not apply to proceedings in the House. In other words, to say that Members of the House should be guided solely by their own discretion in making any comment, insinuation, or attack upon any Senator, or any proceeding of the Senate. The other alternative is to rigidly insist upon strict adherence to both the spirit and letter of Jefferson's Manual.

In the opinion of the Chair, the adoption of the first alternative would be violative of the spirit in which the House for 140 years has followed the precepts of Thomas Jefferson in our manner of association and dealing with the other legislative body. After all, Jefferson's general precepts are but a restatement of the manner in which all legislative bodies, particularly the British Parliament, have dealt with each other for centuries. They are but a restatement of what is and ought to be true sportsmanship in the dealings between the legislative branches of great governments.

The Chair is firm, and he believes that the House will remain firm in our adherence to the rules of sportsmanship and comity as laid down in Jefferson's Manual.

Later on the Chair said:

The question raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] is whether a Member may reflect in any way on the floor of the House against the actions, speeches, or proceedings of another Member or of the body itself.

To put it in another way, Shall the House, notwithstanding any adverse action by the other body, adhere to the provisions laid down in Jefferson's Manual, which have always governed?

The answer of the Chair is emphatically "Yes." Indeed, it appears to the Chair that it has become all the more necessary, if the rules of comity between the two Houses are to be at all preserved, that Members of the House should be limited even more rigidly than ever by Jefferson's rules prohibiting reference in terms of the slightest disparagement of the remarks or actions of Members or any of the proceedings of the other body.

If no rules of comity are to be followed in either House, then legislation may become chaos indeed.

In conclusion, the Chair will say that so long as he remains Presiding Officer of this body he will see to it that the rules of Jefferson's Manual, in so far as they apply to the friendly relations between the Members of the two Houses and the Houses themselves, shall be enforced with the utmost rigidity, not only in the letter but in the spirit.

The Chair reaffirms those views upon this occasion. The Chair thinks that there is possibly an alternative and that it might be carefully considered under these conditions. That is to change the rule which provides that Jefferson's Manual shall govern the proceedings of this House; but in the absence of such change the Chair will hold that Members of the House are not permitted to refer in any way disparagingly or in criticism of anything said by Members of the body on the opposite side.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the decision of the Chair, may I propound another parliamentary inquiry? In what manner can a Member of the House who has been referred to in another branch by name and asked questions either answer the questions or defend himself from the insinuations contained therein?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not believe he is under the necessity of saying that a Member may not do that outside of this House, but as far as the present occupant of the Chair is concerned he holds that he may not do it in the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Might not the gentleman's object be attained by the unanimous consent of the House?

The SPEAKER. There is a rule in Jefferson's Manual which seems to apply in this case:

Where the complaint is of words disrespectfully spoken by a Member of another House, it is difficult to obtain punishment, because of the rules supposed necessary to be observed (as to the immediate noting down of words) for the security of Members. Therefore it is the duty of the House, and more particularly of the Speaker, to interfere immediately, and not permit expressions to go unnoticed which may give a ground of complaint to the other House.

So long as Jefferson's Manual governs the proceedings of the House, the Chair thinks it is impossible to take any official notice of such remarks as are now complained of. Of course, the alternative is to change the rules.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, another parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DYER. Is it not in order to pass a resolution requesting the Senate to expunge from its records and proceedings statements and remarks criticizing or impugning motives of a Member of this body?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The Chair passed on that question shortly before he rendered the decision just quoted. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] proposed such a resolution and the Chair declared it was not in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Where the two Houses are so close together and it takes only a few minutes for a Member of one to reach a Member of the other, is it necessary to go to the trouble to change the rules?

The SPEAKER. The Chair fears the gentleman from Texas did not get the full purport of the Chair's suggestion.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. In view of the fact that the rule refers to words spoken on the floor, what would be the result if a Member utilized the privilege of extending his remarks in the RECORD, having in mind that the RECORD is so widely read that it would bring about the desired result?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the same rule exactly would apply.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRISP. I am in perfect accord with the ruling of the distinguished Speaker and, as he said, the remedy, if the House does not approve of that ruling, would be to change the rule. Now, this is my inquiry: If a Member of one House makes a speech outside of the Chamber or gives out interviews in the press, would the rule apply then?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it applies only to words spoken on the floor and where action is taken on the floor of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuing my inquiry a step farther, my inquiry was: Could not the House do away, so to speak, with the rules of the House by unanimous consent? Inasmuch as the rules of the House are made by the House, can not those rules be waived in any specific instance by the unanimous consent of the House? Of course, in making that inquiry I appreciate the fact that the Speaker is a Member of the House, that the Speaker may exercise his function as a Member of the House even though he is Speaker, and that has been so held where he refuses to recognize for a unanimous-consent request, and in doing that he has in effect exercised his rights as a Member of the House temporarily occupying the chair. If the House were unanimous and the Speaker was acting entirely in his capacity as Speaker, and not in his individual capacity as a Member of the House, and he were in accord with the request of the gentleman propounding the unanimous-consent request, then could we not accomplish by the unanimous consent of the House, including the Speaker in his individual capacity, what is here sought?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does not the gentleman think that the language of the rule in Jefferson's Manual practically imposes the duty upon the Speaker of not permitting such a proceeding?

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Michigan is of this opinion: That the rules are the creation of the House; that day after day and time and again we waive rules of the House by unanimous consent, and if we are able to waive the rules of the House in one particular we can then waive them in all particulars and set aside all of the rules of the House in order that the House may function in accordance with its desire. Unless, of course, there is a specific rule to the contrary, and there is no such rule in this case.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It seems to me that the House itself has imposed upon the Speaker at least this implied duty of not permitting such proceedings.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. May the Chair answer the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] first? In reply to the gentleman from Michigan, the Chair would not undertake to say it would be impossible that this could be done by unanimous consent, but the Chair would conceive it his duty, in view of the rule he has just read, not to recognize anyone for that purpose. The Chair will repeat the rule:

Where the complaint is of words disrespectfully spoken by a Member of another House, it is difficult to obtain punishment because of the rules supposed necessary to be observed (as to the immediate noting down of words) for the security of Members. Therefore, it is the duty of the House, and more particularly of the Speaker, to interfere immediately and not to permit expressions to go unnoticed which may give a ground of complaint to the other House.

Under this rule the Chair would feel that if there were no change made in the rules he would not recognize a Member for that purpose, but the question involves a very simple proposition. The Chair would recognize the chairman or some member of the Committee on Rules, if the committee thought it advisable to bring in a rule providing for certainly the rest of the session that Jefferson's Manual shall not apply.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, while I have ample ground for a question of personal privilege, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. CRAMTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege, and do not ask the consent of anybody. If there is anyone on that side of the House that has any question about it, I withdraw the unanimous-consent request and rise as a matter of right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not ask the consent of anybody, and will state my ground of personal privilege. If it has come to the point when we have to risk an objection on that side of the House when a Member of the House is unfairly attacked, I do not ask consent. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. I am in sympathy with the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that Republicans have as much right in this House as Democrats. [Applause.] I want to say there is no one on our side of the House who would think of objecting to such a request.

Mr. COX. Will not the gentleman yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not yield.

Mr. COX. I did not intend to object.

Mr. CRAMTON. I renew the request.

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

Mr. COX. I do not object; but I feel, in view of the gentleman's statement which has drawn an unfavorable inference, because I am in sympathy with the position the gentleman takes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, in another legislative body on two occasions I have been most unfairly attacked with a contemptible disregard of the truth and the facts and, as a result, very serious accusations have gone to the country.

I am completing 18 years of service, and gentlemen on that side of the House know as well as I do that in these 18 years my service has been characterized by the customary courage in the performance of duty and the customary disregard of personal interest. [Applause.] And to me it is no small thing that there should be carried in the press of

the country the direct charge that I have sought through my place on the Appropriations Committee to prepare for myself a job. Anybody who says this is a plain, unadulterated liar. [Prolonged applause, the Members rising.]

There are men on this floor, on both sides of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, who know that the statement printed in the press of the Nation is untrue.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CRAMTON. There are men on both sides of the aisle who know I have paid no attention whatever to the appropriation—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not yield to anyone.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order— [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The gentleman has made a statement that the gentleman should not make, and I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the right to make a point of order. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. PARKS. And I desire to make it respectfully. The gentleman has used language that is unparliamentary.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is the only language that will adequately picture the occasion.

Mr. PARKS. I am not talking to the gentleman; I am talking to the Speaker. May I proceed, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I think he should make his point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. PARKS. I can not do it when he talks all the time. The gentleman has made a statement here that is unparliamentary and has used language that is unparliamentary, and he has made the statement with reference to a gentleman he would not look in the eye and use the same language.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will make it plain to anybody who will make that charge.

Mr. PARKS. Wait a minute, and we will see whether you will or not. I desire to submit this proposition: Will the gentleman stand here on this floor to-day—

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I have not yielded for a speech. I protest that I have the floor, and I do not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PARKS] has the right to make a point of order, but the Chair thinks he should state his point of order.

Mr. PARKS. I am trying to make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, but with the gentleman talking it is a little difficult. Will the gentleman say he does not intend to take a job under this Government?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not stated a point of order and is not in order.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman from Arkansas will wait a minute, I will tell him all about it.

Mr. PARKS. I will be grateful.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say this: If my brother is in want and I have the money, I will not ask the Federal Government to care for him. [Applause.] If I work for the Government and have a salary on which I may live, I have not got to the point that I will ask the Government to send all of my sons to West Point. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, members of the Appropriations Committee of both parties are on the floor, and they all know this to be true: I have never asked the Appropriations Committee to make any appropriation for the Bicentennial Commission. I have paid no attention to those appropriations. I have not even read the item in the pending bill with reference to it.

Furthermore, let me say this for the information of the gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House: Knowing, as you do, that in my work here I have never regarded section or party [applause] and that many of you sat in your seats or voted for it when an unfair question was raised, let me explain to you that I have not as yet asked of this administration any job whatever. [Applause.] I have not asked anybody to ask for any job for me. When the Bicentennial Commission three weeks ago, without my knowledge, without my instigation, were canvassing the field as to whom

they might employ, feeling, as I understand it, that it was needed to have some one, and my name was suggested, I have been advised that every member present at that meeting spoke favorably of the appointment.

Thereafter the vice chairman of the commission asked me whether or not if the position were offered to me I would accept it. I stated that I did not know that I could afford to accept it, but that the work did appeal to me, and at his request I took the matter under advisement.

Then before any controversy was raised here and up until this moment I never have told anybody that I would take the job if offered me.

Mr. PARKS. Will you take it?

Mr. CRAMTON. That is none of the gentleman's business. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKS. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman ought to thank me for my courtesy, because I have had none from him.

Mr. PARKS. Yes; the gentleman has. I assisted him to get an international bridge and then he objected to mine.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, this country is in a serious situation. A great responsibility rests upon every Member of the House as well as the Senate. I hope we can get to the point where we may legislate on the basis of merit in legislation and not through personalities. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16738) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

Pending that, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be unlimited as of to-day, that one-half of the time be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 16738; and pending that, asks unanimous consent that one-half of the time be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. LA GUARDIA in the chair.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, a good deal has been said in the last two days in reference to the proposed appropriation on the part of the Federal Government of \$25,000,000 to be expended under the auspices of the Red Cross.

That debate has gone on in both branches, and it caused certain Members to make rather peculiar references. Inquiries have been made as to why individuals may have voted pro and con on some particular item and why, after having voted one way for the Russian relief, the individual referred to would vote another way for Arkansas or other drought-section relief. It is very apparent that there is no comparison between these two kinds of relief nor in the type of votes suggested.

I have made some investigation in reference to the methods of the Red Cross on a previous occasion and I want to repeat what I then said, that it seems to me the Red Cross is particularly a humane means of accomplishing individual relief by the individual giver. It is no disparagement either to that organization to consider that a very great difference arises in the situation when the organization, contrary to its wishes, is asked by the Federal Government to accept an

appropriation from the Federal Government and in that way do away with the possibility of future individual contributions to the cause of that organization.

Assuming that the proceedings of Congress are correctly reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I believe questions were asked me in another body yesterday which, of course, it would be impossible for me to answer here. I understand these questions had to do with Federal contributions to the Red Cross for relief in the drought sections of the South and West, and also referred to a Federal appropriation for the relief of suffering as the result of a fire in a Massachusetts city. I maintain that the questions are not analogous. I hold that there is nothing out of place in voting one way on one measure and refusing to vote for that particular item.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Chair maintain order.

Mr. TREADWAY. I decline to yield.

Mr. PARKS. I did not ask the gentleman to yield. I am asking the Chairman to preserve order so that we can hear what the gentleman says.

Mr. TREADWAY. I shall talk loud enough so that the gentleman can hear.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. PARKS. I am going to insist on order whether the gentleman yields or not.

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, I shall stand right beside the gentleman and talk, if he is afraid that he will not hear me. I thought I had considerable lung power, but if the gentleman is deaf I shall endeavor to take care of the situation. I am perfectly willing that he should hear what I am about to say.

Mr. PARKS. That is such a courteous statement that I shall refrain from answering it.

Mr. TREADWAY. It is discourteous when I ask not to be interrupted to have the gentleman interrupt me.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of harmony I think I ought to talk a little bit. [Laughter.]

Mr. TREADWAY. I was asked certain questions in the other body yesterday, and under the very strict ruling of the Speaker, with which I thoroughly agree, under the rules I am prohibited on this occasion from answering those questions. Therefore I am going to speak in an entirely hypothetical way and make no reference to any individual Member of this or any other body. However, if I were fortunate enough to have a brother, I would not publish the fact that I was not willing to aid him in distress by at least furnishing him with clothes sufficient to warrant his attendance at church—and that statement goes. Further than that, if an offer of a position of influence at a good fair salary were made to a man who has distinguished himself for many years in public service, I would not complain about it, particularly if I lived in a glass house that would have its windows broken by the stones that I throw, when the records show that two of my sons had been appointed to West Point, one of them by a Member from another State where I did not live, and the other by a Senator from a State in which I did live. That is the second proposition.

As a third proposition, I would make an effort to be truthful when I said that a certain Member of this branch had been lobbying around the corridors of the Senate to secure an appointment for his brother to public office to such an extent that he interfered with the conduct of the business in the other body. I would at least have an element of truth back of me if I made such a statement. Then, to reach another proposition, although it is somewhat personal, when the governor of my State, now a Member of the United States Senate, not a member of my political party, but of the political party of a certain man, made a recommendation to Congress for an appropriation, I would not find a whole lot of fault if a certain man, not a member of the party to which that governor owed allegiance, voted for an appropriation requested by the governor.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that under no rule of the House is any discussion permissible on the floor which is hypothetical, be-

cause it may not be within the comprehension of the Members of the House.

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, I am sure the gentleman from New York will comprehend what I am endeavoring to say in a parliamentary manner, because I realize what large brains the gentleman from New York has.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. TREADWAY. This is not the first time occasions like this have come up. In view of the Speaker's ruling here a short time ago, I say in the interest of fair play and comity between the two branches, that either another branch of Congress should revise its rules and its method of procedure, or that we should. [Applause.] I, for one Member of Congress, ask only for fair play, and I want the same privilege of repartee or reply or answer to inquiries made of me that any Member would assert as his rights in the other body. I do not think it will lead to good agreement between the two branches to have two sets of rules, and therefore the suggestion that our able Speaker has made is very apropos, that we should change our procedure to compare favorably with permissions granted in the other branch.

Mr. Chairman, can you or any Member of this branch so far forget etiquette or courtesy to speak in a derogatory manner of the Presiding Officer of the other branch, or in a facetious way refer to the Presiding Officer of this branch, if you were speaking in the Senate? Read yesterday's RECORD. I ask the Members of this House to read carefully the remarks to which I am addressing my remarks. I can not speak in as open and frank a manner as I would like to do or as the occasion warrants. I was very glad that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] made the remarks that he did and in the manner he did, because the occasion warrants it; and we are not going to sit here, no matter how disgraceful the remarks may be made in the other branch, and take that sort of talk and keep quiet about it. At least I shall not in my feeble way, anyway, and I think the other Members of the House have just as much red blood as I have. We are not going to sit here and allow that type of abuse to be sent out over the country against individual Members of this House, from the Speaker down. [Applause.] We intend to defend ourselves; and, if the present rules will not permit that, then they ought to be changed; and there has been some talk of a change of the rules lately.

I did not hear the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] suggest any change of this nature, but I should be glad if the gentleman from Georgia would include in his change-of-rule program, a rule that will permit us to give as good as is given to us.

I think the last thing we want to do is to have a man with a glib tongue insult Members of this House intentionally and continuously, year after year; because this is no new attack. It dates back to the time when Speaker GILLET occupied the chair, to my certain knowledge. A freedom of speech may on certain occasions be a valuable asset; but we know of many people "who get in Dutch" by being too free with their tongues, and that has happened within a very few hours in another legislative body.

Therefore I join the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] if the gentleman desires to offer an amendment to the rules that will permit us to say truthful things—not untruthful or dishonest or wrong things or exaggerations or any other adjective which it is desired to use that will describe the kind of speech I am referring to, but that will permit us, men as we are, to defend our rights and to defend the good name of this House. If the good name of this House is criticized through the instrumentality of references to one man, the Speaker alone—leaving the rest of us ordinary Members out of it—when the Speaker of this House is facetiously attacked as he was yesterday in another branch, I say it is time the House arose in its might and showed where it stands on that sort of attack. [Applause.] I am ready to join with the gentleman from Georgia in revising the rules to that extent, at least.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have endeavored to keep my remarks within parliamentary limits and within the ruling of

our distinguished Speaker made a few minutes ago and at the same time I think in an indirect manner I have said what I would have been glad to say, and with considerably more emphasis and force, if I had not been under the curb and restraint of abiding by the decision of our Speaker. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] has expired.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in the words of the great Webster, after the ship has been tossed hither and thither through the storm of turbulent waters, the mariner looks at his compass to see where he is; and now that the storm is over and tranquillity is restored, I desire to talk for a few minutes about some proposed legislation that is of national importance and significance.

Because the time allotted to me is limited, I respectfully ask the Members of the House who have questions to propound to reserve those questions until I have made my statement, and I shall then, if time permits, be glad to answer any questions that I can.

Because my constituency is vitally and directly affected, and at the request of many of my colleagues on both sides of this House, I now rise to speak in support of the bill S. 4123, as amended by the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, commonly and generally known as the Glenn-Smith or drainage bill.

Briefly, the provisions of this act authorize an appropriation of \$95,000,000, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, advanced to drainage and irrigation districts in distress, over a period of 40 years, bearing interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum. This bill, which was introduced in the Senate last session, passed the Senate before the adjournment of Congress last year without a dissenting vote. Long and extensive hearings were held before the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on a similar measure, and this House measure has been reported unanimously and favorably by that committee.

The Rules Committee last week gave us a hearing of three days, which 135 Members of this House had petitioned them to do, asking for a rule to bring this bill onto the floor of this House for consideration at the present session of Congress. Since those hearings closed last week a half dozen Members who are most directly and vitally interested in this legislation have called on the Secretary of the Interior, and also the President, and found them most sympathetic and willing to consider seriously the provisions contained in this bill.

Drainage and irrigation districts are so numerous and widely scattered throughout our Union, extending all the way from Ohio to California and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, that the serious crisis that now confronts us is not a local one but is national in its scope and importance.

I wish to say the entire Missouri delegation in Congress, including the 2 Senators as well as the 16 Representatives, are whole-heartedly and unreservedly in favor of the passage of this bill.

We have in our State two and one-half million acres of drained lands, and of that total amount, four-fifths, or 2,000,000 acres, are located in the eight counties of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi, in southeast Missouri, most of which are in my district. Over 230,000 of my constituents live in those drainage districts. When I was born—and since my name is "Dewey" most of you can well remember that time—southeastern Missouri was an impenetrable swamp, but at the beginning of the present century the pioneer men and women who have builded this Nation with heroic courage, with indefatigable energy, by practicing strict economy and frugality, went into southeast Missouri and, through perseverance and suffering, turned that mosquito-breeding, disease-infested swamp into a paradise.

In 1903 the first drainage ditch was dug. There are now 112 drainage districts in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. They have dug over 3,000 miles of canal

and removed more dirt than was removed in the excavation of the Panama Canal. This was accomplished, if you please, by issuing drainage bonds, counting the interest coupons thereon, to the amount of \$53,000,000. In addition to that drainage indebtedness my people have spent \$75,000,000 more in clearing, fencing, and improving those farm lands. Altogether, they have actually spent \$128,000,000 in reclaiming that marshland in southeast Missouri, and which is to-day as fertile as any under the face of the shining sun.

It has been my privilege to have seen some of the rich spots of this earth. I have gone down the Tigris and the Euphrates; I have gone down the Ganges in India; I have gone up the fertile valley of the Nile in Egypt and over the blue Danube in Europe; and I state here, without any fear of contradiction, that nowhere in the world can you find soil more fertile and unsurpassed in its productivity than you will find in southeast Missouri.

