created by section 702 of the World War adjusted compensation act of 1924; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9422. Also, petition of citizens of California, respectfully petitioning the President and Congress of the United States in behalf of immediate cash payment at full face value of adjusted-compensation certificates as created by section 702 of the World War adjusted compensation act of 1924; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9423. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Clyde H. Nelson and others, of Donora, Pa., urging support of the Sparks-Capper amendment (H. J. Res. 356) to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9424. Also, petition of Mary C. Taylor, of Donora; Rev. G. M. Conner and other residents of Houston, Pa., urging support of the proposed Sparks-Capper stop-alien representation amendment (H. J. Res. 356) to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9425. Also, petition of John S. McCans and other residents, of Donora, Pa., urging support of the Sparks-Capper stop-alien representation amendment (H. J. Res. 356) to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9426. Also, petition of Rev. Thomas F. Chilcote and a number of other residents of Donora, Pa., urging support of the Sparks-Capper stop-alien representation amendment (H. J. Res. 356) to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9427. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Amos A. J. Myers Post, No. 28, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jeannette, Pa., advocating cash payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9428. Also, petition of members of Stewarts Station, U. P. Sabbath School or Church, of Trafford, Westmoreland County, Pa., urging favorable action on Sparks-Capper amendment eliminating approximately 7,500,000 unnaturalized aliens from count in proposed congressional reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9429. Also, petition of citizens of Trafford, Westmoreland County, Pa., urging favorable action on Sparks-Capper amendment eliminating approximately 7,500,000 unnaturalized aliens from count in proposed congressional reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 26, 1931)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the approval of the Journal of the calendar days of February 9, 10, and 11, 1931.

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable me to make the point of no quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield for that purpose?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. FESS. 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	Carey	Gillett	Howell
Barkley	Connally	Glass	Johnson
Bingham	Copeland	Goff	Jones
Black	Couzens	Goldsborough	Kean
Blaine	Cutting	Gould	Kendrick
Blease	Dale	Hale	King
Borah	Davis	Harris	La Follette
Bratton	Deneen	Harrison	McGill
Brock	Dill	Hatfield	McKellar
Brookhart	Fess	Hawes	McMaster
Bulkley	Fletcher	Hayden	McNary
Capper	Frazier	Hebert	Metcalf
Caraway	George	Heflin	Morrison
Morrow	Pine	Smoot	Vandenberg
Moses	Pittman	Steiwer	Wagner
Norbeck	Ransdell	Stephens	Walcott
Norris	Reed	Swanson	Walsh, Mass.
Nye	Robinson, Ark.	Thomas, Idaho	Walsh, Mont.
Oddie	Sheppard	Thomas, Okla.	Waterman
Partridge	Shipstead	Townsend	Watson
Patterson	Shortridge	Trammell	Wheeler
Phipps	Smith	Tydings	Williamson

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

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

LINCOLN—THE GREAT AMERICAN FATHER

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, to-day is Lincoln's birthday.

Every year the events with which the name of Abraham Lincoln is associated recede farther into the background of history, but the character of the man himself rises to a still higher place in the esteem of mankind. The name of Lincoln stands like a pyramid rising out of a plain that is fading from our vision. He is no longer merely the rail splitter, the country politician, the emancipator, or even the savior of the Union. He has become an ideal which time holds aloft out of the clouded reasoning, the bigotry, and the carnage of a century that has passed. Through the perspective of two generations we see the skill of Lincoln, the statesman; the humanity of Lincoln, the lawyer; the fortitude of Lincoln as the leader of a great cause; the commonness of Lincoln as a friend and neighbor; the patience and resourcefulness of Lincoln as the President of a war-torn nation all converge into one sublime conception of Lincoln, the man and the father.

In those years immediately following his triumph and tragic death his friends, who were besieged for information, sought to shield him from the truth. Some tried to conceal the squalor of his childhood environment in Kentucky and Indiana; others to throw a false glamour of romance about his courtships; to hide his neglect of law for politics and literature; to distort the truth of his family relationships; and to minimize what were thought to be his shortcomings as Chief Executive. But in trying to hide what they thought were his weaknesses these friends revealed their own ignorance of the real Lincoln.

To-day we are not content to acknowledge Lincoln's greatness. Our admiration for his achievements is superseded by our love for the man himself, as he is revealed by his failings, his defeats, his humble mode of living, and his simple virtues. In ascending to the heights of honor and renown he never lost the common touch of humanity, and never wished to. More than any other man he felt and reflected in his life the heart throbbings of a nation. His crude nobility of character inherited from the backwoods blended with the knowledge he absorbed from the great minds of the world, and with the experience he gained from long devotion to public issues to produce not only the highest ideal of American statesmanship but also one of the finest examples of fatherhood.

A man of letters whose soul had been stirred to its depths by fratricidal war might have written the Gettysburg Address. In the course of social evolution a wise emancipator might have abolished slavery. A militant Chief Executive might have crushed the South and brought the Civil War to an end. But only Lincoln could have fathered a nation in such distress. Our lasting memory of him is that of a kind, unassuming, patient, and sagacious parent whose love did not blind him to the nature of that colossal feud, whose grief did not swerve him from the fixed purpose of preserving national unity.

Washington will always be known as the Father of our Country. It was his high privilege to shape the destiny of the United States as an infant nation. Beside him Lincoln has taken a place as the father who guided the same nation through its most perilous years of adolescence. Who can say that the genius of a father was needed more in the travail of 1776 than in the convulsion of 1860? History has

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

not revealed a character more deserving of patriarchal veneration than was Abraham Lincoln.

God seems to have prepared Lincoln as a father preserver of the American Union. In youth he was the leader and protector of his companions. As a young man he was village philosopher and athletic champion. Lincoln never seemed to be young, because his attitude was always that of a big brother or a companionable father. Children trooped after him. Men congregated about him to hear his stories, jokes, comments, and advice. He loved the common people because he was one of them, and concluded that God must love them, too, "because he made so many of them." Long before they recognized his greatness the people lovingly called him Father Abraham.

Sorrow laid a heavy hand upon Lincoln in his tender years.

> There was a darkness in this man; an immense and hollow darkness, of which we may not speak, nor share with him, nor enter.

The death of his mother in the wilderness of Indiana cut off the only refining influence in his life up to that time. Vacant loneliness again laid hold upon his heart when a sister who had been his companion in youth was also stricken. Not many years later death terminated his courtship with Ann Rutledge, and Lincoln experienced a period of the most abject despondency. But out of the grief of these separations arose his profound sympathy for the distress and sufferings of mankind.

Disappointments were added to sorrow, and Lincoln's soul was purged of pride and selfish ambition. His marriage with Mary Todd was not a happy one, because they were unsuited to each other by temperament, manners, and training. But it accentuated Lincoln's patience and humility and strengthened his mastery of self. Mrs. Lincoln added much to the melancholy of his life, but her insatiable ambition buoyed him up and goaded him on. The hand of Providence seems to have shaped his environment so as to discipline him for the appalling ordeal which was to climax his life.

Defeat in his chosen field of politics completed Lincoln's castigation. Fondly he had dreamed of a career in Congress, but his opposition to the Mexican War brought him into disfavor when he had served one brief term, and he returned to the practice of law in Springfield, Ill., convinced that his public service was at an end. But out of his despondency emerged a higher resolve to subordinate his aims to the cause of the Union. When he did attain the highest office within the power of his country to bestow he did not consider it a personal triumph but the ascendency of the noble cause to which he gave devotion.

Chastened by sorrow, humbled by defeat, and strengthened by a knowledge of his own limitations, Lincoln came forth as the strongest influence amid the chaos arising from the abolition movement, the Dred Scott decision, and the threats of secession. With characteristic fatherly spirit he pleaded with the Southern States not to alienate themselves from the Union. He conceded that the sons of the North and the sons of the South were equally brave and chivalrous, and with all the energy of his powerful intellect he strove to prevent them from turning their muskets against each other. When these efforts failed he took the only course left to him; namely, preservation of the Union by force of arms. Like a parent who is forced to drastic measures by a child's perversity, he pushed the war with relentless energy, even though every battle rent his heart.

Few personalities have ever been so completely submerged within a cause. Lincoln allowed the people to sneer at what they called his weakness, because he was determined to keep the border States in the Union. He suffered indignities from subordinates because the Union needed all the support it could command. His unfathomable grief was frequently camouflaged beneath outbursts of humor because the country needed to face its ordeal cheerfully. Even Cabinet members were permitted to regard the President as a novice, so that their own sense of responsibility for directing the country through that terrible crisis would be sharpened.

Lincoln had gathered about him the ablest men who remained loyal to the Union. His Cabinet included such men as Seward, Chase, Cameron, Blair, Bates, and Smith, a liberal division between Republicans and Democrats. The fact that Seward and Chase considered themselves superior to the President did not diminish in his estimation the potential value of their service to the cause.

The new administration had been in office less than a month when Seward, to use his own words, "assumed a sort of dictatorship for defense." Secretary Seward's insulting letter, in which he proposed that the powers of Chief Executive be delegated to him during the crisis, must have sent a flame of anger leaping through Lincoln's heart. But the cause which had been intrusted to Lincoln's leadership was not his. It was America's. Lincoln's reply was calm, serene, and free from any taint of malice or resentment. Seward was mastered like a child in error. The President retained his authority and, at the expense of his personal pride, acquired the loyalty and ultimate devotion of a capable man.

Lincoln's first aim in the early days of the war was to maintain the adherence of the border States to the Union. To do this it was imperative that the unity of the American States and not slavery be made the fundamental issue of conflict. Lincoln alone seems to have sensed the dangers in a premature emancipation movement. He was determined that no blow should be struck against slavery until it could help to save the Union. In defiance of this well-known policy, General Frémont issued a proclamation to liberate all slaves owned by persons who had taken up arms against the United States in Missouri. Instead of rebuking and dismissing this impetuous general, Lincoln condoned his insubordination, reversed his order with no display of enmity, and left him in command.

It is not surprising that the North and the West rallied to the support of such a man in putting down the rebellion of the South. The country was not in a mood for a dictatorship, but it responded nobly to the paternal guidance of Father Abraham. The American people learned that the destiny of their beloved Nation was in the hands of a man who reduced passions to common sense, who tempered judgment with mercy, who mastered impulse with patience, and who relied upon God for guidance and comfort.

In the words of Edwin Markham:

> Here was a man to hold against the world,
> A man to match the mountains and the sea.

A beautiful story, full of symbolic meaning, could be told of Lincoln, the sorrowful President, and his 9-year-old son, affectionately nicknamed "Tadpole." Throughout those tragic days in the White House Tad shared, as well as he might, the confidence of this father. In turn Lincoln always saw the boy's point of view and was always indulgent with him. A romp with Tad was about the only thing that gave him relief from the crushing problems of the Nation's troubled soul. Tad was allowed to conduct guests through the Executive Mansion, to interrupt official routine, and even to break into Cabinet meetings. Lincoln reproved the boy for his pranks in much the same kindly tone that he used in pardoning untrained recruits who went to sleep on duty after a hard day's march. His great heart lavished upon this boy the love and compassion he felt for the thousands of loyal sons of America who were giving their lives that that Nation might live.

Yet with all this indulgence, his informality, his contravention of military discipline, and his official humility, no man has ever held a government more steadfastly to pursuit of a great cause than did Lincoln during those fateful years of civil war. Beneath his mild manners was a determination that could not be shaken. Behind his personal restraint lay a reserve of will power and courage that has seldom, if ever, been equaled. Under the mask of humor which it frequently wore the bitter anguish of a nation tearing itself asunder brought him daily torture. Abuse and cynicism from many individuals of the North were added to the anathema of the South. But Lincoln suffered in silence and held to his course with the unwavering conviction of one who knows he is right but must wait for victory to prove it. We now recognize his patience, forbearance, and

judgment as the source of his strength as well as his greatness.

As time goes on Lincoln will continue to emerge in the light of a wise, kind, but resolute father. No man has shown more comprehensive knowledge of human nature than he. His boundless sympathy extended to all created things. His interest went to the root of every human problem. It was as much his nature to befriend everyone as it was to sponsor every righteous cause. Whether dealing with a child, a client, or a nation, his guiding principle was, "Firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right." Where is there a leader among men who was so little of a ruler and so much of a father?

Illustrations of these lovable qualities run through his career as a spark of benevolence through an age of hate. As a boy accompanying his father's family on its lonely trek into the wilderness of Indiana, Lincoln recrossed an icy stream on foot to rescue his stranded dog. As President he stretched his long arm around the shoulders of his Secretary of the Treasury and paced the floor with him until the indomitable will of Secretary Chase had been melted. As Commander in Chief of the Army he visited the battlefields and hospitals to speak words of comfort and cheer to dying soldiers; he exposed himself to dangers along the firing line to inspire his men with courage; and he pardoned negligent recruits who were not accustomed to the discipline of war. As Chief Executive he offered the simple thanks of the Republic to mothers of the dead and bade them find "solemn pride" in their sacrifice. After four years of rebellion, bloodshed, and devastation, he met the supreme test of statesmanship by proclaiming "malice toward none" and "charity for all."

Through these crises Lincoln was not trying to write his name among the great of the world. In his own ingenious way he was dealing with problems as they came to him. But the result of his humble devotion to those problems has been to exalt his name wherever civilization has spread.