That land is in a state of high cultivation. Malaria was stamped out; health conditions have been improved; transportation was made possible; communication of ideas was advanced; and we have created a great national asset to our country which put millions of dollars in taxes for the 10-year period prior to 1925 into our Federal Treasury. Cotton, corn, and wheat, the great staples, are grown there in abundance; also alfalfa, soybeans, and cow peas.

From 1903 to 1925 my people prospered and succeeded in meeting their maturing obligations by paying off over \$20,000,000 of those drainage bonds. Since that time, with the beginning of agricultural depression and the general decline in the prices of farm commodities, due to drought, due to hurricanes, due to constant and recurring floods, over which no human being had any control, those people have been reduced to a state of bankruptcy. In 1920 not 1 per cent of all the land in that district was delinquent in the payment of its taxes, but to-day over 80 per cent of all those farm lands are delinquent. Though we have reduced the death rate from malaria, dysentery, and other kindred maladies 75 per cent in the past 10 years, that rate has been increasing within the past two or three years because of the inability of my people to pay off these drainage bonds and their mortgage indebtedness.

To-day if you would go to my district this is the condition you would find: Industry paralyzed; transportation crippled; banks closed, over a score of them in my district within the past year; farms mortgaged; people out of employment and leaving their homes, not knowing which way to go. The light of day has died out of their eyes; the faith in their hearts is no longer there; hope has waned; their spirits are almost broken, and they are now looking to the Federal Government, not for charity but for a loan.

There are two things in the consideration of this measure which I trust the Members of this House will constantly bear in mind. The first is that this bill is not a dole. The people whom I have the honor to represent are not beggars. They are fighters. All they ask is a fighting chance. What we want is credit restored, because business is based upon credit, and credit is based upon confidence. We are not asking a gift. We are asking assistance long enough to enable us to get back on our feet and meet our maturing obligations. If this bill should become a law and if the time of the payment of these bonds is extended over a 40-year period and the rate of interest cut in two, from 6 to 3 per cent, I am confident that my people, who met every single obligation over a 25-year period, up until 1925, can and will meet that obligation in the future. The second thing which I wish to have the Members of this House bear in mind is that this is not a program of expansion; it is a program of conservation.

The money that is authorized to be appropriated in this bill is not to be used for the reclamation of more territory; it is not to open new lands but merely to assist these heroic pioneers, men and women who have invested \$128,000,000 in reclaiming that disease-infested swamp, in improving the status of agriculture, in building up the state of public health, in aiding transportation and the communication of ideas, to hold on to the land they already have.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Who issued these bonds? Were they State bonds or were they issued by the National Government?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Let me say to the gentleman from Maryland that these drainage and irrigation districts are of a quasi-public nature and the bonds were privately issued to the landowners in these various districts.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What is the purpose of the bill? Is it to take up these bonds and then give these people a 40-year period in which to pay the Government? The gentleman has not told us much about the purposes of the bill.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I have not the time to describe the bill in detail. I merely wanted to get the main facts before the House and then if the bill is presented to the House for consideration those intricate features will be discussed. However, I will say to the gentleman that the bondholders will incidentally be helped by the passage of such legislation, and I see no reason why they should not be considered a part of the picture because they helped in the reclamation of this land. This bill, however, is primarily for relief of farmers and not bondholders.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I did not mean that the bondholders should not receive some benefit out of it, but I wanted to know whether these bonds were State bonds or national bonds?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. They are bonds issued by private corporations and sold to individuals.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Is it not true that if this bill is passed these bondholders would be obliged to reduce their bonds to the actual value of the property so that the loan which the Government makes would only be on the actual value of the property as of to-day?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct, because section 4 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior in administering the provisions of the act and in carrying it out to negotiate with the bondholders, many of whom, I know, will be willing to accept a great reduction, below par value.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. COLE. The rate of interest is how much?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Three per cent. The Senate bill carried no rate of interest at all, but the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation put in 3 per cent.

Mr. COLE. This may be all right, but if we are going to do this for these particular landowners, I see no reason why the Government of the United States should not refund all the farm mortgages at 3 per cent.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. In answer to the gentleman's statement I wish to say there is a distinct difference. The individual farmers in drainage districts have to meet the same individual obligations that farmers generally over the country have to meet. They are all subject to the same school, State, and county tax, and farmers in the west end of my district where I happen to live are not affected in the same way as farmers in the east end of my district, because in addition to paying their State and county and school tax they must pay the additional burden of their drainage tax and of the mortgage indebtedness. For instance, farmers in these drainage districts, particularly those I have the honor to represent, are now paying from \$1 to \$3 an acre drainage tax. They pay from 50 cents to \$1.50 per acre school and State and county tax and they are paying from \$1.25 to \$3 per acre on the mortgage indebtedness on that land, making the total tax on land in these drainage areas all the way from \$3 to \$7 per acre, which at the present time, because of the general decline in prices of farm commodities, is an unbearable burden.

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

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes additional.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield to my good friend and able colleague from Missouri.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman state, before he concludes, what part of the country other than southeast Missouri is concerned in regard to this proposed drainage legislation?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I shall say that 34 States of our Union, a vast majority of our States, and 135 Members of this House are so directly and vitally affected by this proposed legislation that they have petitioned the Rules Committee and appeared before the Rules Committee last week at its hearing urging them to adopt a rule that will allow us to bring this bill on the floor of the House for consideration.

Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. DICKSTEIN rose.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I may say in addition that the reason I have discussed southeast Missouri or our State is because I am more familiar with that than I am with other regions of our country, although Ohio has more of these drainage bonds than any other State. Michigan also has them, as well as Iowa, Minnesota, California, and every State throughout the Middle West and the far West of our country.

I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. HASTINGS. I just want to break in to say that I am very much interested in this proposed legislation. My State of Oklahoma in a measure is similarly situated to the district which the gentleman from Missouri so ably represents, and I was going to ask the gentleman what is the amount that is authorized to be appropriated in this bill?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Ninety-five million dollars in the present bill, but not more than \$19,000,000 a year will be appropriated.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the gentleman from Missouri think that that appropriation would be adequate?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I do not. I think additional appropriations would have to be made later on.

Mr. HASTINGS. I hope they will be made.

Mr. LINTHICUM. If the gentleman will yield, may I inquire if this is down in the neighborhood of Cape Girardeau?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to say to the gentleman that it was Maryland people who went to that section and were among the first settlers there and helped to develop that country.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I appreciate very much that statement. They are mighty good people, and I wish we could get more of them.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished lawyer from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In differentiating between your case and any other debt-ridden community of the country, as I understand, the difference is that you simply owe one form of obligation that the others do not carry.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. That is right, and it is of a public nature rather than a private, individual matter.

Mr. COX. Just what are its characteristics that give it a public nature and entitle it to preferential treatment over other sections which have their burdens similar to those of the gentleman's section?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Improvement of public health is one of the greatest benefits, and the gentleman from Georgia, being a very conspicuous member and a very able member of the Committee on Flood Control and having gone up and down the Mississippi Valley all the way from New Orleans to Cape Girardeau, well realizes that if the Federal Government does not assist these people to hold on to these rich lands that have been reclaimed, the Federal Government itself will have to go in there and stamp out malaria, dysentery, and other diseases.

Mr. COX. In order to entitle the gentleman's district to preferential treatment, does not the gentleman think it necessary to predicate his case entirely upon the question of public health?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Public health and facilitating rapid transit of the United States mails and making possible transportation of commodities and the communication of ideas between peoples adjacent to this drainage area of the United States.

Mr. COX. How would transportation be affected by failure to refinance this obligation?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman there are thousands of miles of paved highways, railroads, telephone and telegraph wires in my district, and if southeast Missouri allows the 2,000,000 acres there to revert to swamp, this will mean not only the individual farmers, but all public utilities of that vast region will absolutely be driven from that section.

Mr. COX. One more statement, if the gentleman will permit. I did visit this community with the gentleman and the improvements which the gentleman has detailed have been made and in my judgment it is the most fertile section of the entire country, of course, with the exception of Georgia.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I have been very much interested in the eloquent way in which the gentleman is presenting his bill, but it would be interesting to know whether this will be in the nature of a gift out of the Federal Treasury or a new loan.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Oh, not at all; it is not a gift; we are not asking for charity; it is not a dole.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Would this loan go along with the existing encumbrance on the property, or would it take it up?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. It would take it up, or the Government's loan would be first lien on the property. I want to say that indiscriminate and careless giving is not only a silly and sentimental philanthropy but is conducive to the perpetuation of poverty and indolence.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. If this bill passes there will be no mortgages created on the property and the actual value of the property will be the safest security for the Government.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I think so.

Mr. LETTS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. LETTS. Is it not true that in many instances the State and county taxes are delinquent?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Over 80 per cent in my district.

Mr. LETTS. What provision have you for the care of that situation and relieving the land from the lien for taxes?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I might say that in some States the local government has been most generous and considerate by reducing the assessed valuation on the land.

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BRIGGS. As I understand this legislation, it is predicated on the general-welfare clause of the Constitution.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. BRIGGS. And it is only an extension of the present reclamation policy of the Government?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. That is partially correct.

Mr. BRIGGS. Has the Rules Committee indicated what their attitude is as to granting a rule for this legislation?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. They have not indicated what they will do, but they were very sympathetic and generous in the hearings.

Mr. BRIGGS. The gentleman knows there is a strong sentiment existing in the House in favor of the legislation.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I have no doubt that the bill would pass this House if we can get a rule to consider it.

Mr. IRWIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. IRWIN. Is it not a fact that this applies to 135 or 150 congressional districts in the United States, perhaps not as acute as in the gentleman's district.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. That is a fact. No single cure can be offered for the farmers' ills, for the causes are many and complex. This proposed legislation will not cure all of the ills of the farmer, but it will go a long way toward helping 5,000,000 of our farm population that are in sore distress.

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

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. Did I understand the gentleman to say that some of these drainage districts now have outstanding indebtedness which is more than the value of the land itself?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I do not think I made that statement.

Mr. HOPE. I understood the statement to be made by some one.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. There are, perhaps, some districts in that unfortunate condition; but if there are, then those districts under the provisions of this bill could not receive loans from the Secretary of the Interior. The matter is wholly within his discretion.

Mr. HOPE. Is it contemplated that the Secretary will make loans up to the full value of the land?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Oh, no; not at all. He will only make safe loans to districts that he can be reasonably sure will meet their obligations.

Mr. HOPE. What is the limit that this bill imposes upon the Secretary?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to answer that?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. The proposition is this. If I own a farm and have a valuation of it in my bond of \$75 an acre, and the Interior Department thinks that \$40 is enough for the land, and is willing to make a \$40 loan, then it is up to the bondholders to accept that. If they do accept it, then the farmer can go back on the land and have 40 years in which to pay for it. It is a meritorious bill on that account.

Mr. HOPE. Do I understand that the Secretary has authority under this bill to loan up to the actual value of the land?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. It is in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior to determine the actual valuation of the property, and he can not loan beyond the actual value.

Mr. HOPE. It does not seem to me that it would be very good security for the Government to loan up to the entire value of the land.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. There is a clause in there that prevents that.

Mr. HOPE. Nobody would make a loan of that kind.

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

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. COX. Unless something is done to give relief to the people of that community, they will have to abandon their properties, and they will revert to a wild, desolate state, and the expenditures already made will have been wasted.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Absolutely.

Mr. COX. And it is of taxing value to the State as well.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. It would be a great economic loss to the Nation to allow this land to revert to swamp, not only to the 230,000 people in my district, but to the 5,000,000 people in farming areas in these drainage and irrigation districts. They would suffer the loss of all that they have put into them and the Federal Government would be robbed of one of its greatest sources of revenue. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BUSBY].

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the subject being discussed, and if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] will give me his attention, I desire to deal with the question that he asked a while ago. There is in this proposed legislation no disadvantage whatever to the Government. A great many drainage districts have been organized throughout the country to reclaim lands that are very fertile, to drain lands that were breeding places for malaria and disease. These drainage districts have been going along for 10 or 12 or 15 years, and have largely paid up the original debt that they contracted. They have driven up to the point now, with only a small portion of their debt in many cases, and larger portions in others, where they can not go any further.

What is proposed in this legislation is very much like the proposal in a reclamation project in the arid sections in the West. It is to let the Secretary of the Interior send a man to look over, make survey, and evaluate the project as it is laid out. Perhaps the bondholders will hold bonds to four, three, or two times the value of this project, according to the value placed upon it by the representative of the department. What is to be done? The representative of the Department of the Interior will say that all the Government can see in the project is such and such an amount, and that if the bondholders will agree to settle their bonds on that basis, which is the real value of the district, the Department of the Interior can arrange and make an adjustment for the district with the bondholders. Then whatever obligation is incurred by the Government for the district is secured by the district, and it obligates itself and all of the property in it to meet the obligation incurred by the Government on its behalf. Then it also agrees to pay 3 per cent for the money that is loaned. In other words, it is taking a lot of insolvent situations that are reverting back to their original state and adjust them for the bondholders and the districts for the people where they can not adjust them for themselves. It is making a national asset. There is no use in going out and conquering other countries in order to obtain lands when we should conquer the lands within our own confines. If we will use common sense and do it, we will add greatly to our national wealth, save many farm homes from destruction, and render an efficient service in many ways without a dollar's loss.

Some years ago I began studying the reclamation situation in the West. I thought the Government was being imposed on. I thought the money of the taxpayers was being wasted; but the more I studied those reclamation projects, the more I became convinced that the people went out there and took waste lands that were worth nothing as national assets, and converted them into splendid farming lands. Cities were built upon them, and I venture to say they have paid more income taxes into the National Treasury than the Treasury has put into the revolving fund with which to reclaim those arid stretches of land. [Applause.] That is the situation with reference to these drainage projects. They will pay more income tax when we have put them back on their feet than we will ever be called on to advance to reclaim them from their present condition. The reclamation fund started out with about \$150,000,000, and it has grown with the interest collected until it is about \$200,000,000, and it is still growing. It is not a waste of funds for the Government to assist to reclaim lands; it is not a waste of effort; it is not a dole, but it is using common sense on the part of our National Government to take care of and make usable national assets, and to help people do a thing they can not do by themselves. I do not want anyone to think that the Government is likely to lose money by helping to adjust the business of the reclamation of drainage districts and to reclaim the lands that make our Government and country great and wealthy as it is. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I regret I do not see the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] in the Chamber.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order of no quorum.

Mr. CRISP. I hope my colleague will not do that.

Mr. COX. Very well. I withdraw the point of order, with the permission of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. CRISP. I have sent word to the office of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] that I was about to address the House.

Gentlemen, I shall conduct this discussion in the utmost good humor. I do it because I think it is the proper way to discuss a matter of rules, and for the further reason that I am not making any fight for a change of the rules for partisan purposes, but am making it in what I conceive to be for the interest of the entire membership of the House. [Applause.] I am certain in my own mind some of my colleagues on this side may not agree with all of the changes I propose. I am equally certain there are a number of gentlemen on the other side who will whole-heartedly favor them, and I am convinced that a majority of the membership of the next House, irrespective of political affiliations, will favor them, and that, in substance, they will be adopted as the rules of the Seventy-second Congress. [Applause.]

I do not blame the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] at all for replying to my address. When I made it I invited reply. I was prepared then, as I am prepared now, to defend every position I took, anywhere, and at all times. I will be perfectly content and happy if the distinguished Speaker and majority leader will see fit to reply. If they do so, I can have no doubt whatever that the speech I delivered over the radio is having effect on the country and that the gentlemen are hearing from it, and that is what induces them to reply. [Applause.]

Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] very correctly stated that the rules of this House are not the product of any one mind or the product of any decade or any number of Congresses, but they are the evolution from rules adopted 150 years ago when this country became organized under the Constitution.

From time to time rules have been changed and modified, and each change has been in favor of liberalizing the rules of the House to give greater power to each of the Members of the House. Gentlemen, the world does not stand still. All animal life and all vegetable life must go forward or die and wither away. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] does not seem to realize that principle, but he desires to operate under the old order of things.

May I say that when man was in a primitive state, the ruler had the right to chop off a man's head, but as man progressed in intelligence and civilization, he would not submit to it, and from early man all through the different ages, men have demanded and received more liberties and more equality, and the evolution of the rules of the House is but carrying out that principle.

The Constitution has been amended in many ways, and each amendment, practically, is to protect the rights of individuals.

Now, as a son, I am going to crave your indulgence if I make a few personal observations. It is not pleasing to me to have to do this, but I am sure under the existing circumstances of the debate that I participate in on the floor of this House relative to changes of the rules, I am justified in what I am going to say. Every time I discuss the rules some one gets up and says, "Those were the rules that governed the House when your father had the honor to preside over its deliberations."

That statement is not true. Many of the rules of the present House are entirely different from the rules when my father was Speaker. The Unanimous Consent Calendar, Calendar Wednesday, and many other things have been added, but I freely admit, gentlemen, that the rules to-day are more liberal than they were during the days when my father was Speaker. At that time the Speaker appointed committees, was chairman of the Rules Committee, and had a complete veto power on all legislation. My father lived

in his day and generation and he measured up to the very highest standards of that time [applause], and was an ornament to it.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. I would like to finish this personal reference and then I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

I am sincerely of the opinion that my father was the greatest Speaker, the fairest Speaker, and the ablest Speaker this House has ever had. [Applause.] There is one distinguished gentleman in this House, Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, who served under him, and I have heard him say to me many times since I have been here that very thing.

He was lovable, magnetic, never lost a friend, and was impartial in the discharge of his duties. I have an adoration for him. Never did a boy love his father more than I did mine; but if my father lived to-day he would keep up with the spirit of the times, and he would favor liberalization of the rules of this House, for he always believed in a square deal and that the masses of the people had a right to be protected. [Applause.]

Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman did not mean to infer that the gentleman from New York made any disparaging remarks about his father, did he?

Mr. CRISP. I did not.

Mr. SNELL. I certainly did not, and I would apologize if I had.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman did not. The gentleman is familiar with what took place on the floor of the House, and every time I discuss the rules some one brings that up; and a gentleman, a newspaper writer, George Rothwell Brown, continues to write about it. He is either grossly ignorant or willfully misrepresents the facts; and I do not think he is ignorant.

Now, gentlemen, the first change of the rules that I propose deals with the meeting of committees. I am not going to take up very much time to consider that, for surely every Member of the House believes that a majority of any of the committees of the House should have a right to convene whenever they see fit to do so.

The gentleman from New York says they can do that now, provided, when the committee assembles, it makes provision for the committee to assemble at the request of a majority of its members. That is true, but they do not do it.

The committees of the House are but the agents of the House. The House is the principal. The House delegates certain authority to the committees and surely the principal has the right to make rules for its agents to act under. Under the general parliamentary practice of this House the rules of the House are the rules of the committees, and under the rules of the House a motion to recess is not a privileged motion. Therefore, if a committee met and a member attempted to make a motion to recess until the next day, it would not be in order. The proposal I suggest simply permits a majority of the members of a committee to meet whenever they see fit and it makes in order a motion to recess, so that the committees may function from day to day if they elect to do so. I can not, to save my life, see how anyone can object to that provision of the rules.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the gentleman from Georgia take issue with the statement made by the gentleman from New York that under the present rules of the House the committees may do that?

Mr. CRISP. I do not, and I so stated. I am going to be perfectly frank with the House, and I always am. I have never made a statement on the floor of this House in arguing a point of order to the Chair unless I sincerely believed in it and I have given the reasons why I believed in it.

The gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, says—and I quote from his speech, page 3700 of the RECORD:

Never, by one single paragraph in that manual, not by a single sentence or a single word, as far as I know, has this House ever given the Rules Committee any substantive power to control

legislation. It has not given the Rules Committee any substantive power to defeat legislation.

I respectfully take issue with the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Rules Committee. The jurisdiction of the Rules Committee is defined in Rule XI, section 35.

All proposed action touching the rules, joint rules, and order of business shall be referred to the Rules Committee.

Paragraph 725 of the same rule provides:

It shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the Committee on Rules.

Paragraph 725 (a) of the same rule provides that:

The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business.

Seven hundred and twenty-six of the same rule provides that:

No committee, except the Committee on Rules, shall sit during the sitting of the House.

If that does not confer absolute power upon the Rules Committee to report to this House what nonprivileged bills shall be considered, I am so obtuse I can not read the English language. I will demonstrate later how the Rules Committee does function; how the Rules Committee does say what nonprivileged bills shall be considered and what bills shall be considered provided a majority of the House votes to adopt a special rule they report.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman in his last statement answered the question I was going to ask; that is, that the Rules Committee may, under the rules, map out the program, but that program must be reported to the House, and that program can not even get started unless a majority of those present and voting wants it started.

Mr. CRISP. My objection to the Rules Committee and the vice of the system, as I see it, is not on the rules they report, for when they report them it takes a majority of the House to adopt them; but the vice, as I see it, the gag rule, as I see it, is when the Committee on Rules pigeonholes in that committee and lets sleep in the dark chambers of the committee room a resolution providing for the consideration of a bill and will not bring it out to the floor and let a majority of the House have an opportunity to act.

I will leave my memorandum as to the order in which I was going to discuss this matter and say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] said in his speech that the Committee on Rules had reported 40 rules during the three sessions of this Congress; that 22 bills had been considered under special rules, and that he had some other rules which, for one reason or another, he had not called up. Gentlemen, that leaves 149 rules pending before that committee asking for the consideration of bills, and the vice is that they are gagging the House, smothering those resolutions in the Committee on Rules, and will not give a majority of the House the opportunity of voting as to whether or not they desire to consider them.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I do not want any wrong impression left in the minds of the Members of the House. Every rule that the Rules Committee has ever reported has been called up unless there was some reason for not calling it up, like a bill having been passed by unanimous consent, or for some reason we had to take the rule back in order to change it or bring out another rule to take care of the particular situation. The statement made by the gentleman from Georgia as to the other resolutions remaining in the committee is correct, but let me say that there is not a committee in this House which reports one-fourth of the resolutions or bills referred to it, and in addition let me say that the Rules Committee has before it 50 or 60 resolutions asking for investigations. Is the gentleman in favor of bringing every one of them before the House?

Mr. CRISP. I am, if 100 Members of the House are interested in them. I am not in favor of bringing everyone

here that 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 Members may desire, for the whole burden of my speech on this subject has been that I do not want chaos, I want orderly procedure in the House. I do not want any rule that will permit a mere handful of men to filibuster and interfere with the procedure of the House, but where there is a public matter of sufficient importance that 100 Members of this House desire the House to pass upon it, they should have the privilege of doing so, and if there are 100 Members interested in any resolution pending before the Rules Committee asking for a special order they are entitled to it.

It has developed in debate here on this floor to-day that there is a bill or resolution pending before the Rules Committee asking that the House be given an opportunity to consider a bill dealing with drainage bonds. It was stated that 135 Members have signed a petition asking the Rules Committee to report this rule. I do not know the merits of this legislation. I do not know whether or not I would support it if it came upon the floor of the House, but I do say that it is the duty of the Rules Committee to give these gentlemen an opportunity to have the bill considered. I do not know what the Rules Committee will do. They may give them a rule, but I say to these 135 Members, whether the Rules Committee gives you a rule or not, if you had the discharge rule that I am going to propose you would certainly get an opportunity to make the House vote on the question.

Mr. SNELL. May I say to the gentleman that we have heard them now for three days?

Mr. CRISP. I am making a perfectly fair statement. I said I did not know what you were going to do and I quoted what was said here. I do not make anything here but fair statements. [Applause.]

Now, the gentleman says that the Rules Committee has no control over legislation. Let me call your attention to an occurrence that happened on the floor of this House in 1922. I have the volume here and I will quote from it. Mr. Campbell, of Kansas, was chairman of the Rules Committee. A debate was had on the floor of the House as to a rule pending before that committee and Mr. MOORE of Virginia said:

In April I introduced a resolution which was sent to the cemetery which is operated by the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Campbell, the chairman of the Rules Committee, a cemetery where all Democratic measures are interred.

Some Member said, "A morgue." Mr. Campbell said:

The Committee on Rules takes into account the bills that the steering committee has shifted into a place for privileged consideration. Then the Committee on Rules provides machinery to consider them.

Mr. Campbell, in that debate, also said:

Facetious comment has frequently been made about the chairman of the Committee on Rules who carries in his hip pocket or his coat pocket rules. If the work of the Committee on Rules continues to grow as it has been growing in the past seven or eight years, they will have to have a calendar for the Committee on Rules instead of a place in the pocket of the chairman for rules that are reported. I have in my pocket now other rules reported by that committee which I have not presented to the House.

The gentleman from New York said in his speech that some of the rules his committee had reported had not been called up.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman misinterprets me there. I gave the gentleman the reason a few moments ago why they were not called up.

Mr. CRISP. I will quote the gentleman verbatim.

Mr. SNELL. I said that for various reasons they were not called up. The gentleman from New York has never carried a committee rule in his pocket and I challenge any man to state once when he ever did.

Mr. CRISP. I do not know what the gentleman carries in his pocket. I do not have access to his pocket. [Laughter and applause.] I just quoted what the gentleman said on the floor of the House here. I will now quote him verbatim:

Up to December 1, 1930, there were 927 measures passed in this House. There were 40 special rules granted, and several of them

were for investigations that have not been considered, and some for one reason or another were not presented. Only 22 pieces of legislation in the first two sessions of the Seventy-first Congress were ever considered under special rules.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CRISP. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. I have just explained to the gentleman the reason two or three of them were not presented. As a matter of fact, every rule that is presented by the Rules Committee goes on the calendar, and the gentleman can very well find out whether the gentleman from New York has ever pocketed any rules or not; and earlier in the gentleman's statement he said he was going to talk about present-day conditions and not archaic conditions of the past. Now the gentleman is going back to something the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Campbell, did. The gentleman from New York, the present chairman of the Rules Committee, has never carried a rule in his pocket.

Mr. CRISP. Gentlemen, there is an old saying, "The hit bird flutters."

Mr. SNELL. No; he does not flutter in this case.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman from New York is fluttering.

Mr. SNELL. I deny the statement the gentleman has made, and I would like to have him recall a specific instance where I have ever done that.

Mr. CRISP. I told the gentleman I did not know what he did.

Mr. SNELL. Then do not make the charge here unless you know.

Mr. CRISP. Well, I will quote what the gentleman said on the floor of the House here or anywhere else. [Applause.]

Mr. SNELL. If the gentleman makes a charge, he should substantiate it, and that is what I am asking the gentleman to do.

Mr. CRISP. I have told the gentleman that I do not know what he has in his pocket.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman can not substantiate the charge, and he knows it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The gentleman from New York is interrupting without permission.

Mr. SNELL. Oh, the gentleman yielded to me.

Mr. CRISP. I yielded to the gentleman, and I am in perfect good humor about this.

Mr. BLANTON. The chairman of the Rules Committee does not need permission, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CRISP. I am in perfect good humor, and I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York; perfectly so.

Now, let me tell you what the gentleman from New York said further in that speech, and I am quoting from page 3700;

It is the duty of the Rules Committee, as I understand it, to act, as far as possible, for the protection of the administration and the administration program of legislation.

The gentleman from New York evidently thinks the Rules Committee should have the power to censor what bills the House shall consider.

In his speech the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] compares the House of Representatives to a private corporation, intimating that the members of the Rules Committee are the directors and the other members the stockholders. The whole burden of that part of his speech was to the effect that the directors controlled the affairs and the stockholders' province was to submit and, at the end of the year, if they did not like the management of the directors, they might elect new ones. I can not subscribe to any such fallacy. The House of Representatives should not be likened to a private corporation or a civic organization, but it is one of the two coordinate bodies provided for by the Constitution of the United States to represent the people of the Nation in legislative matters. Each Congressman represents a constituency, and each is entitled to as much consideration in that body as another. I must confess, it seems to me the Rules Committee acts on the theory intimated by the distinguished gentleman from New York.

The gentleman from New York does protect the administration. Seventy-five per cent of this House might be interested in considering some nonprivileged bill of great public import, but if the administration does not desire it, if the leaders of the House do not desire it considered, they sit on the lid and will not let the resolution come out of the Rules Committee to consider it.

Now, our fathers in organizing this Government provided three coordinate branches—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. The executive branch has nothing to do with what bills this Congress considers. [Applause.] It is none of their function; it is none of their business.

The President has the right to recommend to Congress such legislation as he sees fit, but it is the imperative duty, the power, and the right of the House to consider any legislation it sees fit. If it passes, when it reaches the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, if it does not meet with the approval of the President it is his duty and right to veto it. When he vetoes it, it comes back to Congress. It is a privileged motion. Then the representatives of the people and the Senate have the right to vote to overrule it, and if it gets two-thirds to vote for it, it becomes a law.

But under the present system, if the leaders of the House do not desire a bill to be considered, they sit on the lid; they do not let it come out; they exercise a more autocratic veto power than any President of the United States exercises.

Now, does the Committee on Rules refuse to report out resolutions? I have called your attention to the number they have had and the number they have reported out and the number they have not reported out.

Gentlemen, you do not have to take my word for the fact that the Rules Committee has exercised almost complete control as to which nonprivileged bills of the House of public import are considered and which are not considered. You have seen it operating, you have seen the machinery, the roller, and you know it as well as I do. I repeat that I have no fault to find with the Rules Committee when it reports out for consideration a special order whether it is a hog-tying rule or not, because it can not be adopted unless a majority of the House agrees to it.

My fight is to put it in the power of a majority of the House to consider a measure, irrespective of the fact that the leaders or the administration do not want it considered.

I criticize them only when they refuse to take a bill up in the committee room and will not give the House an opportunity to consider it.

Now, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee said that the discharge rule is the most important rule that I am going to propose. Unquestionably it is, and the gentleman from New York makes an earnest appeal to let his committee stand out above all others and not to let the vicious rule apply to this sacred Committee on Rules.

Let me quote. He says:

I am sure the common sense of this House will not allow you to use this new discharge rule against the Rules Committee and thereby destroy the very purpose for which the House itself created the Rules Committee, namely, to enable it to function as it wanted to at all times.

I think that language was a slip on the gentleman's part, although it speaks the truth. I think the gentleman had in mind that the Rules Committee should be allowed to function as it wanted to function at all times. That is what they think. Probably the gentleman meant in his argument that the House could function as it wanted to at all times. However, he did say let the Rules Committee do as it wanted to. That is what they do now under the rules.

The language is capable of two constructions, and the gentleman probably meant to say that the House could do what the House wanted to. As a matter of fact, the House can not do it under the present rules.

The gentleman referred to the discharge rule under the Democratic control and said that there was a joker in it—that you could only call up a bill after you had called through the Unanimous-Consent Calendar and Suspensions. That was true, and the Republicans in the Sixty-sixth and Sixty-

seventh Congresses had that rule word for word, and I was the one, if I may be permitted to say so, who discovered the joker. I proposed—

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

Mr. CRISP. Let me finish this.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I wanted to—

Mr. CRISP. I decline to yield, if the gentleman will not desist when I courteously ask him to wait. After the occurrence on the floor of the House with Mr. Campbell the rules dealing with the Committee on Rules were amended to provide that when the Rules Committee authorized the report of a special rule, if it was not called up within three days, it should go on the calendar, and then if the chairman did not call it up within nine days the Committee on Rules could direct some other Member to call it up—another evolution, trying to get away from autocratic procedure on the part of a few in control. In the next Congress I proposed a discharge rule, and it was adopted with two changes. The rule that I proposed provided that 100 Members could initiate the proceeding, but in drafting the rule I did not confine it to public bills. The House adopted that rule, changing the "100" to "150," and made it applicable to public bills, and if you will notice that rule, I provided that the motion should be in order immediately after the approval of the Journal, and I stood two days on this floor and debated it and showed why the change was made, that it was to prevent the very situation that the gentleman from New York pointed out, that if you had to wait until you had called all the committees it would not operate. Who killed Cock Robin? I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Oh, no; I follow the gentleman, and I shall yield to him.

Mr. CRISP. I yielded to the gentleman, and I asked him courteously to wait until I finished that statement. I said I would yield afterwards. If the gentleman does not care to interrogate me, it is immaterial to me. I am perfectly good humored, and I made up my mind when I took this floor that I was not going to get ruffled.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I hope the gentleman will not get ruffled by the question that I ask him. The gentleman states he wants to be fair, and I think he does want to be fair, but outward appearances do not always indicate that.

The gentleman was the parliamentary clerk here from 1911 to 1913. He was a Member of the House from 1913 to 1918, and during those eight years the Democrats were in complete control. Would it not be fair or fairer at least to state or let the country know that during all of the time the Democrats were in power the gentleman never did suggest anything here that would liberalize the discharge rule, which everybody concedes was ineffective?

Mr. CRISP. I think the gentleman has asked the question, and he should let me answer it now. I do not want to be discourteous, but if you will give me unlimited time, I am willing to stand here until I drop on this floor to answer every question anyone will propound.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I do not want to go as far as that. I quit.

Mr. CRISP. I will answer the gentleman. I did not make any suggestions of any change in any of the rules during the Democratic administration. I was a new Member, and I have never, if I may be permitted to say it, tried to push myself forward, but I do say to the gentleman that as far as any law, any code of rules that are adopted, is concerned, how they work depends upon the men who handle them and execute them; and under the Democratic régime we did not have this procedure that we have now. There was not a complaint of the rules then as the complaint has been since, and the complaint of the present procedure is not confined to the Democratic side of the House, but it is largely on the Republican side also—so much so, gentlemen, that while you have a paper majority of two for the organization of the next House, you know that unless these rules are liberalized you will not be able to get all of the independent, freethinking men on the

Republican side to vote with you, and you will not organize the House unless the rules are liberalized, and you know it.

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

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. As I understand the procedure in the House, and the organization of the House, the first thing to do is to organize and elect your officers, and then comes the adoption of the rules. That is an entirely different proposition. A man could very well vote for whoever he wished to for Speaker and still vote against the rules or for the rules. Why does that necessarily depend upon the election of the Speaker or the other officers of the House?

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman states the situation correctly, but a number of men on the gentleman's side of the House are not so gullible or simple as to vote for the Republican nominee for Speaker unless they have assurance that these rules are to be changed, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Has the gentleman's prospective leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], promised these proposed changes that the gentleman is talking about at the present time?

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman from Texas is 21, and I shall let him speak for himself. I say this to the gentleman: When I prepared and introduced this discharge rule, Mr. GARNER did not know anything in the world about it; he had never seen it and I had never discussed it with a single Member of the House. No one knew what I was going to do. I introduced it, and I am doing so on my own responsibility as a Member, trying to liberalize the rules of the House. What the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] has said to others I know not, but it is my judgment that Mr. GARNER will support this change.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, for information?

Mr. CRISP. Certainly.

Mr. SLOAN. In the discharge of these committees of various bills, is there a limit placed as to the number of discharges as to which each man may sign his name or may not, and might not the minority congest the calendar much more than it has been congested under the rules of the present and preceding régimes?

Mr. CRISP. I will answer the gentleman. It could unquestionably congest the discharge calendar more than it has under the present discharge rule, for there is not a single one on it and not a single one can get on it under these rules, but I do not believe the House of Representatives would be so silly as to pile up the calendar with motions to discharge for the purpose of filibuster or delay; but even admitting they would be so silly, that only can apply 2 days in the month, and in a long session of Congress there would not be more than 10 or 12 days when the rule would apply, and before the rule can apply the bill must be in committee 30 days, and only once can the rule be applied to any particular bill. When there has been one motion to discharge and that has been disposed of either by adoption or rejection by the House, another motion can not be filed against that bill.

I think I have answered the gentleman frankly.

Mr. SLOAN. Not from my viewpoint; but the point was the congestion of the other—

Mr. CRISP. Well, I may say to my friend that I think I answered him frankly and candidly.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman did not understand my question. The congestion I referred to was not the congestion of the discharge calendar but the congestion of the various other calendars which we have in the House, which, in a way, control and give precedence to legislation.

Mr. CRISP. The other calendars are unquestionably congested, and many of them, in the natural order of events, can not be considered. Many bills will be reported from committees and die because they can not be reached.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CRISP. I dislike to trespass on the time of the House, but I have yielded to so many questions and I have not really answered some of them.

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] 15 additional minutes.

Mr. CRISP. Now, gentlemen, please do not interrupt me. I have yielded, but I think I should have a chance now to conclude.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will be glad to yield whatever additional time is required to answer the question which I wish to ask the gentleman.

Mr. CRISP. Very well.

Mr. SIMMONS. If I understood the gentleman's statement correctly, it is the gentleman's opinion that under the present discharge rule it is practically impossible to get a bill before the House?

Mr. CRISP. Absolutely; a nonprivileged bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Under that statement, am I correct in drawing the conclusion that the procedure suggested by some Members of the House of securing the discharge of the Committee on Ways and Means on the so-called Patman bill to pay cash on the bonus was a futile undertaking?

Mr. CRISP. It was futile for two reasons: Under the rule you could not get 218 Members to sign it, but if you got that, then you had to have 218 votes by tellers. The rule says you can not call the roll, but you have to have 218 pass through tellers; and when that was done, the committee was directed in 15 days to report the bill and it was to go on the calendar. It is a nonprivileged bill, and if it was reported favorably by the committee or reported under that rule and went on the calendar, it is nonprivileged, and 80 per cent of the Members of this House—and I repeat that statement—80 per cent of the Members of this House desiring to get it considered could not do so without a revolution, by overturning the rules, unless the Rules Committee brought in a rule for its consideration.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then, as I say, the proceedings with reference to the Patman bill were futile?

Mr. CRISP. Well, I think it was to show their earnest desire, but if you had the rule I propose it would not have been futile. One hundred and eighteen Members would sign that. If you had the rule I propose, I would have had a little special-order rule before the Rules Committee, a special order for the consideration of that bill, and when 100 Members signed that discharge rule I would have applied it against the Rules Committee and if a majority of the House, a quorum present, voted in the affirmative, that committee would have been discharged and we would have adopted the rule and the House would have proceeded to consider the adjusted-service certificates under the terms of the rule, just as much as if the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] had brought in here a favorable report for consideration of the bill under the rule.

The gentleman from New York says, "Oh, there are certain privileged bills that can come up." Yes. Appropriations. Who in the world ever disputed that appropriation bills could come up? If they do not come up and are not passed, we would have an extra session of Congress, which I hope will not be the case. Then the gentleman says, "The Ways and Means Committee." Later on he said, "You can not pass a tariff bill through the House without a rule; you have to have a rule." Therefore he destroys and negatives his own proposition that a tariff bill can be considered without a rule from the Rules Committee.

Then he says, "Other committees." Yes. The Committee on the Territories is privileged to report a bill admitting a new State. This has not been done since the great State of Oklahoma came into the Union. There will not be another Territory admitted to statehood in years to come.

Is not this a great privilege conferred upon our membership? The gentleman says the Printing Committee can report a resolution providing for printing a document that does not cost more than \$500. A great gift to the House of Representatives!

The chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills can quietly slip in the door and leave upon the Speaker's desk,

the enrolled bills that have been passed. Oh, gentlemen, we should be grateful for this consideration.

Gentlemen, the bills in which the country is interested are nonprivileged bills. Bills that come from the following committees are not privileged: Judiciary, Immigration, Banking and Currency, Agriculture, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Merchant Marine, Flood Control, Foreign Affairs, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, Irrigation and Reclamation, Education, Labor, Civil Service, Claims, and others. Those are the committees in which the country is interested. But, says the gentleman from New York, "You have Calendar Wednesday." Yes. In the three sessions of this Congress only 18 of the 44 committees have had the call. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], on the floor of the House the other day, said the Committee on Immigration had not been called since 1922—nine years. I checked that up and it seems to be correct. So, to consider them on Calendar Wednesday, "Abandon hope all ye who hope to enter here." I quote Mr. JOHNSON literally:

Mr. JOHNSON. There is no way, however, to get them up on the floor except by a rule, by suspension of the rules, or by unanimous consent. It so happens that the last Calendar Wednesday of this Committee on Immigration and Naturalization occurred on April 5, 1922. Think of it—nine years ago! The committee has been recognized by rule occasionally in that long period covering more than four Congresses. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 20, 1931, p. 2693.)

I am going to propose an amendment to the Calendar Wednesday rule so that each committee will be limited to one day. That may relieve the situation some and permit more committees to be called.

The gentleman from New York overlooked one way that the House might consider a bill without the approval of the Rules Committee. I will remind him of it. Suspension of the rules on certain days, but the Speaker is absolute boss as to that. There is no provision in the rules making him recognize anybody. He has the privilege of doing it if he wants to, but he does not have to do it.

Now, gentlemen, the whole purpose of the rules I have prepared is not to deal with a committee that is functioning, not to deal with a committee that is having hearings on bills referred to it, but with a willful committee; one that attempts to strangle in the dark a public bill; one that your constituents and mine are interested in. That is frequently done. They smother them there to keep the House from voting on them and to keep Members from going on record as to how they stand. I will quote what I said in my radio address on this subject. I said committees can kill bills in committee—page 3205—

Under our present code of rules any public bill in which the people are vitally interested can be smothered in a committee and thus killed, and it is most frequently done, and by the same means the membership of the House may be prevented from going on record as to how they stand on the measure. This system of gag rule plays directly into the hands of the special interests and is a favorite method used in preventing legislation opposed by them. I believe that a man or woman elected to the high office of Congressman should have the courage to vote on any public legislation pending in Congress, and to let his constituents, who have a voice on the legislation only through their Representative, know how he stands upon it.

The gentleman from New York admits the criticism. I quote from his speech:

It is very difficult for a man constituted as I am to take the pounding that the chairman of the Rules Committee receives on the floor of the House, when I know the Member is demagoguing. I know it because time and time again he has come to me after he has made a statement and said, "Do not pay any attention to it. I did not mean it, but I was forced into this for political reasons, but for God's sake, you stand up and do what is right."

He admits the charge. He says that when the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee did not do what they should have done, smother that Capper-Kelly bill in the committee, they passed the buck to him, but he was not going to stand for it, so he brought in a rule. I am glad he did. I have been writing my folks for two years that I would not support it and I was delighted to have the privilege of voting against it. But the gentleman admits my case.