Lincoln's character has withstood scrutiny for three-quarters of a century. Critics and cynics have beaten in vain against the shrine he occupies in every American heart. But they leave his renown more invulnerable than before. In a nature so free from pride and ostentation, in a mind so honest and candid, in a heart so apprehensive of the general welfare, and in a life so genuine there is nothing to taint our highest admiration of him. By losing himself in humble, fatherly devotion to a people and a nation in their darkest hour of distress he made his name secure against the onward flow of time.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN—THE GREAT CAPTAIN

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, the Republic, "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," in the throes of dissolution; the Union of Washington and Jackson, framed by the wisdom and sanctified by the blood of brothers, about to be rent asunder; the "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" in mortal danger of perishing from the earth—in that dark hour of estrangement, doubt, and fear the Great Captain of our country's salvation came.

He came, and thenceforth all was clear. Simple in speech, plain in manner, straightforward in action, tender as a child, fearless as a hero, humble and lowly, he came to speak and to act. Born of southern parents and reared in the broad prairies of the West, whose very winds sang liberty, he realized the curse of bondage and the blessing of freedom. From the unfelled forest, from the log cabin and the country store, from humble forum and obscure dwelling, from out the ranks of the people, the Great Captain came. He came, and statesmen paused and wondered; he spoke, and a nation hearkened to his counsel.

Devoted to truth and the right, opposed to falsehood and the wrong; scorning the tricks and subterfuges of the self-seeking, and abhorring the mean and base; loving his country with a devotion that made him forgetful of all else save the preservation of the Union, the incomparable leader rose. In judicial tribunal and hall of State, in capital and village, in stately mansion and log hut, bewildered men listened to his words and saw, as they had never seen before, the darkness, the light, and the path; the wrong, the right, and the remedy.

Who was this man that came unheralded out of the West? Who was this man that rose above great statesmen of his day—who was as earnest as Phillips, as gifted as Baker, more profound than Seward, more wise than Chase, more logical than Douglas, more eloquent than Everett?

Who was this man that combined in one soul the simplicity of a child, the wisdom of a sage, and the foresight of a prophet?

Wheresoever among men there is a love for disinterested patriotism and sublime attachment to duty, wheresoever liberty is worshipped and loyalty exalted his name, his life, his deeds are known. To-day his image is in all hearts, his name is on all lips. That humble, loving, forgiving, sublime man was the rail splitter of Illinois—sainted and immortal Abraham Lincoln—Abraham Lincoln, child of poverty, champion of freedom, savior of the Union.

Rejoice and give thanks to God. The dark hour of brotherly estrangement is gone forever. The Constitution of Washington and Jackson remains. The Union, strong and great, endures. The "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" did not perish. The sons of America march all one way.

And for all these blessings we stand to-day beneath the one and only banner of the loyal heart to pay the tribute of our veneration and gratitude and love to Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I deem it very appropriate on this occasion to read a few lines written by Mr. George Sanford Holmes:

IN BROODING BRONZE—A LINCOLN DAY VERSE

By George Sanford Holmes

He dreams in brooding bronze; it almost seems
A word, a touch, would kindle into flame
The spark of life in that gaunt metal frame
And light those somber eyes with living gleams.

Yet as he patient vigil keeps and dreams
Deep in the shrine erected to his fame,
Glib tongues invoke the magic of his name
To purge a party and promote its schemes.

Oh, wake, immortal heart, and breathe again
Thy pulse of mercy into lesser men!
That pulse that beat in anguish for the slave,
That gave its own lifeblood to heal and save!—
And shame those hollow hearts that praise thee dead
And praising, would deny they people bread!

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of the States of Delaware and New Jersey, praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KEAN presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE
OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
Senate of New Jersey.

Senate Concurrent Resolution. (Introduced and adopted by the senate February 2, 1931, and concurred in by the house of assembly February 2, 1931, memorializing Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to carry out the training of the Organized Reserve for the fiscal year 1932)

Whereas the platforms of the two great political parties of this Nation advocate the maintenance of an adequate system of national defense; and

Whereas the people of New Jersey have ever been in the front rank when the safety of this Nation has been endangered; and

Whereas the Organized Reserve will, in case of a national emergency, constitute by far the largest component of the Army of the United States, and should, therefore, receive proper training and equipment; and

Whereas the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, a patriotic body of citizens of whom the great majority have had active service in the Army of the United States during the late war, have requested the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient funds to carry out the training of the Organized Reserve for the fiscal year 1931: Then be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the House of Assembly concurring), That the Congress be, and it hereby is, requested to appropriate sufficient funds to carry out the provisions of the national defense act of 1920 and its accompanying legislation, so that the program of the War Department may be effectively carried out; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby instructed to forward certified copies of this resolution, signed by the president and secretary of the senate and the speaker and clerk of the house to the following: The President of the United States, the United States Senate, the House of Representatives, the Senators and Members of Congress from the State of New Jersey.

JOSEPH GRADEY,
President of Senate.
R. S. WISE,
Speaker House of Assembly.

I hereby certify that the above is a true and official copy of the resolution adopted by the senate on February 2, 1931, and concurred in by the house of assembly February 2, 1931.

O. F. VAN CAMP,
Secretary of the Senate.
FREDK. A. PRODESSER,
Clerk House of Assembly.

Mr. PARTRIDGE presented petitions numerously signed by sundry citizens of the State of Vermont, praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DENEEN presented resolutions adopted by the city council of the city of Chicago, Ill., favoring the immediate payment of the full face value of adjusted-service certificates of ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BROOKHART presented resolutions adopted by members of Bob Tribby Post, No. 58, of the Iowa Department, the American Legion, at Mount Pleasant, Iowa, favoring the immediate payment in cash of adjusted-service certificates of ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Building Trades Council of Sioux City, Iowa, favoring the selection by the Post Office Department of a half block of ground in Sioux City for a building site and for the starting of construction of a new post-office building at the earliest possible date, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented the petition of Rev. R. J. Cornell and sundry other citizens of Hawarden, Iowa, praying for the passage of the so-called Sparks-Capper stop alien representation amendment, and also the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution excluding approximately 7,500,000 unnaturalized aliens from the count of the population of the Nation for apportionment of congressional districts among the States, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington (House Joint Memorial No. 2) favoring the early construction of a highway on the Quinault Indian Reservation, Wash., which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs. (See joint memorial printed in full when presented by Mr. DILL on February 10, 1931, pp. 4506–4507 of the RECORD.)

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TACOMA, WASH., *February 12, 1931.*

Senator W. L. JONES,
Washington, D. C.:

We protest the passage Senate bill 4582, amending tariff act and penal code and permitting importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments. Print our protest in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CATHOLIC WOMEN'S CLUB.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented letters in the nature of memorials from the National Council of Catholic Women, Diocese of Galveston, and the Altar and Rosary Society of St. Mary's Church, of Austin, in the State of Texas, remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill 4582, permitting the importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CONNALLY presented letters in the nature of memorials from the Catholic Women's Study Club, the Altar and Rosary Society, of St. Mary's Church, and the Catholic Home Mission Guild, all of Austin, Tex., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Gillett bill, being the bill (S. 4582) to amend section 305 (a) of the tariff act of 1922, as amended, and sections 211, 245, and 312 of the Criminal Code, as amended, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HEBERT presented a letter in the nature of a memorial, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EAST GREENWICH, R. I., *February 9, 1931.*

Senator FELIX HEBERT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In behalf of my circle, which consists of 107 members, I wish to protest against the statement concerning Senate bill 4582, to amend tariff act (1930), and Penal Code to permit importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments.

We believe if this bill were passed that it would be detrimental to the public health and morals, especially of our young people, and result in an increase in obscenity and pornography should the present Federal restriction be removed.

We request that this protest be recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanking you in advance, we are yours very truly,

MERCY CIRCLE No. 154, DAUGHTERS OF ISABELLA,
MILDRED A. DU BOIS, *Secretary.*

(I have written to Hon. FREDERICK GILLETT requesting that our protest be embodied in the report of the hearing.)

Mr. WATERMAN presented letters in the nature of memorials, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. CHARLES W. WATERMAN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR SIR: The Good Shepherd Aid Society, of Denver, Colo., protest the passage of the Senate bill 4582, to amend tariff act (1930), and Penal Code to permit importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments. The aid, numbering 250 members, request that their protest be printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,

MARGARET A. LEARY,
President Good Shepherd Aid Society.

FEBRUARY 9, 1931.

CATHOLIC DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA,
COURT ST. RITA, NO. 625,
Denver, Colo., February 7, 1931.

Hon. C. W. WATERMAN,
Senate Office Building, Washington.

DEAR SIR: In the name of St. Rita's Court, Catholic Daughters of America, a local organization of nearly 600 members, I protest most emphatically the passage of Senate bill No. 4582, providing for the amendment of the tariff act and penal code. Should present Federal restrictions be removed, we believe it would result in great danger to public health and morals; also be an added burden on State authorities. We request that this protest be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully,

ROSE M. HAGUS,
Grand Regent St. Rita's Court,
Catholic Daughters of America.

Mr. WAGNER presented telegrams and letters, in the nature of memorials, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALBANY, N. Y., *February 12, 1931.*

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The executive committee of the Catholic Women's Service League, representing a membership of 400 women, hereby petition you to oppose Senate bill 4582, which advocates the promulgation of birth-control policies, to which we are unalterably opposed. We also request that our objection be duly recorded in the RECORD.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. ELMER NEUMANN,
President.
Mrs. BENJAMIN MULDERRY,
Vice President.
Mrs. ANTHONY BRADY FARRELL,
Second Vice President.
Mrs. HARRY YOUNG,
Secretary.
Mrs. LOUIS ALBERS,
Corresponding Secretary.
Mrs. JAMES GLAVIN,
Treasurer.

ONEONTA, N. Y., *February 12, 1931.*

Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Court Regina, No. 217, of the Catholic Daughters of America, protest the Senate bill 4582, to amend tariff act and penal code. Please record our protest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ELIZABETH A. LAREAU,
Grand Regent.

HUDSON, N. Y., *February 11, 1931.*

Hon. ROBERT WAGNER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Court Columbia 248, Catholic Daughters of America, protest against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, etc., of contraceptive articles, as creating danger to public morals and health, especially of our young people, and as tending to increase obscenity if present Federal restrictions are removed. Please include our protest in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ELIZABETH L. SPANBURGH.

FORT EDWARD, N. Y., *February 11, 1931.*

Hon. ROBERT WAGNER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

In the name of public health, morality, and safety of rising generation, we protest against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments. We urge emphatically that you take negative stand on this bill. We request also this protest be embodied in report of hearing, also printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HOLY NAME SOCIETY, ST. JOSEPHS CHURCH,
WILLIAM ARTHUR, *President.*
ROSARY SOCIETY, ST. JOSEPHS CHURCH,
MISS FLORENCE POWERS, *President.*
FORT EDWARD COUNCIL, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
ARTHUR DUFFY, *Grand Knight.*

HERKIMER, N. Y., *February 10, 1931.*

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The attention of the Knights of Columbus Auxiliary, with a membership of 150 women, has been called to a bill introduced last May by Senator GILLETT, of Massachusetts, which has as its purpose the amendment of the Criminal Code and the tariff act, so that literature and material for use in contraception or artificial birth control could be imported into and distributed throughout the country.

We are furher advised of a public hearing proposed to be had on the 13th day of February, 1931, before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

As citizens of the Nation, we feel it our duty to express ourselves in this vital matter as being utterly opposed to the aforesaid amendment, and take this opportunity to formally enter our protest to the passage thereof, on the ground that any such legislation should endanger the public health and morals, especially of our young people, and would increase the obscenity and pornography of the Nation and would tend to destroy the long-standing traditions of good living.

In view of our inability to attend the public hearing on February 13, we therefore ask, as constituents residing in the thirty-third congressional, that you strenuously oppose the passage of the aforesaid amendment when the same reaches your House for disposition and request that this protest be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS AUXILIARY OF HERKIMER, N. Y.,
MARY M. HARRIS, *President.*

HERKIMER, N. Y., *February 10, 1931.*

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The attention of Court Halpin Catholic Daughters of America, with a membership of 90 women, has been called to a bill introduced last May by Senator GILLETT, of Massachusetts, which has for its purpose the amendment of the Criminal Code and tariff act so that literature and material for use in contraception or artificial birth control could be imported into and distributed throughout the country.

We are further advised of a public hearing proposed to be had on the 13th day of February, 1931, before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

As citizens of the Nation we feel it our duty to express ourselves in this vital matter as being utterly opposed to the aforesaid amendment, and take this opportunity to formally enter our protest to the passage thereof, on the ground that any such legislation should seriously endanger public health and morals, especially of our young people, and would increase the obscenity and pornography of the Nation and would tend to destroy the long-standing traditions of good living.

In view of our inability to attend the public hearing on February 13 we therefore ask, as constituents residing in the thirty-third congressional, that you strenuously oppose the passage of the aforesaid amendment when the same reaches your House for disposition, and request that this protest be printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,

EVA D. ALLEN,
Vice Regent, Court Halpin, Catholic Daughters of America.

FEBRUARY 10, 1931.

Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLETT,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

MY DEAR SENATOR: As corresponding secretary of the Catholic Women's Service League of the City of Troy, N. Y., composed of upward of 500 members, I have been duly instructed to present to you our earnest and sincere protest against enactment of your Senate bill No. 4582, for the amendment of the tariff act and Criminal Code.

We sincerely believe that passage of this bill would vitally affect the right standards of public morality and would very seriously tend to destroy traditions of our country. The proposed legislation presents great dangers to our public health and morals, more especially of our young people, and would undoubtedly increase obscenity and pornography.

We understand that the Voluntary Parenthood League drafted this bill and that you introduced it at their request. We believe this type of legislation to be vicious. No State legislature has attempted any such bill and we therefore trust that you will withdraw your support from a bill for which there is no popular demand.

We earnestly request, Senator GILLETT, that this protest be embodied in the report of the hearing to be held February 13.

Very respectfully yours,

MARY BUSHONG O'CONNOR,
(Mrs. Gerald W. O'Connor),
Corresponding Secretary.

Mr. COPELAND presented telegrams and letters in the nature of memorials, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARTHAGE, N. Y., *February 12, 1931.*

Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND:

We, the Ave Maria Circle, Daughters of Isabella, of Carthage, N. Y., wish to have you put in a protest for us against the amendment Senator GILLETT is trying to put through Friday, 13th, on appliance for birth control. Please answer.

MRS. E. J. CROWLEY,
834 West End Avenue, Carthage, N. Y.

ALBANY, N. Y., *February 12, 1931.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Catholic Daughters Court San Salvador, No. 146, protests in name of public health and morality and safety of rising generation against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, sale contraceptive literature and instruments. Earnestly urge you to take this matter in hand and represent unanimous opinion of our society. Further request this protest be embodied in report of hearing; also printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MRS. ANNA L. HAYFORD,
Grand Regent President.

ALBANY, N. Y., *February 12, 1931.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Newman Club Auxiliary protests in name of public health, morality, and safety of rising generation against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, sale contraceptive literature and instruments. Earnestly urge you to take this matter in hand and represent unanimous opinion of our society. Further request this protest be embodied in report of hearing; also printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ELIZABETH B. CAREY, *President.*

ALBANY, N. Y., *February 11, 1931.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

St. Peters Alumnae Nurses' Association protests in name of public health and morality and safety of rising generation against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, sale contraceptive literature and instruments. Earnestly urge you to take this matter in hand and represent unanimous opinion of our society. Further request this protest be embodied in report of hearing; also printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STATIA H. FREEL.

ALBANY, N. Y., *February 11, 1931.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Albany Women's Unit Catholic Parishes protests in name of public health and morality and safety of rising generation against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, sale contraceptive literature and instruments. Earnestly urge you to take this matter in hand and represent unanimous opinion of our society. Further request this protest be embodied in report of hearing; also printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MARY B. CAREY, *President.*

ALBANY, N. Y., *February 11, 1931.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Guild of the Little Flower protests in name of public health and morality and safety of rising generation against Senate bill 4582 permitting importation, distribution, sale contraceptive literature

and instruments. Earnestly urge you to take this matter in hand and represent unanimous opinion of our society. Further request this protest be embodied in report of hearing; also printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MRS. ANNA M. DUGAN.

ALBANY, N. Y., *February 11, 1931.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Thirty-five thousand members New York State Catholic Daughters of America protest in name of public health, morality, and safety of rising generation against Senate bill 4582 permitting importation, distribution, sale contraceptive literature and instruments. Earnestly urge you take this matter in hand and represent unanimous opinion of our organization. Further request this protest be embodied in report of hearing; also printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MARGARET M. RYAN,
Chairman New York State Legislative Committee Catholic Daughters of America.

ALBANY, N. Y., *February 11, 1931.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Children of Mary Sacred Heart Convent protests in name of public health and morality and safety of rising generation against Senate bill 4582 permitting importation, distribution, sale contraceptive literature and instruments. Ernestly urge you to take this matter in hand and represent unanimous opinion of our society. Further request this protest be embodied in report of hearing; also printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MRS. ROBERT COUGHLIN, *President.*

ALBANY, N. Y., *February 11, 1931.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Kenwood Alumnæ protests in name of public health and morality and safety of rising generation against Senate bill 4582 permitting importation, distribution, sale contraceptive literature and instruments. Earnestly urge you to take this matter in hand and represent unanimous opinion of our society. Further request this protest be embodied in report of hearing; also printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MRS. CHARLES M. S. MART, *President.*

ALBANY, N. Y., *February 11, 1931.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

St. Monicas Circle protests in name of public health and morality and safety of rising generation against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, sale contraceptive literature and instruments. Earnestly urge you to take this matter in hand and represent unanimous opinion of our society. Further request this protest be embodied in report of hearing, also printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MRS. SARA BURGESS, *President.*

HUDSON, N. Y., *February 11, 1931.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Court Columbia 248, Catholic Daughters of America, protest against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, etc., of contraceptive articles as creating danger to public morals and health, especially of our young people, and as tending to increase obscenity if present Federal restrictions are removed. Please include our protest in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ELIZABETH L. SPANBURGH.

FORT EDWARD, N. Y., *February 11, 1931.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

In the name of public health, morality, and safety of rising generation we protest against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, sale of contraceptive literature and instruments. We urge emphatically that you take negative stand on this bill. We request also this protest be embodied in report of hearing, also printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HOLY NAME SOCIETY, ST. JOSEPHS CHURCH,
WILLIAM ARTHUR, *President.*
ROSARY SOCIETY, ST. JOSEPHS CHURCH,
MISS FLORENCE POWERS, *President.*
FORT EDWARD COUNCIL, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
ARTHUR DUFFY, *Grand Knight.*

ALBANY, N. Y., *February 11, 1931.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Court Mary Regis 638, Catholic Daughters of America, protests in name of public health and morality and safety of rising generation against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, sale contraceptive literature and instruments. Earnestly urge you to take this matter in hand and represent unanimous opinion of 700 membership. Further request this protest be embodied in report of hearing, also printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CLARA A. KIRSCH, *Grand Regent.*

ONEONTA, N. Y., *February 12, 1931.*

Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Court Regina, No. 217, of the Catholic Daughters of America, protest the Senate bill 4582, to amend tariff act and penal code. Please record our protest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ELIZABETH A. LAREAU, *Grand Regent.*

ALBANY N. Y., *February 12, 1931.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The executive committee of the Catholic Women's Service League, representing a membership of 400 women, hereby petition you to oppose Senate bill 4582, which advocates the promulgation of birth-control policies, to which we are unalterably opposed. We also request that our objection be duly recorded in the RECORD.

Yours respectfully,

MRS. ELMER NEUMANN, *President.*
MRS. BENJAMIN MULDERRY, *First Vice President.*
MRS. ANTHONY BRADY FARRELL, *Second Vice President.*
MRS. HARRY YOUNG, *Secretary.*
MRS. LOUIS ALBERS, *Corresponding Secretary.*
MRS. JAMES GLAVIN, *Treasurer.*

ALBANY, N. Y., *February 12, 1931.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Newman Club Auxiliary protests in name of public health and morality and safety of rising generation against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, sale contraceptive literature and instruments. Earnestly urge you to take this matter in hand and represent unanimous opinion of our society. Further request this protest be embodied in report of hearing; also printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ELIZABETH B. CAREY, *President.*

NATIONAL CIRCLE, DAUGHTERS OF ISABELLA,
New Haven, Conn.

To the UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM NEW YORK STATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The State Circle of the National Circle, Daughters of Isabella, in session in Utica, December 18, adopted a resolution against the proposed amendment to the tariff act (1930) and the penal code, known as S. 4582, for the following reasons:

It will mean great danger to the public health and morals, especially of our young people, and will increase obscenity and pornography. Also, an added burden will be placed on the State authorities, where State laws now forbid the use and sale of contraceptives, in seeking to meet the increased traffic in these articles, as well as in information and advertisements, and the spread of immoral literature generally, which must certainly follow. Please embody our protest in the report hearing.

Thanking you for any efforts you may make against so pernicious a measure, I am,

ANNA R. MANNIGAN, *State Regent.*

HERKIMER, N. Y., *February 10, 1931.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The attention of Court Halpin, Catholic Daughters of America, with a membership of 90 women, has been called to a bill introduced last May by Senator GILLETT, of Massachusetts, which has for its purpose the amendment of the Criminal Code and the tariff act, so that literature and material for use in contraception or artificial birth control could be imported into and distributed throughout the country.

We are further advised of a public hearing proposed to be had on the 13th day of February, 1931, before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

As citizens of the Nation, we feel it our duty to express ourselves in this vital matter as being utterly opposed to the aforesaid amendment, and take this opportunity to formally enter our protest to the passage thereof on the ground that any such legislation would seriously endanger the public health and morals, especially of our young people, and would increase the obscenity and pornography of the Nation, and would tend to destroy the long-standing traditions of good living.

In view of our inability to attend the public hearing on February 13, we therefore, as constituents living in the thirty-third congressional, ask that you strenuously oppose the passage of the aforesaid amendment when the same reaches your House for disposition, and request that this protest be printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,

EVA D. ALLEN,
Vice Regent, Court Halpin, Catholic Daughters of America.

HERKIMER, N. Y., *February 10, 1931.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building. Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The attention of the Knights of Columbus Auxiliary, with a membership of 150 women, has been called to a bill introduced last May by Senator GILLETT, of Massachusetts, which has for its purpose the amendment of the Criminal Code and tariff act, so that literature and material for use in contraception or artificial birth control could be imported into and distributed throughout the country.

We are further advised of a public hearing proposed to be had on the 13th day of February, 1931, before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

As citizens of the Nation, we feel it our duty to express ourselves in this vital matter as being utterly opposed to the aforesaid amendment, and take this opportunity to formally enter our protest to the passage thereof on the ground that any such legislation would seriously endanger public health and morals, especially of our young people, and would increase the obscenity and pornography of the Nation, and would tend to destroy the long-standing traditions of good living.

In view of our inability to attend the public hearing on February 13, we therefore ask,tas constituents residing in the thirty-third congressional, that you strenuously oppose the passage of the aforesaid amendment when the same reaches your House for disposition, and request that this protest be printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS AUXILIARY OF HERKIMER, N. Y.,
MARY M. HARRIS, *President.*

PAYMENT OF ADJUSTED-COMPENSATION CERTIFICATES

Mr. HEBERT presented a resolution adopted by the City Council of Providence, R. I., which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CITY OF PROVIDENCE.

Joint resolution of the city council, No. 24, approved February 7, 1931

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Providence hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the immediate payment of the face value of adjusted-compensation certificates to veterans of the World War.

That the city clerk is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Rhode Island Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

A true copy.
Attest:
[SEAL.] RAYMOND P. MCELROY, *City Clerk.*

Mr. HEBERT also presented resolutions adopted by the North Kingstown Chamber of Commerce, of North Kingstown, R. I., which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted by North Kingstown Chamber of Commerce, North Kingstown, R. I., February 4, 1931

Whereas the Congress of the United States has before it for consideration proposed measure providing for the immediate payment of the face value of the veterans' adjusted-service certificates at a cost of approximately $3,400,000,000; and

Whereas the possibility of the passage by the Congress of any of these measures is a matter of deepest concern to the entire Nation because of its far-reaching and adverse effect on the business recovery so much hoped for and on the solution of the problem of unemployment, necessarily affecting not only all industry and every branch of business endeavor, but also the great population of these United States, both collectively and individually; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon business organizations generally to voice unequivocally a definite expression of opinion on all matters of such vital concern, but without any participation in the political considerations which too often become a serious influence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Providence Chamber of Commerce respectfully urges the Congress to reject any proposals to alter the intent and purposes which caused the issuance of the veterans' adjusted-service certificates, and desires to be placed on record as vigorously opposed to the projected plan of cashing these certificates, for the reasons that the plan is unwise in principle and that any such enormous expenditure of public funds at this time as such plan involves would undermine the integrity of our financial and economic structure and would only further demoralize conditions that are already chaotic: And be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be immediately forwarded to the Members of Congress representing Rhode Island with the urgent request that they strenuously oppose the passage of any such legislation and that trade organizations generally be urged to take a definite position on the proposed matter and promptly inform their representatives in Congress.

THE OIL INDUSTRY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have just received a telegram from Governor Woodring, of Kansas, which portrays the dire emergency in which the independent oil producers of Kansas are placed through the lack of protection against imports of cheaply produced foreign petroleum and petroleum products. In his message Governor Woodring points out the necessity that if relief is to be afforded it should come speedily. I ask that the clerk read the telegram from Governor Woodring and that it lie on the table.

There being no objection, the legislative clerk read as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., *February 11, 1931.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Kansas is vitally interested in the passage of the Capper bill for the relief of the American oil industry. Immediate action is of the highest importance. The present crisis is an emergency in the mid-continent field, and relief to be effective should be given us at a time when the life or death of the industry is at stake. The situation in southeastern Kansas has been the most deplorable in its history. We have a temporary solution in the agreement of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana to take the output for a period of two months, but this is only temporary and the menace of destruction still exists because of the situation as it pertains to foreign oil. Not only are the producers threatened with ruin and their wells menaced with complete destruction but thousands of workmen are affected and thrown out of employment. This dire situation which extends to a large section of the State demands immediate relief. The Kansas oil industry should be given an opportunity to survive and should not be paralyzed by unfair competition from Venezuela and other foreign countries. If conservation through proration of this great natural resource is to continue, our Federal Government must back up the plan by an embargo or tariff on the importation of foreign oil and assist us rather than tend to defeat our purpose by permitting the importation of the foreign product. Kansas believes the passage of the Capper bill will afford the imperatively needed relief.