Gentlemen, what I am seeking to do is to correct that; to fix the rules so that if 100 Members desire to put the House on record as to an important nonprivileged public bill they will have the right to do so. Your constituents and my constituents have the right to know how we stand, and the only way they have a vote in this Congress is through you as their duly elected Representatives. They have the right to know; yet under present conditions they can not find out unless you voluntarily tell them. The discharge rule I propose is to deal with that situation. Muscle Shoals is tied up in conference and we can not do anything about it. Eighty per cent—and I repeat it—of the Members of this House may desire to act, but unless the Rules Committee brings in a rule dealing with it they can not do it, unless they override the rules of the House. The same would be true of an amendment to the Volstead Act and the submission of the question of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, dealing with prohibition. Neither is privileged and you can not do it, but if the rule I propose is adopted, 100 Members on two days a month can inaugurate and initiate the procedure, where upon the request of 100 Members the House will be forced to vote as to whether or not it will take up a bill. Oh, no; the 100 Members do not discharge the committee, the 100 Members simply inaugurate and initiate the machinery whereby on two days in each month the majority of the House will have the privilege of voting as to whether a majority of the House desires to discharge a committee, and, if a majority desires to do so, it is discharged. If they do not, then the committee is not discharged. This rule will not clog or interfere with business or tie up legislation. It will not be legislation by petition, because such a motion can not be made until a committee has had an opportunity to consider a bill for 30 days.

I do not believe this House would at any time do the foolish thing but that when 100 Members desired to take up a bill there would be some good reason for it, and that the Members of the House would only act when it was necessary.

I will not have the time to answer the gentleman with regard to the tariff bill. He referred to the fact that they had a conference about the tariff bill, but I remind him that was not the first conference they had on it. They had one long before they reported the first rule in connection with the bill. They did not bring in a rule at once when the bill was reported by the Ways and Means Committee but allowed us to debate it day after day while certain Republicans appeared before these 15 Republican Members who prepared the original bill to see if they could be mollified or pacified in their opposition to the bill if they were permitted to offer some amendments and have them adopted. Then when they got enough satisfied to adopt the rule, in came the steam roller, and she rolled. They adopted the rule and they passed the bill. The gentleman said there were 1,250 amendments placed on the bill by the Senate and that it would have been impossible to permit the House to act on all of them. He said they had a conference. Oh, yes; they had a conference and they had a conference for the same reason. They could not have a rule adopted unless certain Members were given a chance to vote on the tariff on cement, sugar, lumber, the flexible provision, and the debenture. So they had a conference and they agreed to give them separate votes on those propositions and then in came the rule and it was adopted.

Now, much complaint is made concerning the Private Calendar. If we followed the rules of the House, every Friday the House would resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of the Private Calendar. I have not seen that rule applied but once since I have been back here. In the old days it was used, but, of course, at times they were not able to pass as many bills on one Friday as under the present system, because they might get one that was contested and that slowed up things. But that is the rule of the House and it gives everyone a fair and square chance on his bill when it is reached on the calendar.

However, if you are not going to apply that rule it seems to me it would be in the interest of the membership of the House to have a rule adopted which would provide for the consideration of private bills by unanimous consent, and providing that there shall be three objections to the present consideration of the bill, just as we now have it with reference to the Consent Calendar the second time a bill is called up.

Now, gentlemen, I have trespassed upon your time much longer than I anticipated, but I am sure you will admit that the questions asked me have required considerable time. I am in perfectly good humor; I am perfectly sincere; I am making this fight, not for the Democratic side but for the entire membership of the House, to make it again a representative body and to give a majority, irrespective of politics, on two days of the month an opportunity to place the House on record.

The gentleman from New York sees the handwriting on the wall. His speech was the last appeal, the dying appeal, of the old guard for you to rally around him and to retain his power; but the call will go unanswered, for I have not any doubt but that the Seventy-second Congress will liberalize the rules. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield so that I may obtain some information?

Mr. CRISP. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I was not here at the beginning of the gentleman's remarks, and perhaps he has already enlightened the House as to the matter I want to inquire about at this time. Something has been said about the congestion of the business of the House if the particular rule the gentleman speaks of were adopted. I understand, if this rule were adopted, the business taken up under the rule would only be considered by the House two days each month; is that correct?

Mr. CRISP. I am very pleased that my friend has asked this question, because on account of the interruptions I did not have a chance to answer it. The rule has two clauses in it. One of them is the old rule I had in the Fifty-eighth Congress, that where a committee is discharged and the bill taken up it is only considered on those particular days, and if it is not finished on the first day it goes over to the next discharge day; but the only bill I have ever seen the discharge rule applied to was the Howell-Barkley bill, and when it got up there was a filibuster, and they filibustered and filibustered, and we remained here one entire night, and I saw then that the rule had to be changed. I have profited by that experience, and the only effective way to have a discharge rule is to make the discharge rule apply against the Committee on Rules, and this is the way it is to be done: I would sit down and introduce a resolution and send it to the Rules Committee providing that upon the adoption of the resolution a certain bill should be considered. I would make that a continuing order. I would say that the House from day to day shall proceed to consider the bill until it is finally disposed of. I would say how many hours of debate there should be. I would cut off all dilatory motions and confine the Speaker to entertaining only one motion to adjourn, and then if 100 Members signed the petition and the Committee on Rules was discharged and it was brought in here and the House adopted the rule, it would have the same force and effect for the consideration of that bill that it would have if the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] brought it in here with a favorable report and it was adopted. It would cut off filibusters, it would make the House continue to consider the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CRISP. When I discussed this matter last Friday, the gentleman from Alabama asked me how the rule would work if they made an adverse report, and I answered that I had not thought of that and I would have to consider it. I thought of it that night and I now have the answer. That is a weakness. If the Rules Committee purposely and

wilfully sought to circumvent the House from acting when they had a resolution for the consideration of a bill by making a favorable report and not calling it up or by making an adverse report, under the rule as I originally drafted it, they might accomplish their purpose. I am going to propose two others that will change that. I am going to propose that if the Committee on Rules makes a favorable report on a rule for the consideration of a bill and they do not call it up within three days, then any member of the Rules Committee, minority or majority, can call it up, and I am going to provide that if they make an adverse report on a rule providing for the consideration of a bill, then on days when it is in order to call the discharge calendar, any Member of the House can call up that adverse report as a privileged matter, and the House does not have to accept the committee's recommendation of an adverse report, but can turn them down; and if a majority adopts the rule, then we will proceed to consider the bill under the terms of the rule, and there is no escape from it. The rule, with these additions which I shall prepare, will work and will prevent a filibuster, if a majority of the House desires to act.

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

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. CRISP. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I infer from what the gentleman has just stated that this discharge rule could not be invoked against the standing legislative committees of the House.

Mr. CRISP. Not unless the bill had been before them 30 days. In that case, it could.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Does not the gentleman realize that at the beginning of a session a large number of bills are introduced in the House and referred to the appropriate committees, and frequently it is not possible for any legislative committee to give consideration to a bill believed to be very important by some Member other than a member of the committee, and it is not given consideration unless some pressure is brought to bear upon the committee. I am sure the gentleman realizes that I am one of the liberal-minded men of the House, but I like to see orderly procedure, and being a member of a legislative committee, it seems to me that the members of the various committees ought to have a fair opportunity to consider any bill that is proposed to be brought up under this rule, before it is actually brought up. My friend realizes the futility of trying to legislate in the Committee of the Whole, and the thought I have is that before that is undertaken, every opportunity should be given to the proper legislative committee to function in connection with the bill for which the rule is invoked.

Mr. CRISP. I agree with my friend, but the rule gives them 30 days plus 7 days before it is put on the calendar, and I think that gives them a fair amount of time. The rule is not intended to be applied to ordinary bills. It is only applicable to outstanding public bills, and the rule will not destroy the Rules Committee, as they fear. It will make the Rules Committee good.

It will make the Rules Committee subservient to the wishes of the majority of the House. Probably the rule would not be used often because they would probably report a rule when a hundred Members were interested in it.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Might I suggest to my friend that it would be fair to give the legislative committees a longer period of time before the motion to discharge was actually made in which to consider a bill before the rule was invoked? It seems to me that this would make for much better legislation.

Mr. CRISP. I do not arrogate to myself superior knowledge—that is a matter of detail, when the rule is up for consideration the majority can say whether it should be increased or not.

Mr. WOODRUFF. These bills that would be considered under the discharge rule would be bills of considerable import.

Mr. CRISP. Undoubtedly.

Mr. WOODRUFF. It seems to me unreasonable to expect a legislative committee to act promptly because of the necessary hearings that should be held in matters of legislation. The witnesses may have to come from the far ends of the country. The subject under consideration would probably be of considerable importance and it is not only possible but probable that extended hearings should be held by the committee before sufficient information could be secured upon which to legislate intelligently.

Mr. CRISP. If the committee was having hearings, legitimately considering the bill, you could not get 10 Members to sign a petition for discharge.

Mr. WOODRUFF. And further, the committees do not always select for first consideration bills that might strike some Member as being most important. Bills before committees are usually considered in the order of priority importance as suggested by the departments affected by the bills. It seems to me in view of what I have said that the gentleman from Georgia should add considerable time to the seven days which, under his proposed bill, may elapse before the bill is taken from the committee.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] 40 minutes.

EXTRA SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my following the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] is a coincidence. I had intended to get into the general debate when the legislative appropriation bill was up last Saturday but did not have the time as I was occupied in committee hearing before the Ways and Means Committee on the proposals to cash the World War veterans' certificates.

I wish this afternoon to make some observations on the state of the Union, running all the way from the talk of an extra session, through some pending legislation, and then give some attention to the agitation for change in the rules of the House.

In view of the fact that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] preceded me with a discussion on the House rules, I may devote more time to that subject than I had intended.

First let us dispose of the talk of the need of an extra session of Congress. The President of the United States before this session of Congress convened last December, if the press quoted him correctly, wanted, if possible, to avoid an extra session. I do not know what his attitude is now. I presume he is no more enthusiastic for an extra session now than he was then.

During the last few months I have been reading some interesting histories touching the Civil War period and the reconstruction days following the Civil War.

Lincoln, during the Civil War, never did have the hearty support of Congress. He had Thad Stevens here in the House and Senator Sumner and Senator Wade in the Senate criticizing him constantly. Everything he did was criticized in Congress. He had much opposition in Congress. He was denounced as a usurper. His selection of generals, his conduct of the war, his attitude toward the States in rebellion were all subjects of condemnation. Even his Gettysburg speech, according to some critics of that day, was disappointing and inferior for the occasion.

Mr. BECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. BECK. Will the gentleman gratify my curiosity by saying who it was that said that the Gettysburg speech was unworthy of the occasion?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I said some critics of that time. Everett's speech was considered the great speech of the day, but there was not much comment or praise at that time of Lincoln's Gettysburg speech.

Mr. BECK. I was curious to know the name. I thought I had missed it.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I did not give any name.

There were disturbing elements in Congress during Lincoln's time as there are now. I have before me a History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850, by J. F.

Rhodes. In volume 5, pages 137-138, there is an interesting account of the last meeting that Mr. Lincoln had with his Cabinet on the morning of April 14, 1865. You know President Lincoln was assassinated that evening. I shall have this whole paragraph printed in the extension of my remarks. In this paragraph President Lincoln related a dream which he had the night before. He spoke in complimentary terms of General Lee and others of the Confederacy and manifested enthusiasm over the establishment of government in Virginia. The sentences I shall read at this place express the feeling of relief and gratification on the part of President Lincoln that he did not have Congress on his hands at the time. Some of you may see how these sentences apply to the situation before us. I now quote President Lincoln:

I think it providential that this great rebellion is crushed just as Congress has adjourned and there are none of the disturbing elements of that body to hinder and embarrass us. If we are wise and discreet, we shall reanimate the States and get their governments in successful operation, with order prevailing and the Union reestablished, before Congress comes together in December.

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

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman state whether he approves of the method by which those State governments were put into operation?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Oh, I can not go into that. Of course, Mr. Lincoln's position all the time during the war was that the Southern States were not out of the Union; that they were still a part of the Union. His critics in Congress contended the States in rebellion had taken themselves out of the Union, and after Lincoln's death they proceeded to enact the reconstruction acts contrary to Lincoln's views. It would have been much better if Lincoln's views had prevailed. But that is taking me away from my subject.

Mr. PARKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. PARKS. There is nobody who lives in the South that did not deplore the fact that Lincoln's policy was not carried out.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I understand that. I was quoting from Lincoln for another purpose. I do not know whether the President of the United States has any feeling akin to those of Mr. Lincoln toward Congress now or not, but certainly a lot of things can be done and should be done that the President can do and take care of during the nine months following March 4 better without Congress on his hands than with Congress on his hands.

Next, is there any considerable group in the United States that is demanding an extra session of Congress? Let us turn to the farmers. I have in my hand here the American Farm Bureau Weekly News Letter of December 30, 1930. On page 2 there is an article headed "Extra session not seen necessary for farmers." I now read the first paragraph from that article:

Farmers are not expecting an extra session to be necessary following March 4, 1931. Much of the legislation in which they are interested at Washington classifies as unfinished business, and if, in the ensuing two months, Congress works with that speed which may be expected of it and which it usually manifests, they will have secured the final enactment of all or at least most of the bills in which agriculture is interested.

That is the first paragraph. Then follows a list of 16 bills in which the farmers are interested. The legislative committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation assured me that this article correctly sets forth the attitude of their organization. These bills are regarded of minor importance, as the last paragraph of the article will show. I read the last paragraph of the article:

None of these bills will bring in the agricultural millenium, as each one is more of a minor than a major legislation project. However, altogether they constitute a rather large legislative program which, when enacted, will be beneficial to agriculture.

I believe this view is held by the other great agricultural associations and by the farmers generally of the country.

I have heretofore had occasion to present my views on our economic system. There are wrongs in our economic system that not only should be corrected but must be corrected if

our social and economic order is to survive. We have a surplus of food, of clothing, of fuel, and of material for housing on the one hand. On the other hand we have millions of people able, willing, and anxious to work who are suffering because of a lack of food, of clothing, of fuel, and of material for housing. The existence of such a situation no one can or will justify. During the last year I followed with interest the proceedings of the great labor organizations of the country. I was looking especially to these labor gatherings for suggestions for legislation to correct the situation that confronts us. I have not read the minutes of the proceedings of these labor organizations. So far as I could get their attitude from newspaper reports, it is that the problem of unemployment and the more equitable distribution of the fruits of industry is largely for the employers and employees to work out. I have before me an interview given out by Mr. Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, which was printed in the Washington Sunday Star, December 7 last. I read just one paragraph from this interview, which I think reflects the attitude of the great labor organizations of the country. It is as follows:

Probably the machinery for recording unemployment will have to be provided by legislation. But we do not favor legislation to force compliance of industry. Organized labor has made voluntary principles the cornerstone of its philosophy. Government can not control industry.

There is no group in either the House or the Senate that has a legislative program which goes to the fundamentals of our economic ills. The President of the United States, in his annual message to Congress last December, outlined his program which he asked Congress to enact into legislation. The President's program can be easily enacted into legislation before March 4. The President also made suggestions for studies to be made by committees of Congress during the time Congress should stand in adjournment from March 4 until the first Monday in December. These studies should be made. In regard to the economic depression, the President in his message, on page 2, among other suggestions, said:

Economic depression can not be cured by legislative action or Executive pronouncement. Economic wounds must be healed by the action of the cells of the economic body—the producers and the consumers themselves.

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

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it not true that the American Federation of Labor officials, in executive session in Miami, went on record as against an extra session of Congress?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I did not see that. Does the gentleman say that is the fact?

Mr. MORGAN. I saw some such publicity.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I did not see that. So far as I know there is not a group of any kind, farm, business, industrial, or labor, that thinks it is necessary for Congress to be in extra session for the purpose of enacting legislation to aid economic recovery.

The question naturally presents itself whether the economic recovery which the President has in mind can be expedited better by Congress being in session or by Congress taking the usual adjournment which comes between sessions of Congress in the odd-numbered years.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

I shall now take up some legislative proposals that have been suggested that this Congress should pass as the price of avoiding an extra session of Congress. The threat has been made that unless these proposals are enacted into law that an extra session will be forced. Of course, the only place where an extra session of Congress can be forced is in the Senate, where the Senate rules make it possible for a minority to filibuster against appropriation bills the enactment of which is necessary for the Government to function. None of the proposals which have been put forth go to the substance of things. None of them go to the foundation of our economic ills. I shall now consider these legislative proposals.

First. Lame-duck amendment: I was one of the first Members of the House to introduce a resolution following the World War to do away with the so-called lame-duck sessions of Congress. I supported the resolution that was before the House during the last Congress. That resolution was thoroughly and ably discussed in the House. It failed to get the necessary two-thirds vote. I am ready to support such a resolution again if it is in proper form. Amending the Constitution in the way suggested, however, would not solve or help to solve our economic difficulties. Our present system has not caused any particular hardships or wrongs to the people. To amend the Constitution in the form proposed I do not think will hasten the days of economic reform and economic justice. I have favored the resolution for the reason that in my opinion to permit the newly elected Members of Congress to meet and to take charge of the enactment of legislation at an earlier date is more in line with the principles of political science. I shall not discuss this proposal further at this time, because I hope at an early date to get time to discuss Constitution amending, and at that time shall give consideration to the particular form of the proposed amendment to do away with our short sessions of Congress.

Second. Anti-injunction bill. This is another bill that is urged as the price of avoiding an extra session of Congress. My view is that the powers of the Federal courts in issuing injunctions in labor disputes should be redefined and curtailed. Occasionally a Federal court does issue unconscionable injunctions against laborers. I do not know that there is any possibility of considering this bill at this session. A bill on the subject was adversely reported in the Senate and the House Judiciary Committee has not yet reported on the bill. Both political parties in their national platforms in 1928 went on record favoring the curbing of the powers of the Federal courts in this regard. I think it is the duty of the House Judiciary Committee to give this matter consideration and to report out some kind of a bill during this session of Congress.

Third. The so-called Wagner bills. Gentlemen occasionally get up on the floor of this House and speak as though nothing has been done in the consideration of these bills. The bill providing for getting statistics on unemployment was passed at the last session of Congress. The Labor Department now has an appropriation to carry out the purposes of this law. The advance planning bill has passed both the Senate and the House, and is probably at this moment on its way to the White House. The advance planning bill, if enacted into law, is not going to affect our present economic situation. The revolving fund provided for in this bill is \$150,000,000. Already upon the recommendation of the President for this year Congress has authorized the expenditure of \$750,000,000 for public works of different kinds. That is about \$500,000,000 more than we have been spending in normal years. On account of the existing emergency and because of the prompt action of the President as soon as the country was involved in the economic depression, we are doing a great deal more this year than we could do under this advanced planning bill.

The other Wagner bill is for the coordination of the State employment bureaus. This bill has passed the Senate, has been reported out by the House Judiciary Committee, and is now on the Union Calendar awaiting the action of this House. I have favored all three of these bills.

Fourth. The fourth proposal is the Muscle Shoals bill, which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] has again referred to. That is in conference. A month or so ago gentlemen from the South were demanding that the House conferees sign a conference report of disagreement so the matter could come before the House for action. A week or two ago the House conferees unanimously agreed to report a disagreement. The reason why this proposal has not been before the House on disagreement is because the Senate conferees refused to join the House conferees in reporting a disagreement. Personally, I am very anxious that this Muscle Shoals controversy should be disposed of, but it

should be disposed of in a manner that will preserve the rights of the Government to explosives in time of war and the rights of farmers to fertilizers in time of peace. The surplus electric power should be sold by the Government, but certainly no thoughtful Member of this House wants to put the Government in the business of distributing electric power.

Fifth. The farm debenture plan. I discussed this proposal at some length before the House on April 30 last. I shall not undertake at this time to go into the merits or demerits of this proposal. The plan that was before the House was indefensible from the standpoint of the farmers. However, my view or the individual views of Members of the House or Senate are not of controlling importance at this time. The question now is: Do the farmers want Congress at this session or at an extra session of Congress to enact an export debenture law? The leaders of the various farm organizations met the latter part of last November with the Senate Agricultural Committee, of which Senator McNARY is chairman.

The farm leaders all agreed that they wanted to give the farm marketing act a further trial. They did not want any interference with the operations of the Federal Farm Board. They wanted this law to be given further trial until at least in December, 1931. They were not asking for any equalization fee or debenture legislation or anything else along that line.

Mr. Taber, the president of the National Grange, whose organization has sponsored the export-debenture plan, when asked by the press the attitude of the Grange on the debenture, stated that he was still for the debenture, but that he realized that it was impossible to get the debenture through the short session of Congress, and that an extra session of Congress would cost more than the debenture was worth.

This attitude of the leaders of the farm organizations ought to have weight with the thinking Members of Congress.