HARRY H. WOODRING, *Governor.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegram will lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

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

S. 314. An act relating to the payment of advance wages and allotments in respect of seamen on foreign vessels, and making further provision for carrying out the purposes of the seamen's act, approved March 4, 1915 (Rept. No. 1583); and

H. R. 10017. An act to provide for a survey of the Mouse River, N. Dak., with a view to the prevention and control of its floods (Rept. No. 1585).

Mr. PINE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5979) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine certain claims of the Eastern Emigrant and Western Cherokee Indians of Oklahoma and North Carolina, reported it without amendment.

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

S. 6005. An act authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Scappoose Bay, Columbia River, Oreg. (Rept. No. 1586);

S. 6113. An act for the relief of James M. Griffin, disbursing agent, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1587);

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 (Rept. No. 1588); and

H. R. 12284. An act to provide for the construction of vessels for the Coast Guard for rescue and assistance work on Lake Erie (Rept. No. 1589).

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

S. 5033. An act to authorize an appropriation of tribal funds to purchase certain privately owned lands within the Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz. (Rept. No. 1590);

S. 6011. An act 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 (Rept. No. 1591);

H. R. 15064. An act to reserve 440 acres of public-domain land for addition to the Temecula or Pechanga Reservation, Calif. (Rept. No. 1592); and

H. R. 15267. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the cancellation, under certain conditions, of patents in fee simple to Indians for allotments held in trust by the United States (Rept. No. 1595).

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

S. 4391. An act for the relief of John Herink (Rept. No. 1593); and

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider, adjust, and settle the claim of the Indiana State Militia for military service on the Mexican border (Rept. No. 1594).

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 5833) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the further development of agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benfits of the act entitled 'An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts,' approved July 2, 1862, and all acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," approved May 22, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 7, secs. 343a, 343b), reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1596) thereon.

Mr. FESS (for Mr. KEYES), from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 5756. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to exchange with the Rosslyn Connecting Railroad Co. lands on the Virginia shore of the Potomac River near the west end of the Arlington Memorial Bridge (Rept. No. 1599);

S. 5989. An act to authorize the acquisition of additional land for enlarging the Capitol Grounds (Rept. No. 1597); and

H. R. 10652. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to purchase land and to construct buildings and facilities suitable for radio-research investigations (Rept. No. 1598).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS

As in executive session,

Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably the nominations of sundry officers in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which were placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. KING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Nathan Cayton, of the District of Columbia, to be a judge of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, which was placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HEBERT, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of James H. Hammons, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal, eastern district of Kentucky, which was placed on the Executive Calendar.

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

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. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 6139) for the relief of Lyman L. Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 6140) to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Lansing, Iowa; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 6141) for the relief of Stanley A. Jerman, receiver for A. J. Peters Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 6142) authorizing an appropriation for the construction of roads and bridges in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 6143) granting a pension to Bill H. D. Wing (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GEORGE:

A bill (S. 6144) for the relief of Dr. Jefferson Wilcox; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEAN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 251) to authorize the United States Shipping Board to sell to the Port of New York Authority certain property of the United States situated in the city of Hoboken, N. J. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BORAH:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 252) authorizing an appropriation for the expenses of the arbitration of the claim of George J. Salem against the Government of Egypt; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

JOHN JOSEPH AMES

On motion of Mr. COPELAND, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 6055) for the relief of John Joseph Ames, and it was referred to the Committee on Claims.

COLVILLE RESERVATION (WASH.) PUBLIC SCHOOL

Mr. DILL. On Tuesday night the bill (H. R. 11675) to authorize the issuance of a patent in fee for certain land and buildings within the Colville Reservation, Wash., for public-school use was passed. I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). The motion to reconsider will be entered.

Mr. DILL. I also move that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

MORTGAGE AND REAL-ESTATE TRANSACTIONS IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. BROOKHART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 447), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution No. 58, agreed to June 4, 1929, authorizing and directing the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, to investigate securities, mortgage and real-estate transactions, and the laws relating thereto in the District of Columbia, and Senate Resolution No. 339, agreed to December 3, 1930, giving said committee authority to expend $7,500 from the contingent fund of the Senate in addition to the amount theretofore authorized for said purposes, are hereby continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-second Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 5768) authorizing the cities of Omaha, Nebr., and Council Bluffs, Iowa, and the counties of Douglas, Nebr., and Pottawattamie, Iowa, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll or free bridge across the Missouri River at or near O'Hern Street, South Omaha, Nebr.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 16913) to amend the act entitled "An act to extend the provisions of certain laws to the Territory of Hawaii," approved March 10, 1924, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 5768. An act authorizing the cities of Omaha, Nebr., and Council Bluffs, Iowa, and the counties of Douglas, Nebr., and Pottawattamie, Iowa, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll or free bridge across the Missouri River at or near O'Hern Street, South Omaha, Nebr.;

H. R. 101. An act for the award of the air mail flyer's medal of honor;

H. R. 252. An act to facilitate work of the Department of Agriculture in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 397. An act for the relief of Lowell G. Fuller;

H. R. 465. An act for the relief of John H. Lawler;

H. R. 474. An act for the relief of Samuel B. Faulkner;

H. R. 477. An act for the relief of Harry Hamlin;

H. R. 542. An act for the relief of Chancy L. McIntyre;

H. R. 1408. An act to provide for the study, investigation, and survey, for commemorative purposes, of the Bull Run and Second Manassas battlefields in the State of Virginia;

H. R. 1594. An act for the relief of John W. Leich, alias John Leach;

H. R. 1612. An act for the relief of Angenora Hines;

H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Robert E. Beck, otherwise known as Rudolph E. Beck and Harry J. Brown;

H. R. 1884. An act for the relief of Charles F. Reilly;

H. R. 1966. An act for the relief of Martha J. Tonguet;

H. R. 2312. An act for the relief of Arthur W. Taylor;

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Leo B. Thome;

H. R. 2458. An act for the relief of Darold Brundige;

H. R. 2887. An act for the relief of Mildred L. Williams;

H. R. 3428. An act for the relief of Rebecca E. Olmsted;

H. R. 3935. An act for the relief of Eugenia A. Helston;

H. R. 5787. An act for the relief of Carlton Olin, otherwise known as Stephen Cebra;

H. R. 5902. An act for the relief of S. W. Greer;

H. R. 6193. An act for the relief of Sidney Morris Hopkins;

H. R. 6194. An act granting six months' pay to Arthur G. Caswell;

H. R. 6197. An act for the relief of William Befuhs (deceased), otherwise known as Charles Cameron;

H. R. 6544. An act for the relief of Francis J. Moore;

H. R. 6586. An act providing for the confirmation of the title of certain purchasers from the State of Louisiana of lands formerly included in the Live Oak naval reserve on Navy Commissioners Island, in St. Mary Parish, La., now abandoned;

H. R. 6603. An act to provide a shorter work week for postal employees, and for other purposes;

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. 6997. An act to confer to certain persons who served in the Quartermaster Corps or under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General during the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition the benefits of hospitalization and the privileges of the soldiers' homes;

H. R. 8253. An act for the relief of Sterling S. Ball;

H. R. 8290. An act to authorize and direct a preliminary examination of the Mohican River Ditch from Lake Fork, Ohio, south a distance of 8 miles;

H. R. 8936. An act authorizing the promotion on the retired list of the Navy of Stuart L. Johnson, ensign;

H. R. 9205. An act for the relief of Julian E. Gillespie;

H. R. 9934. An act providing for the sale of timberland in four townships in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 9987. An act to provide for the relinquishment by the United States of certain lands to the city of Rupert in the county of Minidoka, in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 10365. An act for the relief of Tracy Lee Phillips;

H. R. 10380. An act adjusting the salaries of the Naval Academy Band;

H. R. 11132. An act for the relief of Edward Knight;

H. R. 11281. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 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;

H. R. 11285. An act to amend the Alaska game law;

H. R. 11564. An act to reimburse William Whitright for expenses incurred as an authorized delegate of the Fort Peck Indians;

H. R. 11565. An act to reimburse Charles Thompson for expenses incurred as an authorized delegate of the Fort Peck Indians;

H. R. 11967. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Illinois;

H. R. 12014. An act to permit payments for the operation of motor cycles and automobiles used for necessary travel on official business, on a mileage basis in lieu of actual operating expenses;

H. R. 12023. An act to repeal the provision of law granting a pension to Lois Cramton;

H. R. 12037. An act authorizing the payment of a claim presented by the Polish Government for the reimbursement of certain expenditures incurred by the community authorities of Rzeczyczany, Poland, to which place an insane alien was erroneously deported;

H. R. 12067. An act for compensation to the owners of the Danish motor ship *Indien* for damages sustained as the result of a collision with the United States Coast Guard cutter *Shawnee* at San Francisco on April 5, 1925;

H. R. 12350. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Michigan;

H. R. 12697. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the United States and the State of Utah;

H. R. 12835. An act authorizing the use of tribal funds of Indians belonging on the Klamath Reservation, Oreg., to pay expenses connected with suits pending in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12871. An act providing for the sale of isolated tracts in the former Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.;

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. 13053. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept donations to or in behalf of institutions conducted for the benefit of Indians;

H. R. 13160. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Rosenberg Library, in the city of Galveston, Tex., the silver service presented to the United States for the cruiser *Galveston;*

H. R. 13249. An act to authorize the acceptance of a tract of land adjoining Hot Springs National Park, Ark., and for other purposes;

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. 13293. An act 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;

H. R. 13528. An act providing for payment of $25 to each enrolled Chippewa Indian of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 13547. An act to safeguard the validity of permits to use recreational areas in the San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests;

H. R. 13584. An act to amend an act approved May 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 555), entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims";

H. R. 13587. An act to amend the act of April 25, 1922, as amended, entitled "An act authorizing extensions of time for the payment of purchase money due under certain homestead entries and Government-land purchases within the former Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations, N. Dak. and S. Dak.";

H. R. 14056. An act to amend the act approved March 2, 1929, entitled "An act to authorize the disposition of unplatted portions of Government town sites on irrigation projects under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902, and for other purposes";

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. 15590. An act providing for the sale of Chippewa Indian land to the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 15601. An act 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;

H. R. 15766. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to maintain and operate, as constructed, a free highway bridge across Saline River near Kingsland, Ark., on State Highway No. 3, from Pine Bluff to Fordyce, Ark.;

H. R. 15772. An act to amend section 3 of the act approved May 10, 1928, entitled "An act to extend the period of restriction in lands of certain members of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes";

H. R. 15867. An act to provide for the retention by the United States of a site within the Hot Springs National Park formerly occupied by the Arlington Hotel and Bathhouse, for park and landscape purposes;

H. R. 15876. An act to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes;

H. R. 15987. An act to authorize the President of the United States to establish the Canyon de Chelly National Monument within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.;

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. 16479. An act to authorize the widening of Piney Branch Road NW., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 299. Joint resolution to provide an annual appropriation to meet the quota of the United States toward the expenses of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts.

ENROLLED BILL

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 11675) to authorize the issuance of a patent in fee for certain land and buildings within the Colville Reservation, Wash., for public-school use.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 16913) to amend the act entitled "An act to extend the provisions of certain laws to the Territory of Hawaii," approved March 10, 1924, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. PARTRIDGE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on to-day, February 12, 1931, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 5768) authorizing the cities of Omaha, Nebr., and Council Bluffs, Iowa, and the counties of Douglas, Nebr., and Pottawattamie, Iowa, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll or free bridge across the Missouri River at or near O'Hern Street, South Omaha, Nebr.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

Messages from the President of the United States making sundry nominations were referred to the appropriate committees.

INTERNATIONAL LOAD-LINE CONVENTION AND FINAL PROTOCOL (EXECUTIVE I, SEVENTY-FIRST CONGRESS, THIRD SESSION)

The VICE PRESIDENT land before the Senate a message from the President of the United States transmitting a certified copy of the international load-line convention and its accompanying final protocol, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to be printed.

Mr. BORAH. I move that the injunction of secrecy be removed and that the message and accompanying documents be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

The message of the President was read, as follows:

To the Senate:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification of the international load-line convention and its accompanying final protocol I transmit herewith a certified copy of those instruments, signed on July 5, 1930, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and of 29 other governments participating in the international load-line conference which met at London on May 20, 1930, for the purpose of formulating international rules and regulations to determine the load lines of merchant vessels engaged in international trade.

The convention and protocol are accompanied by the final act of the conference signed at the same time, which I transmit for the information of the Senate. This act embraces a declaration by the delegates of the United States of America and certain recommendations of the conference. The declaration made by the delegates of the United States is designed as a safeguard against any possible misconstruction of the position of the United States that its participation in a multilateral convention with the régime now functioning in Russia known as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not operate as a recognition of that régime by the Government of the United States.