Sixth. Appropriations for food: At this time I have no intention to get into the controversy now raging between the White House and Capitol Hill on this subject. This proposal ought to be faced calmly, judicially, and dispassionately. Everyone knows that the President of the United States has had more experience in relieving human hunger and suffering than any other man in the history of mankind. His plan of relieving human hunger and distress in the drought-stricken States of the United States is through the American Red Cross. The Red Cross is the only organization now in existence that has made and can make a survey of the situation in the drought-stricken areas. No committee of Congress has undertaken to make such a survey. The President and the Red Cross are agreed as to the method that should be pursued to relieve the men, women, and children in the drought-stricken areas of the country.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Not now. I do not want to be discourteous, but I would like to finish my statement. The Red Cross officials say they have funds on hand to relieve all the hunger and distress in the drought-stricken regions of the United States. They are undertaking to raise more funds. They have a trust fund of between forty and fifty million dollars, which they do not want to use in case they can raise the additional necessary funds. But, if necessary, every cent of that money in the trust fund is pledged to carry out the task they have undertaken.

I do not want to be understood as criticizing Members of Congress who have taken the attitude of opposition to the President and the Red Cross. I am willing to concede that the desire of such Members to relieve human suffering is just as great as the desire of the President to do so.

The attempts of Members to give the impression to the country that their hearts beat more in sympathy with human suffering than does the heart of the President, of course, will be futile. The country knows the President's knowledge of and his experience in relieving human hunger and suffering, not only in this country but also in other

countries. The people of the country know that the President's knowledge and experience along this line is many times greater than the combined knowledge and experience of all the Members of Congress. The people of the country have absolute confidence that the President and the Red Cross intend to and will take care of every case of suffering in the drought-stricken areas. The people know that the President and the Red Cross, together with the local committees in the cities where unemployment prevails, will take care of the situation and that we will pass through this distressful winter with a minimum of human suffering and human hunger.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. The President appointed various commissions or committees all over the several drought-stricken States, and those committees reported to him in October or November. Does the gentleman think the President accepted the reports of these commissions he appointed?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I do not know the contents of those reports, but I do know that the Red Cross, together with other agencies under Mr. Woods, have made surveys, and undoubtedly those surveys have been submitted to the President and the President is acting on them.

In the field of human relief the President stands out preeminently above not only any person in the United States but above any person in the world, and naturally I have a great deal of respect for and confidence in the President's judgment in matters of that kind. I believe most Members of Congress feel the same as I do on this subject.

Mr. McKEOWN. The gentleman knows that the President has just issued a statement to the press in connection with that matter?

Mr. RAMSEYER. No; I do not know that.

Mr. McKEOWN. He just issued a statement giving his position.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I have not seen the statement and therefore could not intelligently discuss the contents of the statement with the gentleman. If the gentleman will kindly excuse me, I will now undertake to make some observations in regard to the rules of the House.

CHANGES IN HOUSE RULES

I shall now make some observations on the rules of the House. For four years I was a member of the Rules Committee. Under the Republican conference rules when I became a member of the Ways and Means Committee I had to resign from the Committee on Rules. A majority of the House of Representatives of course has the right to adopt any rules governing the proceedings of this body. It is quite generally conceded that in the first session of the next Congress, after the Speaker is elected and the organization of the House completed, full opportunity will be afforded to all Members of the House to present amendments or changes to the existing rules of the House. My advice to those who favor changes in the rules of the House is to first familiarize themselves with the existing rules, study the history of the rules, the reasons for the different rules, then be sure that the changes proposed will expedite orderly legislation and not retard it.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] has proposed a few changes in the rules which he thinks are of great importance. He just got through presenting another argument in support of his position. In the speech he just made he insists, as he has in other speeches, that he is always fair, but to be frank I must state that I do not think that those who listen to him always get that impression. Before I go farther I want it to be clearly understood that there are places, in my judgment, where the rules of the House should be changed. The rule that has been most in controversy during the last 20 years is the rule empowering the House to discharge a committee from further consideration of a bill and thereby force the bill out of the hands of the committee into the House for consideration. Such a rule was first adopted by the Democrats in 1911.

That rule never did work and according to the opinion of some was probably so drawn that it would not work. This

rule continued a part of the rules of the House until 1924, when a more liberal discharge rule was adopted. When this matter was up for consideration before the House of Representatives in January, 1924, I presented a rule to discharge committees which I regarded as the most liberal discharge rule ever offered. The conservatives of the House on both sides were opposed to it because it would work. The radicals on both sides were opposed to it either because they were committed to their own particular plan or because they did not comprehend the liberality of my proposal.

You can find the rule that I proposed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 18, 1924, page 1122. Following my proposal is the debate that followed the presentation of my amendment to the rules.

The gentleman from Georgia in presenting the two changes to the rules makes a scathing denunciation of all the rules of the House. In reading his radio speech, which was printed in the RECORD of Monday, January 26, one gets the impression, and I am sure the people who heard him over the radio got the impression, that the iniquity of the present rules of the House, from the standpoint of the gentleman from Georgia, is something of recent origin. The denunciation is not against a few rules that need amendment but against the "present gag system," thereby denouncing the whole system of rules. At another place he condemns all the rules of the House by referring to them as "our archaic rules." When he is pinned down he admits that there are only a few rules in his opinion that need changes, and that if his two suggested changes were adopted the whole system of rules would be transformed from archaic to modern. But that is not what he conveyed to his radio audience.

Permit me to state that after considerable study of the history of the procedure and rules of the House and being familiar with the rules that were in force when the Democrats were in power and the rules that have been in operation since the Republicans have been in power, that the rules of the House to-day are more liberal than they were during the eight years of Democratic control, from 1911 to 1919. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Georgia called attention to a colloquy between Mr. CAMPBELL, chairman of the Rules Committee in 1922, and other Members of the House concerning the practice of the chairman of the Rules Committee carrying rules in his pocket and refusing to present them to the House. During the four years I was in the House of Representatives when the Democrats were in control, the chairman of the Rules Committee could do and did do frequently that very thing. When the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] became chairman of the Rules Committee, one of the first reforms he inaugurated was to do away with the pocketing of the rules by the chairman of the Rules Committee. Under the present rules, a rule reported out by the Rules Committee must go on the House Calendar and can not be called up the same day it is reported except under suspension of the rules. Furthermore, the rules of the House were further amended and liberalized so that if the chairman of the Rules Committee fails to call up the rule on the House Calendar within a reasonable time, the majority of the Rules Committee can direct another member of the Rules Committee to call up such a rule. All of this liberalization was brought about by the Republicans since they came into power. Placing a reported rule on the House Calendar before it can be called up gives all Members of the House an opportunity to become familiar with the rule before it is called up for consideration. Certainly these changes governing the Rules Committee are a great improvement and advance over the system which was in vogue when the House was in the control of the Democratic Party.

I do not know of a single rule that we operate under now that is less liberal than when the Democrats were in control. The rule for consent Mondays, the Calendar Wednesday rule, and the rule taking from the Speaker the power to appoint committees and to be chairman of the Rules Committee were all adopted before the Democrats came into power in the spring of 1911.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I yield.

Mr. CRISP. I am sure the gentleman wants to be correct. The first time this House ever elected the committees and the committees were not appointed by the Speaker was when Mr. Clark was Speaker and the Democrats in power.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman knows that it was in March, 1910, that the fight was made by Mr. NORRIS, of Nebraska, to change the rules so as to deprive the Speaker of the power to appoint the committees of the House and to be chairman of the Rules Committee. Why does the gentleman want to give the impression that that rule was changed after the Democrats came into power, and no one could draw any other inference from the statement the gentleman just made?

Mr. CRISP. I repeat that the first time the House ever elected its committees was under the Clark administration.

Mr. RAMSEYER. But it was under a rule adopted under a Republican administration.

Mr. CRISP. Oh, my friend forgets that the Constitution of the United States says that each Congress shall adopt its own rules, and the Democrats in that Congress adopted their rules, and that was the first time committees were ever elected in that way.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes; that is one time the Democrats showed some sense in following the Republicans in adopting the Republican rules of a previous Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. May I ask the gentleman another question? I do not want to inconvenience the gentleman.

Mr. RAMSEYER. If it is on the point I am discussing, I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. CRISP. It is right on the point the gentleman is discussing. The gentleman said the rules are more liberal now than they were when the Democrats were in power.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I stated that I did not know of a rule that we have now that is less liberal than it was when the Democrats were in power. But go ahead; I probably stated it both ways.

Mr. CRISP. I may have misunderstood the gentleman, but I thought he said they are more liberal now. There are two changes only, and one is that a bill on the Consent Calendar requires three objections when it is called the second time, and the other is the rule requiring reports of the Committee on Rules to go on the calendar. Can my friend name a single other change?

Mr. RAMSEYER. That was accomplished in six years. Can my friend from Georgia point out like progress that the Democrats made in the eight years they were in power? [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. I can.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman can not. I know what the rules of the House were when I first came here as a Member and what they are now. Let us be fair about it.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] made a speech over the radio on Saturday night a week ago, and I presume he intended to be fair. I read that speech Tuesday morning after it was printed in the RECORD. I want to be fair with the gentleman from Georgia, but I also want to be frank with Members of the House. After reading that speech carefully I came to the conclusion that the speech was unfair and inaccurate throughout.

I am going to read one of the least offending of his statements which is in the third from the last paragraph:

"Under the present code of rules"—mind you, code of rules. That means all the rules, not two or three. There are 43 House rules and the forty-third rule says:

The rules of parliamentary practice comprised in Jefferson's Manual shall govern the House in all cases to which they are applicable, and in which they are not inconsistent with the standing rules and orders of the House and joint rules of the Senate and House of Representatives.

There are 53 sections in Jefferson's Manual and most sections have a number of paragraphs.

Now, the fair thing to do when you indict the rules of the House, if you do not mean to change every rule of the House, is to go through them and point out which ones of the 43 rules of the House should be changed and which ones

of the 53 sections of Jefferson's Manual should be changed. It is not fair to get up here, or before a microphone, and speak of a gag system and the archaic rules of the House if you can only find fault with two or three rules. The only inference that people over the radio, who do not understand the rules of the House, can possibly get from the gentleman's radio speech is that every rule from the first to the last should be condemned. If you want to be fair, why not state that rule so-and-so should be changed and that the rule for the discharge of committees should be changed, but the other rules, on the whole, have worked well and are good, and that you are not seeking any change in them, and that, in fact, they are rules that both Democrats and Republicans have worked under, and no considerable number on either side is seeking any change in them.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes; certainly.

Mr. CRISP. I stated expressly in that radio speech, in the last paragraph, that I thought the rules of the House as a whole were good, that they had to be construed as a whole, and if there were any weakness in them the whole code fell. I said in that address that with the changes I proposed, and there were only three or four that I discussed, I thought it would be a good code of rules for the House. This statement is in that radio address.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman at the end of his speech does make a guarded statement on that, but all the way through his speech he condemned the system—all the rules—so that people listening could not get any other impression than that the rules of the House from beginning to end were bad and designed to block legislation. [Applause.]

I started to read:

Under our present code of rules—

Code of rules, mind you—

Under our present code of rules the Rules Committee is in supreme control, the dictator as to what measures the House shall be permitted to consider.

Now, if that is a correct and true statement, then you could not get anything through the House unless the Rules Committee first gave its consent. I called up the Clerk of the House on Tuesday morning, which was the same morning I read this speech, and I asked him how many public bills and resolutions had passed this Congress.

Here they are. Public laws, 546; public resolutions, 106; private laws and resolutions, 281; making a total of 927. It is not disputed that the Rules Committee in all this time only reported out 22 rules to aid legislation. So you subtract 22 from the number I gave you and you will see that all the rest, the great mass of legislation, passed this House under the general rules of the House without the aid or advice or consent of the Rules Committee. I repeat, the speech throughout is unfair and inaccurate.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia—mind you, he is talking to a radio audience, and not one in a thousand listening knows anything about the rules of the House of Representatives—he starts that speech by saying, "Under our archaic rules the House ceases to be a legislative body."

When, I ask him, was the House a representative body, if we now have rules at least as liberal as we ever had in the history of the country?

Archaic means ancient. In the sense of being ancient the Ten Commandments are archaic and so the Constitution of the United States is more ancient than the rules of the House. Archaic may also mean antiquated or obsolescent. Now, if the gentleman had said obsolescent or antiquated, then he would have probably said what he wanted the country to understand him to say about the House rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HOLADAY. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman from Georgia states the House no longer represents the people back home. I have already demonstrated that the present House rules are more liberal than any rules the House has ever had. Now, understand me, that does not argue that the House rules can not

be improved or should not be improved. In my opinion they can and should be improved. Because the House rules can and should be improved in a few respects does not justify any gentleman in making a sweeping denunciation of all the rules. There are no rules governing any legislative body or any deliberative body that do not limit the freedom of Members to offer amendments and talk as and when they please. Rules are adopted to preserve the rights equally of all Members and to carry forward the purposes of the legislative organization. The purpose of a legislative assembly is legislation for the welfare of the people. Is there any Member of the House who wants to abolish the 5-minute rule in the Committee of the Whole, the hour rule of debate in the House, the rule for the suspension of rules, the rule for the previous question, the rule of germaneness in offering amendments, and other rules that are familiar to the Members? All these rules limit the freedom of Members. All these rules could be denounced as gag rules. In considering changes in the rules of the House, Members should be governed by this wise saying of Holy Writ: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

I wish I had time to go through the whole radio speech of the gentleman from Georgia and point out its many inconsistencies, inaccuracies, and its unfairness. He denounces the Speaker, the floor leader, and the chairman of the Rules Committee. But I do not care to give heed to what he says about these gentlemen.

He refers in his speech to the passage of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill. In my speech of March 24, 1930, on the politics of tariff making, I pointed out the shortcomings of the practices of both political parties in framing and passing tariff bills. I gave the facts. I did not condemn the Democratic practice and by inference try to convey to the country that the Republican practice was perfect. The practice of neither party in considering and passing tariff legislation has anything on the other. The gentleman from Georgia refers to the fact that on the conference report of the last tariff bill the House was limited to votes on seven amendments. I assert that when the conference report on the Underwood tariff bill was before the House of Representatives the membership of this House then did not have a separate vote on any amendment.

Mr. CRISP. When we considered the Underwood bill the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Mann, offered 140 amendments to that bill.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Gentlemen, listen. The gentleman from Georgia was present when I delivered my speech on the politics of tariff making and heard me say, and everybody here knows, that the Democratic Party caucus on the Underwood tariff bill had bound every Democratic Representative to vote against every amendment offered from the Republican side, whether it was a good amendment or not.

Now, everybody knows when the last tariff bill was up it was considered under a rule limiting the offering of amendments to the Committee on Ways and Means. Now, frankly, I think that limits the Members too much. That method, however, had the approval of the Republicans of the House, with few exceptions. The Democratic method permitted Republicans more freedom in offering amendments but absolutely bound Democrats to vote against such amendments, whether right or wrong. I think that the Democratic practice is more unconscionable and more to be condemned and less frank and open than the practice of the Republicans. [Applause.]

The gentleman in his radio speech and other speeches that he has made on the subject seems to be unconscious that he or his party have now or ever have had any shortcomings. In his radio speech, in his speech here to-day, and in the inquiries he has addressed to me the only inference you can get from those inquiries and his speeches is that the Democratic Party never committed a wrong.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Of course, I admit that the Democrats have made mistakes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. This is the first time I ever heard the gentleman admit it.

Mr. CRISP. Then the gentleman did not want to hear it. I said I favor this rule whether my party does or not. Answering the gentleman's suggestion about the caucus of my party, I have no objection to a party in conference or caucus agreeing to stand to a certain position and presenting its position to the country and letting the country pass upon it, weigh it, and if it does not approve it, condemn it. The minority does have the right and should have the right to offer amendments and present its case to the country; and under the Democratic consideration of the Underwood tariff bill that right was given the minority.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes; and that was a farce, and the gentleman knows it; and while the method that we Republicans pursued may not be entitled to a great deal of praise, at least it was not farcical and hypocritical.

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

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. In other words, the Democratic system is to have a secret caucus and to proceed in a secret way, while the Republicans act in the open.

Mr. RAMSEYER. That is another way to put it. And so all the way through. No one can read this radio speech without reluctantly coming to the conclusion that it is saturated from beginning to end with partisan bias. Remember, I am not against changes of the rules, but I do object to a gentleman getting up here day after day and getting out on the radio and conveying the impression to the country that he is the simon-pure representative of an absolutely simon-pure party, while the other fellows are responsible for all legislative shortcomings. That is the conclusion that it was intended to convey to the radio listeners who are unfamiliar with the rules of the House.

Let us get now to this discharge rule. Of course, the Democratic discharge rule, and I think the gentleman from Georgia has already admitted that, was the only innovation that the Democrats made to the rules when they came into power in 1911. I think they did change the Calendar Wednesday rule a little bit.

Mr. CRISP. And, if the gentleman will permit, I am not sure about this, but I think they established the Consent Calendar, to take away from the Speaker the right to exercise his discretion in recognizing for unanimous consent, but I am not sure about that.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I am sure about that, and the gentleman is wrong. Consent Calendar and Calendar Wednesday were recognized and established by change in the rules in 1909. He admits that when the Democrats came into power they found such perfect Republican rules that they could only change them in one little detail, by a minor amendment to the Calendar Wednesday rule, and they added a discharge rule that never worked and never was intended to work, and at a time when the gentleman from Georgia was the parliamentary clerk of the House. Is it not a proper inference that he himself wrote the rule, and that he himself knew exactly what he was doing when he wrote the rule, and that he knew that it would never operate?

Mr. CRISP. May I just answer that and say that I had nothing to do with the preparation of the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes additional.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Then the gentleman from Georgia was not shown as much confidence and courtesy as we show our present parliamentary clerk, because I know we would not attempt an important change in the rules without consulting our present parliamentary clerk. When the Republicans came into power in 1919 they held onto the discharge rule of the Democrats—this iniquitous rule that would not work.

In 1923, in December, we decided to liberalize the discharge rule, and we debated for a week upon the question in January, 1924. Remember, we had about the same rules then as we have now. The rules were thrown wide open for amend-

ment. The practice is—and this practice prevailed in the last 20 years save once under the Republicans in December, 1923—for the chairman of the Committee on Rules at the beginning of a new Congress to get up and move that the rules of the last Congress be made the rules of the coming Congress, and then the previous question is moved. That is exactly what the Democrats did each time they were in power. The Democrats carried the previous question and put over the rules. The Republicans have done exactly the same thing when they have been in power, except in 1923, when it was agreed after the organization was perfected that time should be given later to a consideration of amendments to the rules. I think we adopted the rules temporarily, and then in January, 1924, the rules were thrown open for amendment, and we debated the matter here for a number of days. The only thing that came out of that was a new discharge rule. It was only put into operation once, and that was on the Howell-Barkley bill, during the short session of Congress. Let me call to your attention a little of the history of the Howell-Barkley bill controversy. The railroad labor men came to Washington at the beginning of that short session of Congress. That bill was introduced and referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The committee was busy with the consideration of other bills and did not get around to considering the Howell-Barkley bill. This new discharge rule was invoked. The bill was called from the committee. The gentleman from Georgia says that you could not get 100 men to sign a petition until the committee was given an opportunity to consider it. I think I am correct when I state that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee did not have time to consider the Howell-Barkley bill when a petition to discharge the committee was signed by 150 Members of the House. The motion to discharge the committee was considered for several Mondays and by vote of the House the committee was finally discharged but no further action was taken thereon. Now, then, what happened? In the next Congress the railroad employees and the railroad managers got together and agreed on a bill. That bill passed the House and Senate almost unanimously and was signed by the President. That bill was satisfactory all around to the employees, to the managers, and to the public. The blocking of the Howell-Barkley bill at the short session of Congress gave opportunity for full consideration of the proposal and time to permit the two groups, the employees on the one hand and the managers on the other, to get together and agree on legislation that was of mutual interest and benefit to both sides.

Mr. Richberg, an attorney of Chicago, representing the labor men, sat down with the men, the managers, and the committee, and probably had more to do with writing or rewriting that bill than any other one person. Mr. Winslow, the chairman of the committee, who fought the move to discharge his committee from consideration of the bill, is now chairman of the Mediation Board and giving all-around satisfaction as a member of that board to railway employees, railway managers, and the public. The way this whole dispute was finally settled with satisfaction to all justified the fight made at the time against discharging the committee from further consideration of the bill.

It frequently is the part of wisdom when new and unconsidered legislation is urged, to stop, look, and listen, rather than to rush in and accept ill-considered legislation that has not been fully and carefully gone over and considered by the groups vitally interested therein and by the public, which has concern in all legislation.

Now, before I close, I want to admonish all Members of the House to familiarize themselves with the rules of the House; to get at the reasons for the rules and how the rules were evolved. If after becoming familiar with them you are convinced that changes should be made therein, then at the next session of Congress feel perfectly free to offer your amendments and suggestions. I am sure that every Member of the House will be glad to listen to what you have to offer.

Remember this, that the rules of the House are a means to an end. The rules furnish an orderly means to bring

about necessary and just legislation. The rules of the House are the vehicle on which to carry legislative proposals for careful consideration through committees and through the House.

Another way to judge the rules of the House is to look back over a period of, let us say 10 years, and count the worth-while legislative proposals that were unduly retarded or blocked either under the general rules of the House or by action or nonaction of the Committee on Rules. Since the World War what legislative proposals sponsored by the farm organizations of the country failed to get consideration in the House of Representatives? What legislative proposals sponsored by the labor organizations of the country failed to get consideration in the House of Representatives? The same question can be asked of legislative proposals sponsored by the veterans' organizations. If you are uncertain as to the answers, then consult members of committees who have in charge the consideration of legislative proposals affecting farmers, laborers, and veterans. I know during the four years I was a member of the Rules Committee every request for a special rule by the committees of the House was always given careful and sympathetic consideration by the Rules Committee. Undoubtedly that is still the practice of the Rules Committee.

More important than suggestions for amendments to the rules of the House are remedies to apply to the economic and social conditions of the country. It is more important that you study out remedies for the economic ills of the country than it is that you bring about some changes in the rules of the procedure in the House of Representatives. It is better to consider legislation a year longer and get good legislation than it is to get hasty legislation that may turn out to be bad legislation.

As an aid to the newer Members to get an understanding of the history and procedure of the House of Representatives, and which will give you a better understanding of the reasons underlying the present rules of the House, I am going to recommend to you a book entitled "History and Procedure of the House of Representatives," by De Alva Stanwood Alexander. This book came out in 1916. The author had been a former Member of the House of Representatives. I read this book soon after it came off the press. It gave me a better understanding of the procedure and rules of the House. This book can be gotten from the Library of Congress.

I do not want to dampen any Member's enthusiasm to bring about changes in the rules. I merely am attempting to caution you to study the rules, so you will clearly understand the effect of the changes that you or some other Member may propose. After you have studied the rules and formed a mature judgment as to what changes you want, then it is not only your right but your duty to get up on the floor of this House and advocate your proposals with intelligence and courage.

Of course, I do not object to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] advocating his changes. He has a perfect right to do so. The fault I find with the gentleman from Georgia is that, in my way of looking at it, he does not present the situation that confronts this House fairly. That radio speech of his—and I am not charging any deliberate intent to do so, but I think that the inference which the people of the country naturally get from that radio speech is that all the rules of the House, including Jefferson's Manual, should be consigned to the scrap heap.

I do not believe that there is a single Member of this House who will study the rules and study them carefully and understandingly but what will come to the conclusion that there are only a very few places in the 43 rules of the House and the 53 sections of Jefferson's Manual that should be changed in the next Congress. In the next Congress you will have the opportunity to propose amendments and a majority of the House, irrespective of party, is going to determine what each one of the rules shall be. I do not know of a single Member of the House who is not reconciled to the idea that those who want changes in the rules of the

House shall have every possible opportunity, after the election of the Speaker and before the House begins seriously to transact business, to offer amendments to any rule of the House, including the rules of Jefferson's Manual. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] has expired.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit for printing in the RECORD, first, the entire paragraph from the History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850, by J. F. Rhodes, volume 5, pages 137-138, from which I quoted two sentences in my speech, as follows:

Friday, April 14, Lincoln held his last Cabinet meeting. General Grant was present and said that he was anxious in his continual expectation of hearing from Sherman. The President replied, "I have no doubt that favorable news will soon come, for I had last night my usual dream which has preceded nearly every important event of the war. I seemed to be in a singular and indescribable vessel, but always the same, and to be moving with great rapidity toward a dark and indefinite shore." Matters of routine were disposed of and then the subject of reconstruction was taken up. After some discussion the President said, "I think it providential that this great rebellion is crushed just as Congress has adjourned, and there are none of the disturbing elements of that body to hinder and embarrass us. If we are wise and discreet, we shall reanimate the States and get their governments in successful operation, with order prevailing and the Union reestablished before Congress comes together in December. * * * I hope there will be no persecution, no bloody work after the war is over. No one need expect me to take any part in hanging or killing those men, even the worst of them. Frighten them out of the country, open the gates, let down the bars, scare them off [throwing up his hands as if scaring sheep]. Enough lives have been sacrificed. We must extinguish our resentments if we expect harmony and union. There is too much of a desire on the part of some of our very good friends to be masters, to interfere with and dictate to those States, to treat the people not as fellow citizens; there is too little respect for their rights. I do not sympathize in these feelings." He then spoke of the Louisiana government, joined in the discussion regarding the status of Virginia, and said at the close of the meeting: Reconstruction "is the great question pending, and we must now begin to act in the interest of peace." Stanton gave two accounts of this council. "At a Cabinet meeting yesterday," he wrote at half past 1 in the morning of April 15, "the President was very cheerful and hopeful; spoke very kindly of General Lee and others of the Confederacy and the establishment of government in Virginia." At 11.40 the same morning he said in a letter to Adams: "The President was more cheerful and happy than I had ever seen [him], rejoiced at the near prospect of firm and durable peace at home and abroad, manifested in marked degree the kindness and humanity of his disposition and the tender and forgiving spirit that so eminently distinguished him."

Second, the entire article from the American Farm Bureau weekly news letter headed "Extra Session Not Seen Necessary for Farmers," as follows:

EXTRA SESSION NOT SEEN NECESSARY FOR FARMERS

Farmers are not expecting an extra session to be necessary following March 4, 1931. Much of the legislation in which they are interested at Washington classifies as unfinished business, and if in the ensuing two months Congress works with that speed which may be expected of it and which it usually manifests, they will have secured the final enactment of all, or at least most, of the bills in which agriculture is interested.

Unfinished business at Washington upon which the American Farm Bureau Federation is working consists of the following projects, all of which in some form or another have been before Congress long enough to permit expeditious handling this winter without being accused of enacting legislation carelessly.

1. Regulation of grain exchanges by amending the grain futures act, as proposed in the Capper-Dickinson measure. This bill seeks to give the Secretary more power over the rules and regulations of the exchanges; to limit short selling; and to license members of exchanges. These features might well be made applicable over cotton exchanges also. This subject has been before Congress in one form or another for years and should be finished before March 4.

2. The crop insurance bill, McNary-Hope, to investigate all phases of crop insurance, having passed the Senate can easily pass the House this winter.

3. The establishment of engineering experiment stations in connection with our State land-grant institutions in a way similar to that under which the agricultural experiment stations were set up years ago, as provided in the McNary-Haugen measure, can be disposed of this winter since it has already been reported to the House.

4. More funds for agricultural extension work, both of the emergency and of the regular classifications, as contained in the

Robinson-Garber bills for emergency and the Capper-Ketcham bills for permanent funds, should be disposed of. This work needs to be planned in counties in periods of from three to five years into the future rather than from hand to mouth methods as is now too much the case. Hence the need for more funds.

5. Farm wastes and industrial outlets for farm crops being a major resolution of the last annual meeting of the A. F. B. F. We are justified in expecting the farm waste research laboratory bill of Congressman DICKINSON to be enacted into law this winter. We must find more ways of getting rid of farm crops than feeding them merely to the animal and human stomachs.

6. Elimination of the six months' maturity minimum on farm loans and limiting assessments on farm land banks by the Federal Farm Loan Board to those amounts needed only to cover expense of examination, both having passed the Senate and reported to the House, can be rushed to final passage during the winter weeks.

7. The Farm Bureau having stood for years for the establishment of grades and standards for all farm crops, and the Department of Agriculture with the support of Congress having authorized by legislation such grades and standards, altogether constitute a force which indicates that the bill of Congressman JONES to establish grades and standards for cottonseed will be enacted this winter.

8. Owing to the rapid formulation of a national forestry program, it seems logical to expect that such a measure as that by Congressman ENGLEBRIGHT, to protect more adequately our forests from fires by building forest roads and trails, will be enacted this winter.

9. The Farm Bureau's first pronouncement in favor of eliminating the so-called lame-duck session was made perhaps six years ago. That position has not been changed, so we shall continue our endeavors to have passed the Norris resolution or any other appropriate legislation which seeks to change the Constitution by setting a different date for the inauguration of the President and the convening of Congress.

10. The bill by Senator JONES, authorizing Federal aid to assist States in promoting education relative to the welfare of mothers and infants, having already been reported to the Senate, and being under privileged status on the Senate Calendar, justifies the expectation that it will be enacted into law before the short session adjourns on March 4.

11. Now that the Farm Bureau has authorized its board of directors to set up a committee truly representative of agriculture, authorized to develop and organize a corporation for the purpose of leasing and operating Muscle Shoals on a cooperative basis, the pending Muscle Shoals legislation is expected to resolve itself by compromise into such form as will permit the Farm Bureau to submit its proposal to some sort of commission set up to receive new bids. If the present situation on Capitol Hill results in disagreement, then, of course, the only alternative left is for the Farm Bureau to present its plan in a new and separate bill. It is hoped that the pending House and Senate bills can be merged so that the Farm Bureau can present its plan under the terms of the compromise measure.

12. The Hawes-Cutting bill, providing for Philippine independence after an election has been held upon that subject by the qualified electors of the island, and providing also that by gradual processes throughout a 5 or a 10 year period the political bonds which bind the islands to our Nation will be gradually removed, having been reported to the Senate from the appropriate committee, is expected to move forward this winter. In each of the last two annual meetings the Farm Bureau has stated its position to be in favor of Philippine independence, not alone for the good of the American farmers but more for the good of the Philippine people themselves.

13. The plan of eradicating or controlling predatory animals and rodents, as outlined in the 10-year program of the United States Department of Agriculture and as contained in the Norbeck-Leavitt bills, can easily be disposed of this winter.

14. Elementary education being the foundation of our entire educational plans, and local taxation having been discovered to be inadequate properly to sustain the type of elementary education needed, makes opportune the authorization by the Federal Government of an appropriation to assist the States in the maintenance of elementary schools. This project is contained in the Nye-Brand bills.

15. The name "Farm Bureau" having become nation-wide and of commercial significance, should be along with other organization names permitted to be protected as proposed in the Vestal bill which has already passed the House and can easily be passed by the Senate before the March adjournment.

16. The bill by Senator GLENN, as amended by the House Committee on Irrigation, to permit refinancing of drainage and irrigation districts under more equitable and modern conditions, having passed the Senate in one form and having been reported from the House committee in a slightly different form, under all reasonable expectations can be disposed of by the House, and through the conference committee, before final adjournment.

None of these bills will bring in the agricultural millennium as each one is more of a minor than a major legislation project. However, altogether they constitute a rather large legislative program which when enacted will be beneficial to agriculture.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the floor of the House to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made and to include the printing of some reference that I read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PARKS].

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, for more than an hour we have patiently listened to a very learned discussion of the rules of this House. I confess to you that in 16 years of service in legislative bodies I come here now and say that I know very little parliamentary law. But a long time ago, at the bended knee of a Christian mother I learned a law that if it were practiced here day by day would make unnecessary a discussion of the rules of this House. That was that beautiful golden rule, "Do unto others; do unto others."

I come now not in anger but in great sadness, and approach you to-day as humble as one man ever approached another. I come to talk about a matter of importance. Deeply I regret that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], after 18 years of service, should have shown the spirit he showed to-day. After deliberation and thought he will regret what he said. It is to be regretted that the gentleman from Massachusetts, one of the leaders of this House, who stands high in the councils of his party, would have so forgotten himself as to say what he said to me.

May I come to you to talk as one man to another; as one neighbor to another? The men who sit on the Republican side of the aisle do not know what is going on in this country.

You men who sit over there have no harder hearts than the men who sit about me, but you do not know. If you gentlemen understood the facts as I know them you would want to give relief to people who are starving as quickly as I would want to give them relief. May I come to you with a breaking heart and an humble spirit and tell you that by your votes you sent 500,000 people to bed the other night without food, and yet this is a civilized country, this is a Christian Nation, this is a place where we talk about the brotherhood and fellowship of man and the love of God?

I see the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey who everybody respects and regards [Mr. FORT]. He went into my State and plucked one of its choicest flowers and carried away one who was as beautiful, as pure and sweet as a dew-drop in the heart of a June rose, yet by his speech the other day he sent 100,000 babies in Arkansas to bed without food. Not because he did not care, but it was because he did not know. That is why he did it.

Ah, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] delivered a speech here the other day and after he had finished the entire membership on that side of the aisle stood and cheered him, and by that speech he sent many of the babies of my State to hang on famished breasts and slowly die of starvation. What did he do? He said that if the House took the action which I say it should take the greatest mother in all the world would be assassinated, the Red Cross. I deny it. I will tell him that the greatest mother in all the world was the one who went into the "valley of the shadow of death" and suffered the tortures of the damned to give him and me our existence. Yet by his vote he sent thousands of people in my State to bed the other night without food.

Mr. HOLADAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. I yield.

Mr. HOLADAY. I would like to know what, if anything, the State government has done or is proposing to do for the relief of the citizens of Arkansas?

Mr. PARKS. I will be delighted to tell the gentleman. The House of Representatives in the State of Arkansas, which is now in session, has passed a bill to provide for a bond issue of \$15,000,000. It may pass the Senate, but they could not sell the bonds to save their lives. My God, do you think I would stand here and appeal to you for 500,000 people if we could feed them?

Mr. HOLADAY. Does the gentleman apprehend that the Senate will pass the bill?

Mr. PARKS. Probably.

Mr. HOLADAY. But the gentleman is of the opinion that the State bonds will not be marketable?

Mr. PARKS. Oh, no. Your Liberty bonds under this administration have gone down day by day. You can scarcely sell a Government bond at this time. These people are as brave and honorable and chivalrous as any that ever walked the earth. It is not their fault they are starving.

Let me show you another thing. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] came into this House in 1914, in July, after disaster had come to the city of Salem, Mass., and asked for \$200,000 for those people—probably for 50,000 people. Every man save one from my State rose and voted to go into the Public Treasury and give to his people the money which they needed to save them from distress.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Let me state to the gentleman that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] does not speak for the people of Massachusetts. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKS. Ah, if the people of Massachusetts could speak to-day across the hills and hollows, they would say, "We will meet you in a common brotherhood; we will do for you what you did for us." [Applause.] When disaster comes my people know neither East nor West nor South nor North. They would have contempt for me if I did not vote to relieve suffering in New York or Massachusetts as quickly as I would in Arkansas.

Oh, I want to tell the distinguished floor leader, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], who has always been courteous to me, when the war drums throbbed on every hilltop and in every valley in this Nation, when the earth trembled under the marching tread of the men in the blue and the men in the gray, his father and mine donned the same uniform, wore the same color, and marched away to do their bit in the red welter of war, and they came home after the war and were just as loyal to that flag yonder as any man on this earth. Yet he, knowing the desolation and the destitution of my State and my people, made a speech that ought to waken him in the night with remorse.

Oh, men, I wish you could know the story I am telling you. Five hundred thousand noble people destitute and starving! Do you know what the Red Cross is doing? It is giving a family of five people \$10 a month. Oh, I wish I had the power to-day to send out through this land a ringing call that would arouse people. What did your President say an hour ago? "If the Red Cross will acknowledge"—this is not his exact language—"If the Red Cross will admit they can not handle the situation, I will accept your bill."

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Mr. PARKS. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was informed day before yesterday, and I understand this is general throughout various parts of the United States, that my home county of about 30,000 people, had sent 17 carloads of food and clothing into the drought-stricken areas. Is this distribution in excess of or is it included in the total allowance to each family?

Mr. PARKS. Oh, I imagine it is not included in the money.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then it is true that in addition to what the Red Cross is giving in dollars there are great quantities of food and clothing going into that area for the relief of the distressed people?

Mr. PARKS. I have not a bit of doubt of it in the world. Oh, I would hate to think that people, wherever they lived in America, would not hear this call.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand; but what I want to know is this—

Mr. PARKS. I imagine that food is all that is included in the \$10.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then this \$10 they are getting is supplemented by what they are getting from other sources. I

want this information, and I think the House ought to have it.

Mr. PARKS. I think the gentleman is right. I think the contributions of charity are in excess of the \$10; but it fails to meet the real necessities by a great deal.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. I may state that I know in sections of my State the Red Cross will not presume to aid any citizens except those who are without any resources or aid from any other source whatever, and if they can get help from other sources—landlords, relatives, or from the general public or anywhere else—the Red Cross declines to help; and when they do presume to help, when there are no other means available, they get just what the gentleman from Arkansas has said—the pitiable sum of \$10 per month for a family of five, with an allowance to others in proportion.

Mr. SIMMONS. I would really like to get accurate information about this matter.

Mr. PARKS. I am sure the gentleman does not know the conditions, and I am sure from statements that have been made on that side that you do not know what is happening.

Mr. SIMMONS. Just a minute. I would like to see if we understand the matter, because I can not reconcile the gentleman's statement with the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PARKS. I do not think there is any inconsistency in the two statements.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me finish my statement. My understanding from the gentleman's answer is that the contributions of food and clothing that are being made from all over the United States for the drought-stricken areas are in addition to the aid being given by the Red Cross in dollars, to which reference has been made. The answer of the gentleman from Tennessee would indicate that this is not so, and I think we ought to know what is the fact.

Mr. PARKS. I think the gentleman misunderstands me and misunderstands the gentleman from Tennessee. Here is the situation. We can not keep track of the contributions that are made. If you should to-day send a contribution of clothing, like I know individuals have done from this city, nobody can keep track of that, but the average family of five are not drawing in rations from the Red Cross in excess of \$10 a month, and that is the maximum.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. With pleasure.

Mr. BYRNS. It was testified before the committee the other day by Mr. Evans, a representative of the Red Cross, who has been in Arkansas for some time, that the total amount that was given by the Red Cross in the counties to which the gentleman refers is the amount stated by him. Now, this is not given in money.

Mr. PARKS. No.

Mr. BYRNS. It is given in food of a value amounting to the sum stated by the gentleman?

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. And that is all they get from the Red Cross?

Mr. PARKS. Yes. Now, will you gentlemen listen to this statement from the Red Cross? I wired a gentleman in one of the counties, one of the richest and most fertile counties on the face of the earth, the county of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DRIVER], and received this answer from one of the representatives of the Red Cross:

Doctors advise more and greater variety of food is absolutely necessary. The farm relief seed bill is a failure with us. The livestock are starving. Our people favor the Robinson bill for \$25,000,000.

Men who were worth a fortune a year ago are to-day unable to buy the necessities for their families. Milk cows are being killed and eaten, although they are so poor that they are unfit for food. I say this with humiliation.

Here is a letter from a former law partner of mine, R. L. Searcy, a man whom I loved like David loved Jonathan or Damon loved Pythias. He writes that in a town of 1,500 people and in a splendid school to which children came in

from the country, it was discovered some of the children were hiding away at lunch time. That was because they did not have anything for their lunch. The ladies of the town immediately provided these little children with food. The pride and spirit of the children would not allow them to take food as a matter of charity. One little angel said that she did not mind going to bed without any supper as she had had a fine lunch. In business there is competition and strife; in society there is envy and jealousy, but in the realm of childhood there is sincerity and truth.

Mr. GOLDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDER. Would the gentleman be in favor of a bill authorizing the Government to lend without interest a sufficient sum to the various States to be repaid by the States when they could?

Mr. PARKS. They could not pay it.

Mr. GOLDER. Could not they pay it in the next 10 years if they got the money without interest?

Mr. PARKS. Why should the State borrow the money? Here is a list since 1803 where this Congress has relieved the people when starving. My God, why are you not willing to give the starving people this amount?

Mr. GOLDER. Irrespective of my desire, do I understand that the States would not accept a loan from the Government, that loan to be repaid without interest?

Mr. DAVIS. If the gentleman from Arkansas will yield, I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania why this section now sadly stricken should be expected to borrow money when time after time other sections of the country have not been required to borrow money? [Applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Would Congress have the power to lend this money without the legislature having an opportunity to accept it?

Mr. PARKS. No.

Mr. LANHAM. Was there any prerequisite made for the contribution we made to Russia of \$20,000,000?

Mr. PARKS. None whatever.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman from Arkansas will permit I should like to add further, in this connection, that when the present occupant of the White House asked for \$100,000,000 of Congress to feed the people of Belgium there was no serious objection, as I recall, to turning over public funds for the purpose of relieving suffering humanity in foreign lands and no Member of Congress on either side of this aisle, if I remember correctly, ever suggested that Belgium, Russia, or any of the other foreign governments should ever repay it. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKS. Let me read from a celebrated correspondent, Mr. Fletcher Chinault, of the Arkansas Gazette, who is in the center of this distress. He is among them. He hears the cry of the wolf of want at their very door. He says:

It can not be possible for those who live in tall cities—

That does not apply to the gentleman who sits in the Speaker's chair, the gentleman from New York, Mr. LA GUARDIA. He has a heart of gold, even if he lives in the greatest city in the land. I have no prejudice against cities. The people who live in the cities are like those who live in the towns.

When Jesus Christ walked the highways and the lanes of this earth, He never said a word about the salvation of your soul until He first said, "Feed the body." Wherever He went He said, "Feed them." The first miracle He performed was a miracle to nourish the human body. And after He had carried His cross up Calvary's Hill and paid the penalty for mankind, and when He had risen and made His appearance at the seashore, He said to the fishermen who were without food, "Cast your net on the other side," and they did; and then what was it He said when they came and asked Him what shall be done?