I also transmit an accompanying report on the convention submitted by the Secretary of State.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 11, 1931.*

The accompanying communication from the Secretary of State is as follows:

The PRESIDENT:

In pursuance of the joint resolution (Public, No. 69, 71st Cong.) approved May 9, 1930, providing for participation by the United States in the International Conference on Load Lines, delegates with plenary powers were appointed by the President to represent the United States at an international conference which convened in London on May 20, 1930, for the purpose of formulating international rules and regulations for determining the load lines of merchant vessels engaged in international trade. The conference closed its sessions on July 5, 1930, on which day the international load-line convention and an accompanying final protocol and a

final act of the conference were signed by the respective plenipotentiaries of the United States of America, Germany, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Denmark, Free City of Danzig, Spain, Irish Free State, Finland, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Greece, India, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Norway, New Zealand, Netherlands, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The convention will become effective on July 1, 1932, among those Governments which ratify it by that date, provided five such ratifications shall have been deposited.

The Secretary of Commerce and the United States Shipping Board have approved the convention and have recommended its submission to the Senate. Sharing in this approval, the undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay the said convention and final protocol before the President and to recommend their transmission to the Senate with a view to receiving the advice and consent of that body to ratification. The final act of the conference is submitted for your information and the information of the Senate.

The convention applies to all ships of 150 gross tons and over engaged in international trade, although the act of Congress to establish load lines for American vessels, approved March 2, 1929, and effective September 2, 1930 (45 Stat., pt. 1, p. 1492), applies only to vessels of 250 gross tons or over. Many of the countries represented require loan lines for all seagoing vessels engaged in international trade, while there was no other country whose tonnage limit was as high as that of the United States. The delegates of the United States agreed to this lower limit as a compromise. They felt that this limit would not materially affect the United States, since it possesses very few vessels of less than 250 gross tons engaged in international trade by sea.

Provision has been made in chapter 2 for existing ships already marked with load lines which were determined by the application of the 1906 rules of the British Board of Trade, or by other rules equivalent thereto, to retain their present load lines providing they comply in principle, and in detail so far as is reasonable and practical, with the provisions of the convention relative to the efficiency of (1) the protection of openings, (2) guard rails, (3) freeing ports, and (4) means of access to crew's quarters.

Chapter 2, article 8, provides that ships of special types having constructional features similar to those of a tanker, which afford extra invulnerability against the sea, may be loaded to drafts that are not deeper than permitted a tank ship.

In chapter 3 provision has been made to limit the life of any certificate of assignment of load lines to a maximum period of five years. It is also provided that the same load lines may be continued by the renewal of such certificates, for additional periods not exceeding five years each, after a survey not less effective than the original survey required for the original assignment. Provision is made for the cancellation of the load-line certificate if alterations have been made in the hull or superstructure of the ship which affect the calculations of freeboard or if certain important fittings and appliances and the means of access to the crew's quarters are not maintained in as effective a condition as they were in when the certificate was issued.

Chapter 3 also defines the control which may be exercised by any of the contracting governments over ships of the other contracting governments. This control assures that the ship is not loaded beyond the limits allowed by the load-line certificate and that a ship does not leave port in a manifestly unsafe condition.

The technical rules for determining load lines are contained in annexes 1 and 2 to the convention. Zones and seasonal areas for the oceans of the world are defined, based upon the record of weather conditions, and load lines are provided to meet those conditions. The load lines determined by the rules conform to the established practice of safe loading as determined by actual conditions experienced in navigating the oceans. The rules are essentially in accord with the rules proposed by the United States load-line committee (1928) in its report to the Secretary of Commerce.

Chapter 4 of the convention authorizes the acceptance in substitution for particular fittings, appliances, or arrangements required in ships by the convention, of other fittings, appliances, or arrangements equally effective, and provides for the exchange by the respective governments of copies of their laws, regulations, and reports on matters within the scope of the convention, as well as for the modification of the convention and for future conferences for its revision.

Chapter 5, in addition to authorizing the application of the convention to overseas territories of the contracting governments at the election of the respective governments, contains provisions regarding ratifications, adherence, coming into force, and denunciation.

It is agreed by the final protocol to exempt from the provisions of the convention ship engaged solely on voyages on the Great Lakes of North America and existing ships of the United States and France of the lumber-schooner type. It is also agreed in the protocol that on the request made at any time by the United States a conference shall be called of the governments of the countries having tankers for a reconsideration of the rules which determine the load lines for tankers.

It may be added that the following declarations, recorded in the final act of the conference, were made by the plenipotentiaries of the United States:

"The plenipotentiaries of the United States of America formally declare that the signing of the international load-line convention by them, on the part of the United States of America, on this date, is not to be construed to mean that the Government of the United States of America recognizes a régime or entity which signs or accedes to the convention as the government of a country when that régime or entity is not recognized by the Government of the United States of America as the government of that country.

"The plenipotentiaries of the United States of America further declare that the participation of the United States of America in the international load-line convention signed on this date does not involve any contractual obligation on the part of the United States of America to a country, represented by a régime or entity which the Government of the United States of America does not recognize as the government of that country, until such country has a government recognized by the Government of the United States of America."

The purpose of this declaration, which is identical with the declaration made by the plenipotentiaries of the United States in the final act of the international conference for the safety of life at sea, signed at London, May 31, 1929 (Exec. B, 71st Cong., 2d sess.), is to make clear the position of the United States that the signing of a multilateral convention by its plenipotentiaries with representatives of the régime now functioning in Russia, known as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, does not imply a recognition of that régime by the United States.

Respectfully submitted.

HENRY L. STIMSON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 11, 1931.

CONSTRUCTION AT CERTAIN MILITARY POSTS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to take up for consideration a conference report that I think can be disposed of in about one minute. I think it will provoke no discussion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, 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 amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8159) to authorize appropriation for construction at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.; Fort Lewis, Wash.; Fort Benning, Ga.; 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 amendment to said bill.

DAVID A. REED,
ROSCOE C. PATTERSON,
DANIEL F. STECK,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

W. FRANK JAMES,
HARRY C. RANSLEY,
PERCY E. QUIN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this is an Army housing bill containing three or four relatively small items on which the House and Senate were in full agreement. The Senate, however, added an amendment providing for the purchase of a hotel up at West Point which had gone into receivership. That amendment was offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]; and he explained it at the time as being intended to give some relief to the stockholders and second-mortgage bondholders of the hotel.

The House refused to agree to the amendment. The matter went to conference nearly a year ago. Since then the first mortgage has been foreclosed. The stockholders and second-mortgage bondholders have been completely excluded from any interest in the property. The only effect of the enactment of the Senate amendment now would be to give the first-mortgage bondholders who have foreclosed not only their money and their interest but a large profit as a result of the foreclosure. In view of that, the Senate conferees have felt that it was no longer just to the Government of the United States or to any interest to insist further on the Senate amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I observe that the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] is not present. Has he been advised of the action of the conferees?

Mr. REED. Yes. I have discussed it with him, as well as with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. STECK], who was one of the conferees, and they are both agreed that the action of the conferees is proper.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President——

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. Should not the bill be amended so that this relief would go to the stockholders and junior lien holders?

Mr. REED. I do not think so, in justice to the Government. These people went into a business enterprise, taking their chances and expecting their profit. Now they have found that it failed. It was one of these fly-by-night real-estate schemes; and I do not see why we should come to their relief any more than to the relief of anybody else who has lost in that way.

Mr. BROOKHART. I think the Senator is mistaken as to the facts. This hotel was built under the Government's plans and specifications, and the cause of the failure was the Government changing the road and taking the traffic around another way.

Mr. REED. Oh, no, Mr. President! The Government always has the right to control traffic on the West Point Reservation. The automobile traffic got so heavy that the cadets could not cross the main road through the post, and it was diverted; but nobody was prevented from going to the hotel.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, may I suggest that this will not preclude them from presenting their claims hereafter.

Mr. REED. Oh, not at all. They can put in a claims bill; but it is utterly impossible to get the House to agree to it in this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOVERNOR OF IOWA

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD the inaugural address delivered by Hon. Dan W. Turner, Governor of Iowa, on January 15, 1931.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and it is as follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF DAN W. TURNER, GOVERNOR OF IOWA, TO THE FORTY-FOURTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, DES MOINES, IOWA, JANUARY 15, 1931

Members of the general assembly and citizens of Iowa, by the will of its electorate, our beloved Commonwealth of the State of Iowa has conferred upon me the highest honor in its power to bestow.

One has to experience the weight of this obligation to feel the full impact of its significance. To you who listen to my voice it is but the witnessing of the inauguration of another governor. To me it is the assumption of a grave responsibility. And yet this inauguration concerns every citizen of Iowa. Realizing that in the conscientious fulfillment of the functions of my office is involved, to some degree, the prosperity and happiness of our people, I am resolved in all my deliberations and in all my executive acts your welfare will be the primary consideration. In virtue of my induction I no longer belong to myself. I belong to you. Every Iowa home and the interest of every individual Iowan, irrespective of station, color, or creed, becomes my personal concern.

This day is significant to you, as to me, because it solicits your loyal participation. It serves the high purpose of impressing us with the fact that every task is an exalted one if it contributes to the common good. It brings its recurrent conviction that whilst I, as your chief executive, continually devote myself to your well-being, it is only as each of us performs his daily work in the true spirit of industry, patriotism, and loyal citizenship that we shall reach the commonly coveted goal, and share a mutual benefit.

The high esteem in which I hold the people of my native State, the deep sense of a helpful comradeship in a common cause, the conviction that you worthily merit the best in leadership, increases my determined devotion to this task. The hope that the full measure of our expectations may be realized is inspired by the assurance of your valued assistance. I realize the magnitude of the official obligations with which I am commissioned. With a deep sense of humility I am conscious of the limitations of individual human endeavor. I would be destitute of feeling if I were not deeply affected by the abundant evidence which my fellow citizens have given me of their confidence by entrusting me with this high office, the functions of which I now assume with a gratitude I profoundly feel but can not adequately express.

To the task of guiding our favored Commonwealth in its continued growth, in the prosperity of its farms, cities, and industries, and in the development of a contented people, I have been called. I shall not have fully realized the high ideals that now inspire me, nor completely achieve the ambitions that now actuate me, should I look back over my term of office with a single regret that I have at any time, or to any person, been delinquent to the trust you have so generously reposed in me.

ECONOMY

The business of government is the concern of the people. It becomes more involved as the country grows older. As the demand for laws increase, the machinery of government becomes more complicated.

To meet the natural needs of organized society and not overburden the statute books with unnecessary legislation is your problem.

It is not my purpose on this occasion to deal in detail with the many questions that shall be considered in this session. I desire, however, to comment briefly on those problems that are imminent and of grave importance.

The cost of government has steadily mounted since the pre-war period. Taxes have increased in ratio. In many taxing districts of the State taxes are 20 per cent higher this year over last year. In fifteen years the cost of government in Iowa has more than doubled. During the years of this century taxes have more than quintupled in our State. The day of retrenchment is at hand.

Not a dollar should be appropriated out of the State treasury unless deemed by you indispensable in carrying on the State's business. Every demand on the State treasury should be rejected unless backed by reasons based on necessity. We can not and will not neglect the wards of the State, but there is room for economy in many directions. You have the power to curtail expenditures. It is your stern duty to exercise it.

Consider the importance of reducing cost of government. If taxes can be reduced and the tax burden spread out equitably among the people, we are justified in the belief that the load will be lightened on real and other visible property.

County, municipal, and school governments have equal responsibility with you in this effort toward economy and retrenchment.

The budget department, inaugurated to induce economy, has valuable features, but its recommendations are purely advisory, carrying neither legal nor moral weight.

I would recommend that this department be abolished and the power of the budget director be invested in the State board of assessment and review. The principle of the budget is a sound principle and if consistently adhered to will have a vital influence in holding down governmental expense, not only in recommendations of appropriations necessary to be made, but in aiding us to arrive at the hoped for goal of receiving 100 cents value in the expenditure of each dollar of the taxpayer's money. Whatever else we do, let us have economy.

TAXATION

Before entering into a discussion of possible and proposed remedies that will be brought to your attention in the effort to relieve visible property of part of the unjust burden it now bears I had thought it would not be inappropriate to set forth here some of the reasons that have prevailed with the people in the demand for tax revision.

Ninety-six per cent of all direct taxes are derived from the general property tax. Intangible property, representing approximately one-half the wealth of the State, shoulders less than 4 per cent of the tax burden. Out of each $100 of the farmer's income the sum of $28 is required to pay taxes. Tangible property, real and personal, including the farms and homes, buildings, merchandise, livestock and machinery, property the assessor can see, bears nearly 97 per cent of the tax burden, invisible wealth, less than 4 per cent, while earnings and incomes have no share in the cost of government. Under our ancient system of taxation the citizens who enjoy incomes not derived from ownership of property are in a special privileged class, immune from taxation altogether. Let the rule of justice obtain. Favoritism for any group should be abandoned.

The total income of the people of Iowa in normal years is approximately $1,500,000,000 annually. The income from real estate is less than 26 per cent of this amount. This property, yielding only one-fourth of the State's income, under the present tax system, pays nearly 90 per cent of all State and local taxes. Debate is unnecessary to prove the contention that the tax laws must be revised. The tax burden should be distributed more justly among our citizens. The income tax is based on the sound principle that taxes should be paid according to the ability to pay. Provision for State income tax should be written into the laws of Iowa. The law when written should exempt wages and earnings needed to provide families with necessities, to enable them to educate their children and live in some degree of comfort. Rates ought to be high enough in the upper brackets to permits the citizens of substantial incomes to contribute their share toward the cost of government.

It is essential that you incorporate in this law a mandatory provision guaranteeing a reduction in the State millage tax, corresponding in amount to the total raised through the income tax. It must be a replacement tax.

INHERITANCE TAX

The principal purpose of an inheritance tax is to supplement the general taxes and relieve to some extent the tax burden borne by the great mass of people of the State. The fact that it is so

designed, and furthermore that it is an instrument of revealing considerable property which has been concealed from ordinary taxation, has naturally caused opposition from those whom it affects.

The present inheritance tax act produces an annual revenue of approximately $1,200,000, which is about 1 mill in the general tax levy. The statute as it now stands covers both direct and collateral heirs although the exemptions permitted to the direct heirs are so great that the returns from that class of beneficiaries are not commensurate with the property passing.

I recommend that these exemptions be reduced, and that the rate of tax upon the collateral beneficiaries be increased so that the more distant relatives and those who are strangers to the blood would pay a higher rate of tax. A reclassification of collateral heirs would permit this without any injustice to those who are closer related to the decedent.

The changes recommended, which include some other changes of a more administrative nature, would, according to the estimates made by the inheritance tax department of the State treasurer's office, increase the annual revenue to approximately $2,250,000.

The inheritance tax is eminently a just tax, so recognized by practically all authorities on taxation, and should be made more thoroughly a principal source of revenue rather than a supplementary tax.

CORPORATION TAX

Corporations should be included in such income tax.

To tax the individual and allow the corporations to go free would work a palpable injustice on the former. Such evasion of our duty can not be justified in any effort made for genuine tax revision. I think you should earnestly consider the wisdom and fairness of a tax on the income of corporations. The corporation with small earnings will welcome this form of taxation and new industries will be encouraged to locate in our State, having the knowledge that when earnings are moderate the tax is light.

The larger industries, enjoying greater earning power, are amply able to pay a tax that will be their just contribution to the Commonwealth, which fosters and protects them and furnishes a large share of their patronage.

Iowa is one of only six States in the Union failing to provide for some form of corporation tax. Any effort made for genuine tax revision will include such a tax.

I am confident a careful survey will convince you that earnest thought should be given to the inadequate methods now in use in the assessment and taxation of power corporations, public utilities, and telephone and telegraph companies.

Under the constitution of this State public utilities can not be released from the general property tax. This fact must necessarily be kept in mind in considering a tax on the gross profits of these companies, or an income tax on net income, or whatever plan in your estimation seems best.

ASSESSMENTS

The laws relating to the assessment of property should be revised. Brindley's survey shows that property is assessed all the way from 10 per cent to 110 per cent of its actual valuation. The law now prescribes that property shall be assessed at its actual value. In point of fact, custom has neutralized and failed to follow this rule. In the majority of the counties the attempt is made to assess property at 50 to 60 per cent of its value. As a result glaring inequalities exist in practically every taxing district of the State. A yardstick of measurement should be provided—some certain standard established and adhered to. I hope it will be clearly set forth in the revised law that intangible value or earning power shall enter into assessment valuation of property.

The board of assessment and review created in the last general assembly has taken initial steps to establish a standard of measurement in assessments. The powers of this board should be amplified rather than curtailed.

The county assessment system is strongly urged by many business men, farmers, and students of the tax question. It is now in operation in 33 States. The claim made for it is that it minimizes the likelihood of favoritism in the assessment of property and links up the units together into one uniform system. This subject deserves your earnest thought and investigation.

JOINT LEGISLATIVE TAX COMMITTEE AND BOARD OF ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW

On this whole subject of tax revision, I commend to your attention for serious study and thought the report to this general assembly of the joint legislative tax committee and the State board of assessment and review.

This legislative committee, working in conjunction with the board, has been engaged over a period of 18 months in painstaking and studious investigation of the whole tax problem.

They have devoted much time in digging to the bottom in their examination of this important subject. The result of their work is embodied in the report which will be laid upon your desks. This document represents labor—consistent, thorough, and constructive.

The facts therein set forth are incontrovertible; and while opinions may vary as to certain conclusions reached, particularly regarding rates and exemptions, there can be no difference in judgment regarding the substantial value brought to the discussion of the tax problem through the efforts of your colleagues and the State board.

REVISION THAT REVISES

I leave the subject of revision of our revenue laws with this closing thought. In the face of the present exigency, thorough and genuine tax revision is demanded. It is a "condition and not a theory" confronting us. If I am any judge of the temper of the people, nothing less than a thorough revision of the entire tax system will meet with their approval. To fail them now would be plain evasion of our duty. Half-hearted revision is little better than no revision. Let us be sure when we have finished in this session with this great undertaking that wealth and income now escaping are required to make their fair contribution to the cost of government.

PUBLIC UTILITIES

In order that the public interests may best be served, public utilities, including transmission lines and telephone and telegraph companies, must be made subject to regulation and supervision by the State. Iowa is one of the few States which have permitted the public-service corporations to operate without adequate law regulating and controlling their activities. Recent Federal hearings have disclosed that in many instances the utilities which furnish electric service to the public have established rates which have been based upon inflated values. No company should be permitted to fix a rate based upon a fictitious value.

In this State rates vary in the different communities, determined by contracts made with the municipalities. On account of the utilities' elaborate and intricate financial set-up and their involved corporate structure it is obviously impossible, under our present system, to secure fair and uniform rates. A survey and study of the various rates in force in the municipalities of the State discloses the fact that there is no relation between the cost of production (plus a reasonable profit) and the rate charged. This is grossly unfair.

Public utilities are rapidly extending their services to the countryside and our rural population is required to pay for such service the price asked by the utility which is serving them. The consumers are without protection against extortionate rates, nor do they have the requisite knowledge to determine whether the rate charged is reasonable and fair. We can not permit this system to continue longer in our State. We must see to it that the public is guaranteed a fair and reasonable rate for the services rendered.

This question ought to be given serious consideration at this session and a law enacted which shall provide for State regulation of all public-utility companies so that the public shall be guaranteed just rates measured by cost of production. An adequate method should be provided for arriving at and determining the value of the properties of public utilities located within the State. This will assist in the matter of rate making and will be of benefit in connection with the taxation of these companies.

At the present time certain securities of the public-utility companies are exempt from taxation and may also be offered and sold to the public without any supervision whatsoever. These are special privileges and can not be justified, and I recommend that the law exempting them from taxation be repealed and that all securities of public-utility companies be made subject to the "blue sky law."

Municipal ownership of utilities should not be discouraged. Improved machinery for generating electric current on either a large or small scale, and at a low cost, make it practicable in some instances to erect municipal plants, to be paid for out of the earnings thereof. However, this can not now be done because there is no statutory provision therefor.

A statute should be enacted in this session granting authority to cities and towns to contract for municipal utility plants to be paid for from earnings of said plants.

TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH

There is no provision in law giving either the State or municipalities within the State authority to stand between the people and the large telephone and telegraph companies now operating within the State, in the vital question of establishing fair rates for service. Eight years ago the governor of the State, in his biennial message, called attention to the monopoly enjoyed by these large telephone utilities and the necessity of protection for the people, but his sound advice went unheeded. The situation is even more acute now.

These quasi-public, franchise-privileged corporations should be subjected to regulations in law that will insure the consumers of the service furnished fair rates based on an intelligent survey of operation costs and capital invested.

In any instance wherein individuals or corporations hold control of public necessities it is the imperative duty of the State to establish regulation thereof. No method other than State control has been devised giving assurance of protection against exhorbitant rates levied by unfettered monopoly.

PIPE-LINE TRANSPORTATION

A new factor is about to enter our economic and industrial situation. Large organizations are engaged in constructing lines of pipe for the conveyance of natural gas and petroleum products from distant fields for consumption and distribution in this State. Their advent will materially affect our existing systems of transportation and other domestic industries. If legislation is sought by these organizations for the purpose of obtaining corporation and franchise privileges within the State, it will be the duty of the legislature to adequately protect citizens whose property rights may be affected.

No franchise rights should be granted unless proper regulatory laws are enacted to safeguard the rights of the citizens of this State, and means should be devised of exacting from these new properties such taxes as will constitute their just share of the tax burden.

ROADS

Iowa has taken a leading place among the States of the Union in the important work of designing and constructing a state-wide system of good roads. This road-building program has been determined by our people and can now be considered a settled policy of the State. We should continue with that work in as expeditious a manner as is consistent with good business and sound financing.

We have adopted the plan of paying the cost of our primary roads from funds contributed by the people who use them. We must steadfastly hold to this plan. It was on this solemn promise the various counties furnished the funds to make possible the great achievement in highway improvement. By this token we shall vigorously oppose any effort made to divert primary road funds from the purposes now defined in the law. It is our absolute duty to use every safeguard insuring property owners that the cost of these improved highways shall never result in a tax on property.

In continuing with our road-building program we must ever keep in mind that the benefits to our people, for whom roads are established and maintained, must be properly apportioned. The construction cost of the main arteries of travel is necessarily high. It will be found to be impractical and financially impossible to carry that class of construction beyond the main channels of travel and down to every community entitled to improved roads. Therefore, some less expensive plan of surfacing must be employed on many of the roads in order that a more complete system of serviceable, all-season roads may be built. The value of good roads, universally acknowledged, will be more apparent when a system of all-weather highways connect farms with markets, and communities with those centers of trade and the main arteries of travel, to which they desire access.

REDISTRICTING

You will be confronted with the duty of redistricting our State into fewer congressional districts. There is still a justifiable hope that in the congressional reapportionment Iowa may be represented by 10 Members in the House of Representatives. But should Congress persist in granting aliens representation, the delegates in that body from Iowa would be reduced to nine Members.

In either event there must be a reduction from the present number, which will require a new districting for congressional representation from Iowa.

In the creation of the new districts an arbitrary arrangement of the political divisions of the State, in disregard of the natural or proper boundaries as indicated by geographical position, should not be made.

Districts should be geographically compact and uniform in population to the degree of practicability.

CONSOLIDATION OF DEPARTMENTS

In the interest of economy there should be consolidation of some of the departments of State government. This can be accomplished without impairing efficiency. Early in the session I will call to your attention several possible departmental consolidations that should, in my opinion, be effected. I earnestly hope you will give careful thought, followed by action, to this matter of consolidation, involving increased efficiency and decreased cost of government.

INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Industrial stagnation with resulting unemployment is a world condition, in which our own Nation is the least sufferer, with less unemployment in Iowa than in other States. This does not mean that there is no problem confronting us and that the most serious consideration should not be given to adjustment, so that every citizen, willing and capable, should have the opportunity of a well ordered and well conditioned means of livelihood. An idle man is not an asset to a community, and of small value to its business interests. His labor power is a total loss in the creation of the material things necessary to a happy and progressive commonwealth. Continued idleness breaks personal morale, and means either State or voluntary charitable support in the end. This must be averted in so far as possible. To say that we are better off in our unemployment than other States or nations during a time of great general distress is poor consolation to people out of work.

The causes leading up to our present industrial situation and consequent problems of unemployment can be largely attributed to the mechanization and development of industry, which kept in mind the matter of production only and almost entirely disregarded distribution. New methods and means of conducting all our industries have produced economies in man power further reducing employment.

These displaced workers should be given aid in the seeking of new employment. This aid should be given without cost to either the person seeking employment or the employer. As a means to this end an extension should be made of the present State-Federal free employment service so as to make possible the best attainable disposition of the willing but idle person into the employment opening fitted to his capacity.

In the meantime our great natural resources and our industrial opportunities should be fully developed so that greater employment will follow, and that our people may not only be producers but consumers and assets in a distributive market.

PRISON LABOR

Prison labor is one of our most pressing problems at this time. There is universal agreement that the prisoner should be kept busy at some productive work. Modern enlightened thought is that the work should not only be productive but that it should give a training that will fit the prisoner for employment by which he can earn a livelihood upon release.

There is no disagreement in this regard. There is, however, difference of opinion as to the method of disposal of the product and the beneficiary thereof. In this lies our major problem at this time. Contracts for the employment of approximately 1,000 prisoners are in effect. These contracts run to private persons or corporations. The Congress of the United States passed an act, to become effective during the early part of 1934, which makes impractical the shipment between States of prison-made goods. This will render difficult the disposal of such goods by a private contractor, and therefore, unless provision is made for employment of the prisoners now engaged in contract work, our State will face a serious condition of idleness in prison institutions. This constitutes an urgent problem and one of immediate necessity.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Ample facilities are provided for those of our people who can afford to take advantage of higher educational privileges. It is equally important that full opportunity be provided for the efficient training of those who are to perform the manual tasks of the world. The problems of the farm are daily becoming more intensive, and more adequate training in all the elements for successful farming should be encouraged. The experiments, investigations, farm economies, and sciences must, of necessity, be the task of the higher institutions, but the results thus obtained must be brought through vocational instruction to the boys and girls who do the active farm work.