When Simon Peter came and talked to Him, what did He say? Did He say seek the salvation of your soul? That was not what He said. No; He said, "Lovest thou Me?" And Simon Peter said, "Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee." "Then, feed My lambs; feed My lambs." Then Simon Peter came back. The Lord looked him in the eyes

and said, "Peter, lovest thou Me?" And he said, "Lord Thou knowest I love Thee." And He said, "Feed My sheep, feed My sheep." O men, with hearts in you, may I appeal to you as Christ appealed to Peter? They are human beings—feed my lambs.

Just one other word, and I am through. I could read you hour after hour the testimony of the starving.

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

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. From what source did the gentleman receive this information as to the destitute conditions in his State?

Mr. PARKS. I received it from the principal citizens whose telegrams I have put in the RECORD; and every morning in my office I receive it in every mail that comes, in heart-breaking letters from individuals who tell me about it; and I receive it from the Red Cross, and from every county in my district, and many other counties throughout the State.

Mr. PALMER. And the statements the gentleman makes are authentic?

Mr. PARKS. Absolutely; and as I stand here in this body and look my colleagues in the face I tell you on my sacred word of honor that there are 500,000 people in a horrible condition of starvation, in spite of what the Red Cross is doing.

Mr. PALMER. In face of the gentleman's statement, I think that we should take some action.

Mr. PARKS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. I apprehend the gentleman probably is to the best of his knowledge making as accurate a statement as he can make with reference to the conditions in his State. I do not question his statement. I simply say this: If you will take \$25,000,000 and spread it over this Nation, to every part where there is a condition equal that there is in Arkansas, how much will there be left of the \$25,000,000 for your 500,000 people?

Mr. PARKS. I would do what we did for Belgium and Russia. I think the gentleman's uneasiness is well founded.

Mr. HUDSON. I come from possibly the greatest industrial district represented on this floor. I have a city of 56,000 population that has spent already out of public sources a million dollars to relieve the conditions the gentleman describes in Arkansas. My own home city of Lansing, not so badly situated, a little larger, has spent over \$100,000, and, sir, I came back from campaigning in the territory adjacent to Arkansas, where the wheat fields showed green, where the garden showed green, where the pastures showed green, back into my home counties, where there had not been a drop of rain since June, and where every field was brown. I say to the gentleman that it is unfair to quote Scripture simply about the gentleman's situation, when that situation exists all over this country. What we need to do to-day is to use that love the gentleman speaks of, of our Blessed Lord and Saviour, to open the bowels of mercy for mankind in this Nation, and there will be all the response that is needed.

Mr. PARKS. That is what I am trying to get you to do.

Mr. HUDSON. No; you are not, you are trying to get the Government to do it.

Mr. PARKS. And still I quote Scripture, "And so far as the sections of the country where he found it had rained and where he found it had not, the Lord said that it rains on the just and the unjust." I say to you that if your people to-day were desolate and mine had prospered for a generation, I would be standing on this floor pleading to help your people, not putting a block in the way. When time is no more, and I stand to be judged with the quick and the dead, I can look my Creator in the face and say that by no word or act of mine did I ever strike the bread from the hand of a starving child. Can you?

One more word and I am through. We went to war in 1917, and I dare say there has not been since Holy Writ was penned a more inspired document than the one that

was delivered here by the man who told this country that America had heard the call of civilization and was endeavoring to see that the torch of liberty should not fall from the hand of man. He could see little things as well as big things. May I tell the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] that when he had his disaster at Salem and when the fire came to devastate your city, you had a real man in the White House. He did not ask you to wait and see what the conditions were, but he wired the Governor of Massachusetts that he would request the Federal Government to give \$200,000 to the fire sufferers of Salem. He is the man whose memory will ever live. He was known by more men than any human being that ever lived on the face of the earth. The Arab in his tented home in the desert bowed down and asked the god that he worshipped to bless the great White Chief in the White House who was fighting the battle of the weak nations.

Yes. Yonder under his thatched roof in the islands of the sea, in the jungles, the savage bowed down at night and prayed to whatever God he worshiped and asked that the great Chieftain of the white man be given strength that the humble of the earth might receive the blessings he fought for. Men who never heard of Napoleon or Julius Caesar or Jesus Christ bowed down at night and asked their God to bless this altruistic, Christian statesman. And yet, men stand on the floor and denounce my people because they are suffering and poor.

Mr. GLOVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. I yield.

Mr. GLOVER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUDSON] made the statement a while ago that in his campaign, around through Arkansas he saw wonderful green wheat fields. Would he do us the kindness to tell us where he saw them in Arkansas?

Mr. HUDSON. I wish the gentleman might hear a Member when he makes a remark. I said nothing about being in Arkansas.

Mr. GLOVER. I understood the gentleman to say he had been down there and had seen it.

Mr. HUDSON. I did not. I said adjacent to Arkansas, and I suppose, as the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PARKS] said, the rain had fallen on the just and the unjust alike.

Mr. GLOVER. I understood the gentleman to say he saw the green wheat fields in Arkansas. I have not seen them.

Mr. PARKS. I appreciate your kindness in listening to me. I am not talking to you in idleness but in the hope, as the gentleman said over there, that somebody will understand the situation. I can give you testimony by thousands as to what is happening if you want to know.

The emblem of liberty and Christian civilization waves over the head of the Speaker of this House, the American flag. We went to war in 1917 to preserve it. We had never sent our men across the seas before. True, we had sent them across the Rio Grande in the days gone by, and they carried that emblem up the heights of Chapultepec until it waved in triumph over the land of the Montezumas. We sent them across the Gulf to strike the shackles of slavery from arms that had been bound for a century; but they had never gone across the seas until you heard the Macedonian cry in 1917. It comes to you again to-day in a smaller way from my starving people.

They told me this story, and I heard it on this floor once. It is fiction, I assume. An American doughboy lay dying on the field of battle in a foreign land far from home, and an angel came as an escort to carry his spirit across to live forever in the beautiful land of the leal. As the flag floated over him the angel said, "What strange banner is this? I have never seen it before."

And this boy as his blood stained the flowers around him said, "This is the emblem of Christian civilization. This is the emblem of human liberty. This is the flag of my country." The angel said, "Yes; that may be true. I have seen the tricolor of France, the British lion, the dragon of China, and the Russian bear go down in the red welter of war, but I never saw that banner before." The boy as he

looked at the flag with dimming eyes as his blood flowed and strength weakened said, "These beautiful stripes of red declare that on the battlefields of my country we have given the purest blood that ever flowed in the veins of man. These beautiful stripes of white proclaim the nobleness of our purpose. Those stars set in an azure field, as beautiful and bright and scintillating as the star of Bethlehem, declare and proclaim that no nation or no man can tarnish or pull them down. It is as eternal as time itself."

For the American ex-service man now in want I plead. For his people and for those for whom he fought I ask you to hear me. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, we have just listened with much interest and appreciation to the fervent plea of my friend from Arkansas [Mr. PARKS]. He has forcefully told of the terrible conditions existing in the drought sections of his State. He says his constituents are in dire need of food and clothing. The condition which has brought about this suffering in our land has not come by accident, but has come largely by unusual laws and practices which have been put into effect in our American Government during the past few years. Of course the drought has brought to a head this terrible panic. The laws and regulations and general practices of the administration which have dominated our Government affairs for the last few years, in my opinion, are at least in part to blame for the present suffering in our country, therefore the Republican Party, which is now in power and has been for many years, must share in this responsibility.

Of course, these distressful conditions are not brought about overnight. They often come from continuous conditions as same as the body may weaken and perish from the inroads of a terrible disease. Unjust and inadequate laws must be to blame for a portion of existing conditions. The laws and national practices of the Republican administration have aided in making millionaires of the few and beggars of the many; yes, of the rank and file of our great American people. By protecting and fostering monopoly and special privilege you have almost wrecked the very economic existence of our country. Our country to-day, financially and industrially, is in much worse condition than many of you realize. Let us stop and take stock for just a moment.

We find, for instance, that in 1930 the finished steel output of our country was 26,600,000 tons as compared with 40,600,000 tons in 1929. We find that in 1930 the steel production of our country represented only 63.7 per cent of its producing capacity. We find that in the United States in 1929 there were made 5,358,420 automobiles, and the automobile industry is a pretty good index of the general condition of our country. We find that in 1930 there were only 3,350,306 automobiles manufactured. We find also that in 1929 the automobile industry of our country consumed 18 per cent of the steel used, 84 per cent of the rubber, 73 per cent of the plate glass, 50 per cent of the upholstery leather, 17 per cent of the hardwood, 37 per cent of the aluminum, 15 per cent of the copper, 23 per cent of the tin, 31 per cent of the lead, 5 per cent of the zinc, 26 per cent of the nickel, and 9 per cent of the cotton used in the country.

As the automobile industry of our country has decreased, so have these various other industries decreased. We find a general factory decline in the year 1930 as compared with the year 1929 of almost 37 per cent, the lowest we have had since 1921. We find that the wholesale trade of our country in 1930 suffered a 25 per cent reduction over 1929. We find that the commodity prices of almost all of the leading commodities of our country are from 10 to 18 per cent, in some cases 50 per cent, less than they were in 1929. We find that the amount of cotton consumed is something like 30 per cent less in 1930 than it was in 1929.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. As a matter of fact, everything seems to be wrong. Everything has gone down.

Mr. GREEN. Almost all of the industries of our country show an appalling decline. Exports and imports during

1930 dropped about one-third; in fact, our foreign trade has decreased to an alarming degree.

Mr. GOLDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. GOLDER. The gentleman does not mean to blame the drought conditions on the matters of which he is speaking?

Mr. GREEN. Not by any means. The drought is beyond the control of man, but other things have contributed to this condition, for instance, the cancellation by the Republican administration of foreign debts owed our Government; the refund of taxes to millionaire corporations and individuals; blatant extravagance in national administration; unnecessary and unwise expenditures of public funds, of the taxpayers' money; refusal to curb the greedy operations of the various monopolies which are flourishing even now; and numbers of other causes have contributed to the panic which now enshrouds our country.

We find to-day that there are something like 6,000,000 people unemployed in our land. Some place the number far greater than 6,000,000. We find that during 1929 there was paid to the wage earners of the United States, exclusive of those employed by the Government and on the farms, the sum of approximately \$45,000,000,000, but that during the year 1930 there was paid approximately \$35,000,000,000. When you kill the earning power of your citizens you stop their purchasing power. People can not buy unless they have the money to buy with.

My friends, it seems that our country is in an unusual condition, and we all realize that this has been brought about gradually but surely by the policies which have obtained largely during this Republican administration. We find that there has been a very sharp decrease in the amount of money paid into the Federal Treasury, largely by reason of the general industrial conditions and the income reduction of the various industries and individuals of our country.

I shall not enumerate them, but there is one thing that is of unusual interest along this line and that is that in spite of all these adversities and in spite of all the poverty which reigns throughout the land the national income of the American people in 1930 was estimated at \$75,000,000,000. We find, my friends, that in 1928 it was \$84,000,000,000; in 1929, \$83,000,000,000; and in 1930, \$75,000,000,000. We find that the savings accounts in our banks have increased with this staggering figure of \$75,000,000,000 income in 1930. It is so improperly distributed among the people that millions are unemployed and thousands are in dire poverty and hungry. We find another thing which is rather unusual, that the amount of tax paid, on the average, per capita in 1890 was \$13.88 and in 1928, the last figures which I have, it was \$77.39.

We find that the tax laws and other laws of our land have been so shaped largely by the Republican administration, which dominates the country, as to permit the wealth of our land to drift into the hands of a petty few, and that these laws have made millionaires and millionaire corporations and combines on the one hand and paupers and beggars on the other. Yes, my friends, we have been existing under Republican reign; they are drunk and dazzling with their own power; how will it last? We find that when these millionaires and millionaire corporations desire a rebate on taxes from the Federal Treasury they go to their friend Mellon, the Secretary of the Treasury, and with what results? Make your own answer. But does the same obtain with reference to the average taxpayer? Taxes, taxes, for the average taxpayer there is no end to his paying. My colleagues, I deplore such conditions. It must be remedied.

My friends, great need is in our land, poverty is stalking on all sides, hundreds of thousands of our people are to-day seeking charity. My colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PARKS], tells us that 500,000 in his State are in need of something to eat, the Red Cross is begging throughout our land from those who have hoarded up their millions, largely through Republican protection, begging them to give money to feed the people of our land. He [Mr. PARKS] tells us that 500,000 in his small State are now in dire want.

Two or three nights ago I heard a great program over the radio, in which Will Rogers and a number of others undertook to portray the need for instant contributions to the Red Cross.

My friends, I was moved to tears when a farmer in Arkansas, speaking on this program, told of the adversity and suffering which he and his neighbors are enduring. He told how they had only a short while ago prospered and enjoyed this world's goods and comforts, but how they were now reduced to hunger. His story was pathetic and touching; yes, it would have melted the heart of stone. He concluded with these words, "We are now beggars"—with these words he choked with American pride and sobbed as a child. Two children and a mother also spoke to the great invisible audience and pictured their distressed and dependent condition. They told of those who were hungry, those who were ill but unable to pay for or obtain medical assistance; yes, my friends, here in the richest nation in the world, and in spite of all this suffering you Republicans have defeated our efforts to appropriate to buy them the dire necessities of life itself. What kind of men are you? Have you no feeling for suffering, helpless men, women, and children? Why, I read of a family of five or more surviving on, I believe, \$5 worth of food every two weeks; possibly \$10. They have only one meal a day, and the father says he often does without his in order that his starving children may have more.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is making a good speech, and I am in sympathy with the gentleman's ideas, but will the gentleman give us some thought as to what he would do and how he would remedy this condition?

Mr. GREEN. I will come to that later. We find that in the United States to-day there are about 850,000,000 bushels of wheat; we find that in the United States to-day there are now 2,081,000,000 bushels of corn; 50,234,000 bushels of rye; 1,402,000,000 bushels of oats; 163,543,000 bushels of apples; 94,000,000 tons of hay; and this year there were 14,243,000 bales of cotton made. The yield of nearly all other staple crops are larger for 1930 than in 1929, a surplus of almost all agricultural crops, and yet our people are freezing in the cold sections of our country and hungry in almost all parts of our land. All of the corn bins and wheat bins are bursting with their heavy load of wheat and rye and corn, yet millions of our people in civilized America are to-day begging for something to eat.

My friends on the Republican side, I want to know how you can answer the starving millions of our land when there is the largest crop of all edibles raised in our land with the exception of corn and hay. How can you answer when you know that people are starving throughout the land, and yet you come in here and vote against anything to feed them out of the Federal Treasury. You can give \$20,000,000 to feed the Russians; you can give \$100,000,000 to feed the Belgians; you can give \$200,000 to feed those in Massachusetts; you can give to charity here and you can give to charity there. Yes; this \$20,000,000 was Federal aid and would have come out of the Nation's Treasury, and you know it; yet it was given to feed starving Russians. Yes; this was to feed foreigners; yet you are unwilling to feed perishing Americans. I say give the preference to Americans always; with me, America first.

Yes; you could send the then apparently Democratic Mr. Hoover to feed the starving foreigners; will you now authorize the now apparently Republican Honorable President Hoover to feed the hungry multitudes of Americans? He could then administer unto the Belgians and other peoples of foreign lands, and to-day his own land and his own people are begging for something to eat and he and his party are standing in the way of a single contribution from the Federal Treasury. Will America approve such glaring discriminations? I say not.

Mr. GOLDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDER. Can the gentleman tell us the amount of food that has been raised in the respective States?

Mr. GREEN. No; I am sorry; but I may not be able to give it accurately off-hand.

Mr. GOLDER. I may say to the gentleman, without meaning to detract from his statement, that the income-tax reports show that in Arkansas, for which State I have the greatest sympathy, last year the income in that State was at least \$80,000,000.

Mr. GREEN. But what is it to-day? To-day they can not get food and other necessities of life. Their banks are gone. Their crops failed. They are in poverty. They are getting one meal a day. Did you not read the other day where there was a man who said he could not eat but one meal a day, because if he did his own children would perish? Did not the gentleman from Arkansas tell you that the many school children have nothing in their lunch pails? Did you not read the other day where right down here in Virginia a man who was working on the road was eating nothing but potato peelings for his noonday meal? His fellow workers slipped some bread in his pail and threw out his peelings when they learned he had nothing to eat. He expressed his regret by saying, "I am sorry you threw away my peelings, I could have eaten them and could have taken this bread to my hungry children."

How can you reconcile the splendor and luxury of our land with such dire poverty of the rank and file, who are rearing children to carry on the destinies of our country to-morrow? Have you no sympathy or feeling for these patriotic and proud citizens who are fighting a losing battle for their sole existence? How would you like to shovel dirt or rock on the road on nothing to eat but potato peelings? How can you reconcile any such forced condition of present-day Republican prosperity? [Applause.] May I remind you also that there are 13,890,000 horses in our country and 56,389,000 cattle in our country, and yet our people are starving for something to eat. There are 47,000,000 sheep in our country, and I am sure you can find people in this city who have not had a lamb chop or piece of steak in the last 60 days.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. ALLGOOD. In regard to the amount of livestock, I saw in the morning's paper where the value of livestock in the United States had increased \$1,500,000,000.

Mr. GREEN. And yet our people are hungry and can not obtain the necessities of life. We are the richest nation in all the world, and I read just the other day in the Washington Star about a young man who had come here from Texas, a young man 19 years of age, and he collapsed in a café while begging for something to eat—in Washington, in the very shadow of the dome of our Capitol—and when he was taken to the hospital and finally regained consciousness they asked him what was the trouble, and he said, "I have not had a mouthful to eat in three days." He was perishing on the streets here for want of something to eat in the richest nation in the world. How can those who are a part of the Republican administration reconcile the conditions of our country as they exist and tell our people that they are doing what they should to protect and assist them and their dependents?

PAY SOLDIERS' BONUS

Yes; I have a solution and I am glad the gentleman asked that question. The very first thing I should do, if we could get the Republicans to agree to do it, would be to pay in cash, and in full and at once, the bonus certificate to the soldiers. That would be the first thing. [Applause.] I would disseminate this money to them throughout the various sections of our country. If they could be drawn upon to defend our Nation in its time of peril, are they not now entitled to receive payment by the Government for their just services rendered at a time when their Nation was in peril? I say they are. This debt should be paid now.

If you do not want to pay them in cash I have a splendid suggestion offered by a constituent of mine, the Hon. J. M. McKinney, of Cross City, himself a worthy and gallant soldier of the World War, and it is this: That you issue to each veteran a Government bond to take up his soldier's

bonus certificate, issue bonds in the denomination of \$250 and \$500 and \$1,000 and let him turn in his certificate and receive the bond. Let the bonds bear the usual rate of Government interest. Let him sell the bond if he wants to, and if he does not he may put it in his safety box. It is good and drawing interest for the soldier.

Oh, some Republicans say the Government may not be able to sell the bonds necessary to pay in cash these bonus certificates. Can not you give the veteran a Government bond in lieu of the certificate and let him sell it if he chooses? What is there wrong about that? He is not compelled to sell if he does not want to. I prefer payment in full in cash now, but he would prefer a Government bond in preference to his present certificate.

ADDITIONAL FEDERAL BUILDINGS

As a further measure to reduce unemployment and promote the economic life of our country I have introduced H. R. 10573. I have not time to go into the details, but under the provisions of the bill there will be made an appropriation to each congressional district in the United States of half a million dollars to be used in the construction of Federal buildings for first, second, and third class post offices, using local material when possible, local contractors, local labor. Local attorneys would pass title on land to be acquired for building and local architects would also be employed. In districts where no buildings are needed, then the money would revert to the Treasury.

My Democratic colleagues will recall how we have tried in vain to get some voice in allocation of funds recently appropriated for Federal buildings. Under my bill the funds would be equally distributed to all congressional districts instead of being left in charge of two or three Republican bureaucrats.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. GREEN. Instead of that I will tell you what you are doing. You are tearing down such buildings as this magnificent post-office building down here on Pennsylvania Avenue in the District. That building is worth probably millions of dollars. It would be a credit to any city in my State. And yet the Republicans are going to tear it down and build one that will look good, because some Tom, Dick, or Harry says that it does not look up to date in architecture. To me it is absolutely absurd to tear down a building like that building and destroy its value when people in this country are starving, and you know it. I can not understand how men can become drunk with their own power and go so far as to squander the taxpayers' money when we have starving people in different sections of the country, and when my district needs Federal buildings so badly.

Now I want to tell you Republicans something else with reference to this new building they are building down here for the Department of Commerce. The papers tell us they are going to spend \$82,000 in order to have the offices of these high moguls kept cool with the fresh waters from Old Timber Creek. I do not understand how men of good judgment can become so drunk with their own power that they can forget the wants of our people and squander the money of the taxpayers in such a reckless and ruthless manner and our people in want throughout the land and my people begging for post-office buildings.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the gentleman does not want the Record to show in his statement that at the present time the Post Office Department Building on the Avenue is being torn down. I understand that eventually under the program it will be removed.

Mr. GREEN. Oh, they are not doing it at the present moment, but it is in their plan, and will be done if we Democrats can not stop it. I understand they are going to tear down also the railroad building near it, which would be a credit to any city in the average State, because it does not look good.