The rapid changes in industry have displaced hundreds of workers who must be given an opportunity to earn a livelihood in new lines of work in which they have no experience or training. For these there must come a fundamental training along general industrial lines that will make possible a readier adaptation to other lines of work, and for the person who expects to follow more highly skilled vocations, there should be given an opportunity of training for fitness in his chosen field.

There is also the adult who had no opportunity of definite education, or who perhaps now realizes neglected opportunities, and who has sufficient energy and ambition to become a more valuable person to society. He should have his chance.

Vocational education aims to cover these fields, and has made good progress during the decade of its existence. Encouragement should be given so that its program can spread to every locality and to each person seeking its advantages.

EDUCATION

Iowa is the peer of any State in the Union in the opportunities offered our young people to obtain higher education. The many fine colleges of the State, together with the State's own renowned institutions of higher learning, afford scholastic opportunities to our sons and daughters, not exceeded by any State and equalled by few.

While we have a justifiable pride in our colleges and universities, we should not forget that the common schools deserve our utmost concern and devotion; not only because they are the foundation of our Commonwealth, but also for the reason that the great majority of our citizens receive their only educational advantages in the common schools.

It is entirely probable that many localities have set up a more elaborate educational program than their financial abilities justify. All school officials or governing boards should conscientiously scrutinize their school costs to the end that all possible economies may be effected and that expenditures shall, wherever possible, be reduced to the minimum, without impairing the quality of instruction.

The report of the superintendent of public instruction shows that during the last year 65,476 pupils were enrolled in the first grade of our public schools, while 35,925 graduated from the eighth grade, and 21,011 received high school diplomas. Nearly four times as many children were enrolled in the grades as in the high school. Let no one interpret these facts as minimizing the value of high-school and college training, but we must emphasize the necessity of first providing the essentials of a common-school education and of making them equally available to all.

AGRICULTURE

Farming is our greatest industry. Among all the States of the Union Iowa stands first in value of farm lands, farm equipment, and farm products. Our State, bounded on either side by the great rivers of the continent, comprises a valley characterized by dark loam soil, unequalled in fertility by any area of land of equal size in the world. Having been blessed by Providence with fruitful acres and propitious climate, it only remains for us to apply our energy and best intelligence to the task of working out economic justice for the farm. First, in standing back of our Congressmen in every effort to stabilize on a fair price level the products of the farm. Second, in providing an impartial tax and assessment system which should reduce the taxes upon the farm

and here, this forty-fourth general assembly, has unquestioned authority and opportunity to render to agriculture a distinct service. In no other way can the farm be accorded equality and opportunity with business and industry. Moreover, in degree and as a direct result, when agriculture prospers all business in Iowa, manufacturing, wholesale, and retail, is stimulated and encouraged. It is a truism so trite that it needs no repetition here—that when the farmers are doing well, the beneficial result is immediately reflected in better business conditions throughout our State.

The great farm organizations under virile and sagacious leadership are rendering invaluable service to the State, through unremitting efforts, intelligently directed in behalf of our State's greatest industry. They are entitled to our cooperation, that agriculture may come into its own in the greatest agricultural State in the Union.

MANUFACTURES

Iowa has many manufacturing industries, some of them the greatest of their kind in the world. These industries add in material degree to the sum total of the State's resources. They employ our labor and purchase large quantities of Iowa products in raw material.

James A. Garfield said 50 years ago: "Place the factory beside the farm and both will prosper."

A practical way to encourage these industries and what will constitute a drawing power to influence new manufacturing industries to locate in Iowa would be for Iowans to buy whenever possible Iowa-manufactured and processed products. This rule holds good in all the fabric of business, linking up the manufacturer, the wholesaler, and the retailer with the ultimate consumer. Our economic problems are not all dependent on legislative enactments for solution. The effort to keep the Iowa dollar in Iowa depends on our realization of the value of cooperation in retaining in our State the wealth created here.

IOWA COAL

Over 8,000 Iowa citizens, the majority of them heads of families, depend upon the mining of coal for a livelihood. We should encourage this industry. We ought to strive to bring our mining population back to the 1910 basis when 18,000 men were mining coal in Iowa.

By tests made on a basis of 36 representative samples of coal from different Iowa mines, it was found that Iowa coal furnishes more heat units per cost than other coal.

Let us use every means to encourage Iowa consumption of Iowa products. The more Iowa coal used the more men employed—these miners in turn buy Iowa farm and manufactured products. They patronize the retailers, who are the customers of the wholesalers. Thus we see forcibly illustrated the value of patronizing our own industries. A more striking example in this respect could not be given.

CHAIN SYSTEMS IN BUSINESS

The growth in recent years of chain business presents a new economic problem and one that is regarded with deep anxiety by many of our citizens.

The laws governing interstate commerce make it difficult for the State, through legislation, to deal with some classes of these large chain organizations. However, where laws do not apply public opinion often decides issues. The individual citizen will seriously ponder the apparent lack of cooperation in community enterprises on the part of any chain system not locally controlled. These systems should not be permitted to escape their share of community responsibility. Methods of taxation should be devised also to compel them to carry their fair share of the tax burden.

CHAIN BANKING

Chain banking presents problems of a different kind. This State has been developed through extension of credit to citizens intent on home ownership and community enterprise. Any system that curtails credit to the frugal, industrious citizens who are ambitious to till the land, own their homes, or engage in business, will have a depressing effect on the development of our State. In the last analysis credit must be determined by the financial interests in the community where a bank is located and not be determined by persons outside the State.

CHAIN FARMING

Chain farming is now in its incipiency in Iowa. The time may come when it will be our chief concern. I do not believe chain farming can take root in this State when conditions are such that our people are encouraged to live on the land—conditions that hold out substantial hope of a fair price for their products, and taxes that are not oppressive. I doubt the validity of the claims made of lower cost of production through corporation farming methods. But, granting chain farms will produce crops, it is an assured fact that they will not produce yeomen citizenry. The individual farmer is interested in schools, churches, and community building. The whole question of the standard of our citizenship is involved in the system that shall obtain in the business of farming. I hold to the family unit system; it has proved excellent in the production of both citizens and crops.

CONSERVATION

No State can hope to retain a devoted and happy populace which does not in due measure provide for the preservation of health and beauty in its surroundings.

The people of Iowa have a right to expect that out of nature's bountiful endowment of rivers, lakes, and wooded hills, sufficient areas may be preserved for their recreation and enjoyment. Thoughtless encroachments of commerce and private ownership have polluted many of our streams, drained our lakes, and cut off our approach to those natural playgrounds of our people. Our scattered efforts toward conservation need coordination under an expertly devised state-wide and continuing program immune to the favoritism of changing political forces.

To this end, I call the attention of the legislature to the need of a budgeted program extending over a term of years, made by competent experts, to provide the State of Iowa with parks, game refuges, bird havens, fish hatcheries, and recreation areas, based on a complete and extensive survey of the entire State. We are in need of a program toward which all the conservation forces of the State may bend their energies and resources in a coordinated effort. Too much money is being wasted in haphazard efforts which benefit a few instead of the whole State.

Without increasing expenditures, but by coordinating and directing the funds now provided, toward a definite state-wide plan we will attain a more efficient and orderly progress toward a common goal.

The establishment of such a program is in accordance with the most successful methods employed in progressive State management.

Linked up with this subject of a definite program, we should consider that many students of conservation believe a more efficient and economical administration of the State fish and game department could be had through a commission.

This plan has to recommend it the fact that in the States where it is in operation it has proved successful. The conservationists backing the commission plan are animated by unselfish motives and a keen desire to improve our methods in propagation of fish and game, protection of bird life, and in preventing pollution of the lakes and streams.

Our streams are rapidly degenerating into open sewers, receiving the waste drainage of private industry, and the sewage of municipalities. I trust the legislature will make sure there is ample legislation to enable the administrative branch of government to terminate this practice of stream pollution.

Without entering into a more thorough discussion of the subject at this time, I commend it to you as deserving your careful study and thoughtful investigation.

EXPENSE ACCOUNT

Chapter 1, acts of the forty-third general assembly, grants each member of the general assembly the right to file a statement of expenses to the maximum amount of $500, the amount so listed to be paid out of the State treasury. This law should be repealed. There is a principle involved here that will be apparent when careful analysis is made of this statute. Without going thoroughly into the matter I will call attention to a contingency that might easily arise in connection with this law that I believe should cause grave concern regarding it. Any succeeding legislature, by changing two words in the law, could raise the amount designated as a maximum to any figure desired. You can easily imagine a time when the expense money might exceed the salary. It does not measure up to our conception of what constitutes sound public policy. If I were you I would repeal it.

This law was supported, as I agree, by many honorable men with none but honest motives; the fact remains, this type of law is unsound in principle and may in future be subject to abuse.

CHILD WELFARE

The influence of women in government has been greatly widened and strengthened during the decade just drawing to a close. Their presence at the polls in equal numbers with men, proves a sincere interest in governmental affairs and attests a true perception of the obligations of citizenship. The record of their competency in many offices of public trust is undisputed. They are keenly interested in all the economic questions pressing for solution. To the problems that center about the home, that deal with child health and protection, they bring exceptional understanding and the value of experience. The character of our civilization can be faithfully gaged by the interest we evince in all questions pertaining to the junior citizens of the State and the insistent and varied problems included in child-welfare work.

To promote conditions that will safeguard the health of the children and insure them opportunities of education and surround them with influences that will aid in their spiritual development is a duty so close to the hearts of our people that it resolves itself into a sacred privilege.

I grant you that the chief responsibility is with parents, and that home influence will ever be the strongest factor in raising children to be worthy citizens of the Republic. Nevertheless, the community must share this obligation by providing them with clean, wholesome environment and facilities that encourage moral and mental development.

In this connection we will give special thought to the deficient, backward, and delinquent children, and wherever possible set their feet on the path toward happy, normal, and useful lives.

PROFESSIONAL LOBBYISTS

The right of the people to be heard on any measure under consideration here is unquestioned. We represent an intelligent and patriotic constituency and we should welcome their counsel and invite their opinion. The citizen, the corporation, the organized group, should each be accorded a fair hearing and equal consideration. But the professional lobbyist, prostituting his talent for hire, should be ejected from the presence of honest men with the same contumely we are prone to visit on other enemies of the commonwealth. His methods are nauseous. He has no princi-

ples. He is the paid creature of any and every mercenary interest venal enough to hire him. He is insidious enough to devise ways and means to impose himself upon every right-minded organization in his lust for gold. He is ever the agent of special privilege seeking through underground methods to stifle good measures and promote bad ones. The professional lobbyist is affable and genial, but the smooth exterior is a cloak for sinister purposes. When he approaches you he underestimates both your intelligence and your character. He is not interested in the well-being of the people whom we represent.

Our constituents for the most part will not be seen here. They are at home attending to their work. We constitute their only representation during the deliberations of the general assembly. They trust us, their representatives, to go about the business of looking after their interests, uninfluenced by the crafty inducements of the professional lobbyist.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

I feel constrained on this occasion to take up the subject of law observance, coupled with the problem of law enforcement.

When all those citizens, generally denominated good citizens, render strict observance of all laws the vexing problem of law enforcement will be well on the road to solution.

To obtain general law enforcement it is necessary in the premise to have the great body of public opinion awake to the necessity of unwaivering observance of each and every law. This accomplished, we can deal with complete self-respect with the vital question of law enforcement. Without going into the intricate subject of causes for the marked increase in crime, we acknowledge the fact, firmly resolved to meet it with all the forces at our command. If in any respect the laws are inadequate, strengthen them. If in any locality law-enforcement officers are derelict in their duties, they should be removed. The law provides machinery to obtain such commendable results. The automobile and hard-surfaced roads have undoubtedly aggravated the problem. All the more necessary it is that every citizen accord moral and, if need be, physical support to those agents of the law whose sworn duty imposes upon them the obligation to meet the crime situation with grim-resolved and unwavering courage. We are greatly encouraged by the resolute efficiency of our law-enforcement machinery during the testing time of the last few months. Twenty-five bank robbers have been apprehended, and in nearly all instances our officers have proved competent and courageous in the discharge of their duties. The press of the State can render a signal service in the vital matter of crime prevention by giving prominent space when criminals are apprehended equal to space devoted to the story of the commission of the crime.

The marked increase in loss of life and injury due to accidents on our highways, warrant you in taking steps to strengthen the laws regulating traffic.

PROHIBITION

The prohibition law is the subject of much discussion. Many pronounce it a failure whose memories do not go back to the days when legalized sale of liquor by common consent was held directly responsible for broken homes, poverty, and crime. It is unnecessary for me to enter a defense of prohibition in the presence of representatives sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, and the State of Iowa, representatives in a Commonwealth where dry sentiment has been in the ascendency for over 50 years. I wish, however, briefly to analyze propaganda set forth that can have no effect except to encourage lawlessness and breed crime. Prohibition was placed in the Constitution of the United States by an amendment that was ratified by 46 of the 48 States of the Union. It is a fundamental law of the land. Neither Congress nor a State legislature can legalize the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. A law contemplating nullification would be declared by the courts as unconstitutional and void. Moreover what Iowans should keenly realize is the fact that Iowa's prohibition laws are stronger than the Volstead Act, therefore, it is beside the question in this State to complain of prohibition. No matter how much the Volstead law might be weakened, the situation in our State would be no different. We would still be operating under our State laws. Let us, therefore, loyally maintain our own State ideals and laws by personal observance, and render unqualified support to our officials in the fulfillment of the duties of their office.