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

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman gave us one solution about paying a bonus to the veterans. He said something about the millions of bushels of wheat on hand. What would the gentleman do with the wheat to alleviate the suffering?

Mr. GREEN. I should turn over to the Federal Government, to be distributed through the Red Cross or otherwise, at least the quantity of wheat now held by the Federal Farm Board; supply it to the needy for food. Another bill that I have that could take care of my State, at least, is H. R. 16628, which provides for reimbursement of part of the losses my people suffered during the fruit-fly campaign.

Those who suffered from the campaign to eradicate the pink boll weevil and the campaign to eradicate the foot and mouth disease have been repaid, and, yet, after almost two years since the Federal Department of Agriculture went to Florida and ruthlessly and perhaps necessarily, destroyed millions of dollars worth of the property of the citizens, they have not yet received a penny for it, and plead all we may, request all we may, we have been unable to get reimbursement for them. I shall deeply appreciate it if my colleagues will cooperate with me in bringing this just relief to our Florida people. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, to refer for a moment to the bill under consideration, I rise to give notice that during the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule I shall offer an amendment which will be in the nature of legislation and, therefore, subject to the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. However, I hope it will so appeal to the membership of the House that no point of order will be made against it. The purpose of the amendment is to continue the select committee of the House studying the fiscal relations between the District of Columbia and the Federal Government after the 4th of March. The present Congress, of course, ceases on the 4th of March, and any committee of the House of Representatives appointed by simple resolution of the House also ceases to exist at that time. The select Committee on Fiscal Relations has found that it will not be able to complete satisfactorily the work assigned to it before the adjournment of this Congress, and at a session some time ago unanimously voted to suggest that appropriate action be taken to continue the life of the committee. Accordingly, after consulting with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS], chairman of this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having charge of the District appropriations bill, this course has been decided upon. The Committee on Appropriations is sensitive about putting legislation on appropriation bills. I am making this statement at the suggestion of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS], chairman of this subcommittee, so that the House may have full notice of what is proposed to be done. I trust there will be no opposition to it. It is merely a method of continuing the select committee for a time after the adjournment of this Congress so that it may complete its work.

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

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. How many members of this committee are Members elect of the next Congress?

Mr. MAPES. There are seven members of the committee and all of them are Members elect of the next Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I send to the desk and ask to have read in my time the amendment which I propose to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FISCAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Those members of the Select Committee on Fiscal Relations, House of Representatives, appointed pursuant to House Resolution No. 285, Seventy-first Congress, who are Members elect to the Seventy-second Congress, or a majority of them, during the

period from March 4 to December 31, 1931, inclusive, are hereby authorized to continue the investigations and to have the authority and privileges provided in such House resolution. Any unobligated balance on March 4, 1931, in the allocation made to such select committee from the contingent fund of the House, under the authority of House Resolution No. 329, Seventy-first Congress, shall remain to the credit of such committee as continued hereby, to be paid out on the usual vouchers approved as now provided by law.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to add just this further word: The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS], I am informed, told the full committee of the Committee on Appropriations that some such amendment as this would be offered to the bill under the 5-minute rule, and, as I said, I make this statement now so that the general membership of the House may be fully informed of the purpose sought to be accomplished.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I shall take a few moments for myself. A considerable discussion has been had in the House at different times regarding the matter of cashing adjusted-compensation certificates. Presentation of all sides of the matter should be had. A statement was made before the Committee on Ways and Means by General Hines of the Veterans' Administration, former Director of the Veterans' Bureau, upon that subject matter. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including about two pages of the summary of that discussion on the part of General Hines.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

General HINES. Yes; I talked about those; but we have found this, Congressman, that due to conditions we have had a greater number of applications for disability compensation filed during this year than heretofore, and many of those claims are good claims. We lay it primarily to the fact that a number of veterans undoubtedly were endeavoring to carry on and had no intention of applying to the Government for relief until they found themselves out of employment and in need and they filed, having protected their claims at a prior time by receiving from the Government a certificate of injury or disability, which they used.

Previous to this time in coming before your committee on pending legislation I have been able to offer for your consideration suggestions as to the best method, in my opinion, of meeting the need sought to be provided by the various bills introduced in the House and before you for consideration. In this instance, however, I must confess I am unable to offer any suggested legislative solution of the problem confronting you.

Four different general plans for providing additional payments under the World War adjusted compensation act have been presented to you for consideration:

1. The payment of the face value of all adjusted-service certificates.
2. The payment of the present value of all adjusted-service certificates.
3. The payment of adjusted-service credits, plus 25 per cent, plus 4 per cent interest, to the present time.
4. Increased loans.

Undoubtedly from a financial standpoint the least costly and therefore from that standpoint the best would be the fourth plan, namely, that to increase the loan values on the certificates. Likewise, this plan has the merit of not requiring the surrender of the certificates in order to secure additional funds. However, it would not be actuarially sound to increase to any great extent the present loan values on these certificates, and, in my opinion, a slight increase would be of little benefit and would only result in piddling away of an additional amount which would be charged against the face value of the certificate. The first three plans mentioned, while providing a real measure of cash relief, are, according to the Secretary of the Treasury and other financial experts, unsound from a financial and economic standpoint. Therefore, I find myself in the predicament of being unable to recommend one plan because of the inadequacy of the relief afforded and the others because of their adverse effect on the finances of the country.

It is my honest belief that a great deal of misunderstanding has arisen among veterans as to just what their certificates represent. I believe many of them are of the opinion that the face value of the certificate is the value of the certificates at this time. If it could be explained to them just what the present value represents in cash, I do not believe that there would be any serious demand for this cash payment. Further, it goes without saying that the average veteran would not advocate or favor any proposal which would disrupt, or tend to disrupt, the fiscal policies of the Government, or which would adversely affect the economic situation of the country or the public welfare.

As I see it the veterans of the country may be divided into three groups. The first group are those to whom the adjusted-service certificate is just another security in the strong box.

While undoubtedly the number of men in this group is not large, still there are a considerable number of ex-service men in such circumstances. Certainly this group of ex-service men do not need cash or assistance from the Government at this time, and there is no reason why the Government should strain its resources to pay to-day an obligation due them in 1945.

The second group, and I believe the largest group of ex-service men, are those who, while working for a living, are employed and earning enough to support themselves and their families. It is probably true that the majority of this group of ex-service men are not able to save much, if anything, and that these certificates represent not only their sole investment or savings, but their only life insurance. Further undoubtedly many of them have borrowed on their certificates. However, I will venture to say in most cases they have spent the money so obtained on other than bare necessities. While a part of this group undoubtedly could use additional amounts of cash to advantage, I believe such amounts, to a great extent, would be expended for other than necessities of life. In other words, there is no actual need for relief. Therefore the payment of any additional cash on the basis of these adjusted-service certificates, in so far as this group are concerned, can not be said to be essential, and to offer them an inducement to cash in their certificates would, in my opinion, be most unwise.

The third group of ex-service men are those, especially the ones with families, who are out of work and are now in dire need. Undoubtedly this group, which consists of a considerable number, could well use and would take any cash settlement offered to them. They have already borrowed on their certificates to the maximum and are in need of assistance at this time. But should we force them to surrender this investment, which is without question the only investment or life insurance which they have, in order to secure aid to bridge this period of economic depression. Would it not be better to help them find jobs and assist them by creating more jobs than to make them pay their own way out of their only savings through this period of distress. They are only a component part of thousands of American citizens who are in such circumstances. If we are to provide direct relief to the other citizens, why should not these ex-service men be permitted to keep their adjusted-service certificates and likewise benefit by such direct-relief measures as are provided. The American Legion and other ex-service organizations are helping these men to secure jobs. These organizations, through their welfare and other funds, are assisting in taking care of them and their families until they can secure jobs. It seems to me that this problem will be better met in this way and that the soldier will be better off by so meeting it. As I previously stated concerning this group, there can be no question of need for assistance, but is there any greater need and have they any more right to look to their Government for assistance than their equally unfortunate neighbors who were too old or too young to serve?

Also, while it seems to me the country owes a greater duty to the disabled ex-service men, whether disabled through disease or age, and to the widows and orphans of deceased ex-service men than which it owes to its other citizens, it also seems to me that it owes only the same duty to the able-bodied ex-service men and their families as it owes to every other citizen.

I realize it is contended that this is money due the ex-service men but, as I understand it, outside of the present and future loan values, no money is due on these certificates until 1945 unless the holders die prior to that date. Therefore, I can see no reason why the Government should advance the date of maturity at this time. I am firmly of the opinion that if these certificates are paid off at any value less than their face value the ex-service men of the country will feel that they have been forced to sacrifice the true amount which is due them and that after the amounts provided are paid and spent they will come back and demand that the difference between such amounts and the face value be paid to them.

There is one phase of this matter which I think merits particular attention and which, to my mind, if no other, would prevent my recommending any of the plans which would involve the surrendering of these certificates or the greater impairment of their value, and that is the benefit which is derived from these certificates when the ex-service man dies, leaving a widow and children. If the members of this committee could but see the good which is accomplished in such cases—and I might say that 75 per cent of the veterans have dependents—I am sure you would agree with me. I do not believe that I am overestimating when I say that 98 per cent of the ex-service men who died leave no other assets than the proceeds of their adjusted-service certificates. In other words, these amounts represent the only money left to help span the period between the date of death of the soldier and the date of adjustment by the widow to her new conditions in life. I should be glad if the committee would see fit to call before it those in the bureau and those in the American Legion and other ex-service organizations who are daily confronted with the problem of caring for the widows and orphans of these deceased ex-service men. I am sure they would advise the committee of the inestimable amount of benefit which flows from the proceeds of these certificates and would advise against any legislation which would take away this godsend to the widows and orphans of these ex-service men.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that in making this statement I have offered no legislative solution to this most perplexing problem of what should be done about paying the bonus, but my best advice is that the Congress should give consideration to the further extension of benefits to the disabled, to the widows and orphans of deceased ex-service men, and to the building of additional hos-

pitals and soldiers' homes to care for the sick, and leave the able-bodied ex-service men to take their places along with the other citizens of the country in working out their own salvation during these distressing times. Certainly, he has this advantage over the average citizen—that is, an excellent investment, which has a loan value and which is a protection for his family in the event of his death and for him in his old age.

In closing, gentlemen of the committee, I would invite attention to the fact that the appropriations which you approved in the House the other day for veterans' relief for the fiscal year 1932 were nearly \$900,000,000; that these expenditures will undoubtedly increase under existing law and that additional costly legislation will be needed and later enacted into law. Therefore, it seems to me we should pause and think of the possible effect the acceleration or the increasing of this enormous liability of the Government will have on future legislation for the disabled and widows and orphans. I believe we have reached a point in connection with veterans' relief when we must give serious consideration to where we are going. It would be a pity, in my judgment, to have public opinion turned against relief measures for disabled veterans because of any unwise legislation for the able-bodied.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to express to the committee my appreciation for the patience and great courtesy you have extended to me. I will be glad to furnish additional information or to answer additional questions, and am at the disposal of the committee in any steps you may decide to take. I thank you.

Mr. SIMMONS. 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. LaGUARDIA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 16738, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

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. 2936. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Tittabawassee and Chippewa Rivers, Mich., and San Juan River, N. Mex., with a view to the prevention and control of floods; and

H. R. 14040. An act to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to expedite work on the Federal-building program authorized by the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, and acts amendatory thereof.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4944. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River at or near Dahlgren, Va.;

S. 5319. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the French Broad River on the proposed Morristown-Newport Road between Jefferson and Cocke Counties, Tenn.; and

S. 5360. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Wednesday, February 4, 1931, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Wednesday, February 4, 1931, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

(10 a. m.)

To amend subsection (a) of section 1 of an act entitled "An act 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," approved May 29, 1930 (H. R. 16218).

To authorize the acquisition of additional land for enlarging the Capitol Grounds (H. R. 16703).

To amend the act approved March 4, 1929, entitled "An act to provide for the enlarging of the Capitol Grounds" (H. R. 16340).

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend section 5216 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (H. R. 12490).

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

(10 a. m.)

To consider bills for the immediate payment of adjusted-compensation certificates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

812. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department for salaries, office of the Secretary of the Navy, for the fiscal year 1932, amounting to \$5,420, which is supplemental to the estimate of \$211,960 contained in the Budget for the fiscal year 1932 (H. Doc. No. 733); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

813. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimate of appropriations submitted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to pay claims and causes of action which have been settled by them under the provisions of 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 (45 Stat. 1160), as amended, amounting to \$19,114.18 (H. Doc. No. 734); 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. WASON: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the Government Printing Office (Rept. No. 2470). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 13293. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Frazer, Mont., in the construction of a high-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 15601. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Poplar, Mont., in the extension of the high-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EVANS of Montana: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 873. An act to supplement the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain nations or tribes of Indians in Montana, Idaho, and Washington," approved March 13, 1924; with amendment (Rept. No. 2476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PEAHEY: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 11281. A bill authorizing a per capita payment of \$100 to the members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the

United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2477). 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. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9221. A bill authorizing the President to reappoint Maj. Harry Walter Stephenson, United States Army (retired), to the position and rank of major, Coast Artillery Corps, in the United States Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 2467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. H. R. 12148. A bill for the relief of Charles C. Bennett; with amendment (Rept. No. 2468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILL of Alabama: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 3360. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the University of Oregon certain lands forming a part of the Coos Head Military Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 12560. A bill concerning the claim of Jacobs Landry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 13661. A bill for the relief of George W. McDonald; with amendment (Rept. No. 2472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 16635. A bill authorizing the relief of the McNeill-Allman Construction Co. (Inc.), of W. E. McNeill, Lee Allman, and John Allman, stockholders of the McNeill-Allman Construction Co. (Inc.), and W. E. McNeill, dissolution agent of McNeill-Allman Construction Co., to sue in the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 2473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16493) granting a pension to Hiram P. Marcum; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 16127) granting a pension to Philip Aaron; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 16828) to extend the time in which applications may be made for the benefits of the disabled emergency officers' retirement act of May 24, 1928; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 16829) granting the consent of Congress to the Board of County Commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to construct a free overhead viaduct across the Mahoning River at Struthers, Mahoning County, Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 16830) granting pensions to certain soldiers of the Regular Establishment who served on the western frontier during the Indian wars, skirmishes, expeditions, and campaigns for opening new territory for settlements under martial law from 1817 to 1898, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 16831) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 16832) to pay 50 per cent of the face value of adjusted-compensation certificates to veterans of the World War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16833) to establish a term of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at Huntington, W. Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 16834) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the point known and designated as the Power-site Crossing or at or near the point known and designated as Wilder Ferry, in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 16835) to amend the revenue act of 1928 relating to depletion of mines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRIGHAM: A bill (H. R. 16836) to amend 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; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHOTT of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16837) to provide for cooperation with the several States in the care, treatment, education, vocational guidance and placement, and physical rehabilitation of crippled children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the Congress of the United States to reimburse the State of California for moneys actually expended in the aid of the Government of the United States during the War between the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of North Carolina, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass an act authorizing the immediate payment to veterans of the World War the face value of their adjusted-service compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of the State of North Carolina, requesting the Representatives from the State of North Carolina to secure the enactment of some appropriate measure delaying foreclosure of liens by Federal land banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the Congress of the United States for the immediate payment in cash of the World War adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLTON: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the Jones bill, H. R. 255; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KADING: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation looking toward the payment in cash of the World War adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLACKBURN: A bill (H. R. 16838) granting a pension to Mariah Matilda Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 16839) for the relief of Ida Becker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 16840) granting a pension to Alice Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 16841) to authorize the purchase by the city of Myrtle Point, Oreg., of certain lands formerly embraced in the grant to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. and revested in the United States by the act approved June 9, 1916; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16842) granting an increase of pension to Martha Dorsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 16843) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Reiter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 16844) granting a pension to George H. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 16845) granting a pension to Melissa Powers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16846) for the relief to W. G. Tackett; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16847) granting a pension to Margaret Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 16848) granting a pension to Amanda Builderback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRITCHARD: A bill (H. R. 16849) for the relief of Harry P. Cooper; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 16850) granting a pension to Lizzie B. Stoner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 16851) granting a pension to Myrtle B. Oldfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

9070. Petition of the Tri-County Florists' Association of Ohio, urging the passage of legislation for the payment of the adjusted-compensation certificates, full face value, immediately; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9071. By Mr. BOHN: Petition of members of Upper Hay Lake Grange No. 1552, that the United States Government should aid in making the electric power and water power of the Sault Ste. Marie River available to agriculture at a reasonable rate; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

9072. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of W. W. Bloemer, commander, and E. H. Boese, adjutant, of Prell-Bland Post, No. 271, Batesville, Ind., urging the passage of legislation having for its purpose the payment of the adjusted-service certificates in cash; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9073. By Mr. CLARKE of New York: Petition of the members of the Good Will Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Binghamton, N. Y., urging Congress to enact a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures, establishing higher standards before production for films that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9074. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of American Exporters and Importers' Association, urging that the Foreign Commerce of the United States be represented in the Cabinet by a secretary of foreign commerce, who shall devote his entire time to improving and extending the foreign trade of the United States, both export and import, and that the said secretary of foreign commerce shall have full charge of all matters pertaining to foreign trade now under the supervision of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9075. Also, petition of New York State Bankers' Association, opposing the conferees' report on Muscle Shoals legislation, which is as follows: "Whereas the House conferees on Muscle Shoals legislation have yielded to the Senate conferees and have agreed to a compromise plan under which the Government would build transmission lines for the distribution of electric current from Muscle Shoals"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9076. By Mr. HANCOCK of New York: Petition of Rev. W. W. Hunt and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the Sparks-Capper amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9077. By Mr. JAMES of Michigan: Petition of Veterans Political Association of America, urging legislation to pay the face value of veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9078. Also, petition of Veterans Political Association of America, national headquarters, Detroit, Mich., urging legislation that will permit of the veterans' paid-up service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9079. Also, petition of Richard M. Jopling Post, No. 44, American Legion, Michigan, favoring legislation which will permit payment of the veterans' paid-up adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9080. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of E. E. Oberholtzer, superintendent of public schools, Houston, Tex.; Col. Ernest O. Thompson, mayor of Amarillo, Tex.; and H. D. Fillers, superintendent of public schools, Corsicana, Tex., comprising a committee appointed by the Illiteracy Commission of Texas, favoring a law to provide for the giving of lists of the illiterates to the State superintendents of the various States for use in illiteracy campaigns; to the Committee on Education.

9081. By Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts: Petition of Boston City Council, Boston, Mass., Wilfred J. Doyle, city clerk, urging early and favorable consideration of legislation providing for the immediate payment in cash of the adjusted-compensation certificates issued to United States veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9082. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Resolutions of the New York State Bankers' Association, in opposition to the conferees' report on the Muscle Shoals bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9083. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of local Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Portis, Kans., for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9084. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Friday Reading Club, of West Newton, Pa., urging passage of Sparks-Capper bill eliminating unnaturalized aliens for counting in proposed congressional reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9085. Also, petition of Warren County Council of Republican Women, urging tariff on petroleum and its products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 26, 1931)

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haligan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed bills of the following titles, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 16626. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, etc., and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 16744. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 4944. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River at or near Dahlgren, Va.;

S. 5319. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the French Broad River on the proposed Morristown-Newport Road between Jefferson and Cocke Counties, Tenn.;

S. 5360. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.;

H. R. 2936. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Tittabawassee and Chippewa Rivers, Mich., and San Juan River, N. Mex., with a view to the prevention and control of floods; and

H. R. 14040. An act to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to expedite work on the Federal-building program authorized by the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, and acts amendatory thereof.

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:

Ashurst	Fess	King	Shipstead
Barkley	Fletcher	La Follette	Shortridge
Bingham	Frazier	McGill	Smith
Black	George	McKellar	Smoot
Blaine	Glass	McMaster	Steck
Blease	Glenn	McNary	Steiwer
Borah	Goff	Metcalf	Stephens
Bratton	Goldsborough	Morrison	Swanson
Brock	Gould	Morrow	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Hale	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Harris	Norbeck	Townsend
Bulkley	Harrison	Norris	Trammell
Capper	Hatfield	Oddie	Tydings
Caraway	Hawes	Partridge	Vandenberg
Carey	Hayden	Patterson	Wagner
Connally	Hebert	Phipps	Walcott
Copeland	Heflin	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Howell	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Cutting	Johnson	Ransdell	Waterman
Davis	Jones	Reed	Watson
Deneen	Kean	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Dill	Kendrick	Sheppard	Williamson

Mr. WATSON. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] is detained from the Senate by illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

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

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I doubt the good taste of the statement I am about to make, but I shall make it nevertheless.

The other day I made a speech discussing the drought situation; whether in good taste or bad taste I am not now discussing. Two gentlemen became very much stirred up about it. I have been endeavoring to extend to them an opportunity to tell me personally what they really think about it. They have declined to do it, Mr. President, or to afford me an opportunity to tell them privately what I think about them. I am now extending them this public invitation: At any time that is convenient for them it will be convenient for me to have them tell me privately what they want to say about that speech.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, under the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, designates the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] to read Washington's Farewell Address on Monday, February 23, next.