The talk of a referendum in this connection is futile and misleading. There is now no provision in law, either Federal or State, for a referendum and no vote of the people under existing laws would bind the legislature of the State, its law-enforcing officers, or its citizens.

LENGTH OF SESSION

It is my earnest hope that the work of the session will get immediately under way. Several days in time can be saved if we can eliminate the red tape which generally consumes time the first month and proceed as expeditiously as possible with the work of the assembly.

If we wish to prevent inevitable congestion in the closing days of the session, and if we hope to avoid a plethora of ill-digested legislation, it behooves us to start immediately on the work of the session and in the consideration of the multiplied problems facing us.

IOWA

An address of this nature must of necessity deal with problems and emphasize responsibilities. Such a statement, however, does not alarm but rather calls us to the heroic task of determined progress. Certain injustices exist that, happily, can be remedied We will be strengthened and heartened in this undertaking if we consider the many advantages peculiar to our Commonwealth. Our innumerable material resources; our diversified interests, both agricultural and industrial; our ability to supply the demands of other areas, all should contribute to a rapid return to stabilized prosperity.

More important than any material resource is the character of our citizenry. Sound in judgment, resourceful in action, resolute in conviction, honest in purpose, generously cooperative in every righteous cause, sternly insistent on justice where their rights are concerned, these are the characteristics of our people—the sturdy citizens of a great Commonwealth. Can we, then, doubt either the genius or ability of such a citizenry to meet and solve the problems, economic or moral, as they may arise.

I believe it is entirely appropriate here to pay tribute to the veterans of the Civil War. We honor them for their unselfish devotion to duty during the great crises of the sixties. The youngest of them now are about 85 years of age, but the weight of years has not dimmed their love for their country. Theirs is not only a record of valor "in times that tried men's souls," but of nearly three-quarters of a century of faithful citizenship in a united nation, so peculiarly the product of their loyalty.

Following in their footsteps of allegiance to the highest ideals of the Republic are the veterans of the Spanish War, and our younger comrades of the great world conflict. We can but realize that the priceless possession of freedom has been won for us at an incalculable cost.

We revere the traditions of the past, the noble records written upon Iowa's historic pages, and from them we draw the inspiration that insures the achievements of the future. The pioneers of the last century with courageous hearts, laid the abiding foundations of our State. In national crises, our soldiers defended our liberties and possessions. Forming the stable substance of our Commonwealth is that vast democracy called the people, whose collective patriotism, loyalty, and industry permeates the whole social and economic structure and secures its permanency.

Members of the general assembly, epochs of history are measured not in years, but in momentous events. We are the recipients of a clear mandate from a noble constituency, which, if faithfully carried out, will mark this an epochal session in achievement.

Grave responsibility we are impelled to shoulder, it is true, but with the obligation comes the opportunity of a great work for the common good.

In this high office, into which I am this day inducted, and in the administration of the executive functions with which I am invested, I will seek the valued counsel of my colleagues in office. I will be gratefully attentive to the voice of citizens in all walks of life, for I would understand their problems and share their ambitions. But, above all, I recognize that Divine Wisdom without which nations crumble into the dust of a forgotten past. With a humble and contrite heart, I reverently supplicate the God and Father of us all to be my guide and counsellor.

You, the people, are the sovereign State, and I your servant. To you, to my State, to my country, and to my God, I, this day, make my solemn dedication.

FORT BERTHOLD INDIAN RESERVATION INDIANS

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I report favorably, with amendments, from the Committee on Indian Affairs Senate Joint Resolution 226, authorizing the distribution of the judgment rendered by the Court of Claims to the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, N. Dak., and I submit a report thereon (No. 1584).

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. I think it will take no time. It is an emergency measure to carry out the provisions of a judgment of the Court of Claims providing for the distribution of money to bands of Indians in North Dakota. The amount was included in the first deficiency bill. It has the approval of the Interior Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let it be reported.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, if it was included in the first deficiency bill, why is it necessary to pass a separate resolution?

Mr. FRAZIER. It has to be passed in order that the Secretary of the Interior may distribute this money to the Indians. They need the money.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The appropriation has already been made?

Mr. FRAZIER. It has already been made.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments of the committee will be stated.

The amendments of the Committee on Indian Affairs were, on page 2, line 11, after the word "deposited," to strike out "to their" and insert "as"; in line 12, before the word "in,"

to strike out "credit" and insert "Indian money"; and in line 15, after the word "laws," to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further,* That the distribution herein authorized shall be made in two or more installments, in the discretion of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the first of which shall not exceed $200," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States funds on deposit arising from the final judgment rendered by the Court of Claims in Docket No. B-449, entitled "The Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in the State of North Dakota, Comprising the Tribes Known as the Arickarees, the Gros Ventres, and the Mandans, and the Individual Members Thereof, Versus the United States," and cause the total sum (less fees and expenses as fixed by the Court of Claims, which shall first be deducted and paid from the amount recovered) to be paid in pro rata shares to all members of the Arickaree, Gros Ventres, and Mandan Tribes of Indians who were alive and entitled to enrollment with such Indians on the date of said final judgment: *Provided,* That the said Secretary, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, shall cause to be paid, in cash, all shares due or belonging to competent Indians; and the shares of all other Indians, including minors, shall be deposited as individual Indian money in banks bonded and designated as depositaries for individual Indian moneys to remain subject to disbursement for the benefit of the Indians entitled thereto as are other individual Indian moneys under existing laws: *Provided further,* That the distribution herein authorized shall be made in two or more installments, in the discretion of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the first of which shall not exceed $200.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

PERSONAL STATEMENT OF SENATOR HEFLIN

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Washington Post this morning, in an article by the Associated Press, says, among other things:

Senators CONNALLY, of Texas, and HEFLIN, of Alabama, both Democrats, and BROOKHART (Republican), Iowa, joined in the attack on the compromise, which they condemned as a surrender by the Senate coalition in the controversy with President Hoover to extend Federal money for sufferers.

I am at a loss to understand why the Associated Press would misrepresent my position in this fashion. I stated as plainly as I could that while I was not satisfied with the compromise I would vote for it; that the matter had reached the point where it was $20,000,000 for the drought sufferers or nothing, and that I was going to vote for it. One of the very last things I said was that I would support it, that I did not want to delay action upon it, that I was anxious to have the Senate act on it; and I tried to secure a unanimous-consent agreement yesterday afternoon that a vote be taken on the measure at 6 o'clock, in order that we might dispose of this very important matter.

This is a part of the propaganda on the part of some of those in the press gallery to misrepresent my position.

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, yesterday I reported to the Senate and had printed in the RECORD a conference report on the public buildings bill, authorizing the appropriation of $100,000,000. I gave notice that I would to-day move to take it up. The report is unanimous, and I do not think it will take any time.

Mr. SMOOT. If it will lead to no discussion, the Senator can ask unanimous consent to take it up, and I shall not object.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to the consideration of the report.

Mr. HOWELL. I object. I wish to make a point of order against the report on the ground that the conferees have exceeded their authority.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it go over.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I would like to have this matter disposed of now. The Senator from Nebraska can make the point of order against it, and if it is sustained, we shall have to obtain another conference. The Interior Department appropriations conference report will not be disposed of until we ascertain whether the resolution passed yesterday was received by the Secretary of Agriculture, and he has been able to give an answer.

Mr. SMOOT. One Senator is ready to proceed with a speech which will take the balance of the day.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, this is a privileged matter, and I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. SMOOT. The unfinished business before the Senate is a conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course the Senator from Virginia has the right to move that the report be taken up, but if that is done, it will displace the present unfinished business.

Mr. SWANSON. I simply ask that the unfinished business be laid aside now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to temporarily laying aside the conference report now pending, and taking up the conference report presented yesterday by the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HOWELL. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska objects.

TRAFFIC IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on the call of the calendar on Tuesday I objected to the consideration of Calendar No. 1633, House bill 14922, an act to amend the act known as the District of Columbia traffic act. I have since examined the bill and, so far as I am concerned, I have no further objection to it, and I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that this measure may be disposed of.

Mr. SMOOT. I can only consent to that with the understanding that it will not lead to any discussion at all.

Mr. WHEELER. I suggest that the bill be read.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it is a long bill, and I shall object to its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

COMPETITIVE CONDITIONS IN THE CEMENT INDUSTRY

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to submit a Senate resolution. It is one which, if objected to, will go over under the rule, but I do not believe there will be any objection to it. It will be explained by the reading of it. I send it to the clerk's desk and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 448), as follows:

Whereas there is a wide public interest in the price of cement, due primarily to the increase in building construction and road building; and

Whereas many complaints have been received by the Federal Trade Commission from various sections of the country to the effect that the price quotations of all cement companies are uniform, and that such uniformity in price is highly indicative of an arrangement, understanding, or agreement between and among the various manufacturers and dealers in cement to arbitrarily fix and maintain prices: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federal Trade Commission be, and it is hereby, directed to investigate competitive conditions in the cement industry and report to the Senate of the United States:

1. The facts with respect to the sale of cement and especially the price activities of trade associations composed of either manufacturers of cement or dealers in cement, or both.

2. The facts with respect to the distribution of cement, including a survey of the practices of manufacturers or dealers used in connection with the distribution of cement.

3. Whether the activities in the cement industry on the part of trade associations, manufacturers of cement, or dealers in cement constitute a violation of the antitrust laws of the United States and whether such activities constitute unfair trade practices.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to immediate consideration?

Mr. KEAN. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I assume it will go over under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska is timely. May I inquire whether it would be improper if there were added to the resolution a provision calling the attention of the Department of Justice to the cement products of the United States and the claim that a cement trust exists, in order that if such is the case the antitrust laws may be wielded against the same?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will just think of it, I believe he will agree with me that if this investigation takes place it will be of very great assistance to the Attorney General in bringing that kind of a suit.

Mr. KING. Undoubtedly, but in the meantime—and it will take months to make the investigation—the trust if one exists and there is a belief that a cement trust does exist, will continue its monopolistic course to the injury of the public.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, one House of Congress has no power to direct the Attorney General.

Mr. KING. I understand that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. His duties are defined by law, and any direction to him must be given by the joint action of both Houses.

Mr. KING. The Senator is correct. I am inquiring whether there would be any impropriety in expressing it as the sense of the Senate that the Department of Justice investigate and determine whether the antitrust laws of the United States are being violated by cement organizations.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, on yesterday I asked for information regarding the status of Muscle Shoals legislation. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] very kindly referred me to an explanation he had made, and which I found in the RECORD of January 28.

I read the Senator's explanation very carefully, and I wonder if any lessee could be obtained to make fertilizer under the restrictions insisted upon by the Senate conferees. They require the lessee to put all his eggs in one basket; if I am correct, the fertilizer basket. I would like to ask if it would not be better to consent to the lessee having a little extra power for other purposes than to continue letting the Alabama Power Co. have it all?

As I said yesterday, I am not very well informed on this proposition, but the people in my State are getting very much worried about it. It will soon be time to begin the planting of crops, and it does seem to me that United States Senators and Representatives, men of high intelligence, could certainly reach some kind of a compromise—although I do not believe much in compromising—by which something could be done at Muscle Shoals. Before I came here I heard about it and I am still hearing about it.

I do not know whether it is politics being played or what it is, but certainly somebody is being very much injured while some power companies are making a very large amount of money. Every day that this matter is delayed I understand thousands of dollars are rolling into the treasuries of power companies, while the people are being deprived of that which is justly theirs and are not allowed the benefits of this God-given power which should be theirs.

I am not questioning anyone's rights or anyone's manner of doing things according to his own conscience, but it does seem to me that politics should be laid aside sometimes. That is very seldom done, I know, but it does seem to me that these gentlemen could get together somehow and not delay this matter until the 4th of March and not do anything with it, and thus leave this great power situation in the hands of the Power Trust. If we are here to represent the Power Trust, all right; but if we are here to represent the people then let us do something for the people. We seldom do, it is true, but God gave them this power; let it be theirs.

SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STREET WORK

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, on Tuesday night when the calendar was being called, a measure was reached which has to do with assessing the cost of pavements against the abutting property. I refer to House bill 14049, to provide for special assessments for the paving of roadways and the laying of curbs and gutters. The Borland Act has been declared unconstitutional, so there is no way for the assessments to be levied until some law is enacted. The commissioners regard the enactment of this bill as very important. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] raised an objection the other night on the ground that the measure is unconstitutional, and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] had an objection. Both those Senators are now satisfied with the constitutionality of the measure, and I wish it might be enacted now.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, is this the bill with the retroactive clause in it?

Mr. COPELAND. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask the Senator to let it go over until to-morrow. I thought the objection was valid when it was made, and I confess I have not the familiarity with the measure that I ought to have.

Mr. COPELAND. Let me say to the Senator from California that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] made a careful examination of the measure, in company with Mr. Bride, the corporation counsel of the District, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] has made an examination of it, and both those Senators, legal authorities, have agreed that the bill is a proper measure. I am authorized to speak for both those Senators in the statement I am making to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will not the Senator let it go over until to-morrow?

Mr. COPELAND. Very well.

SOVIET RUSSIA

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three articles by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], published in the Washington Herald, entitled "What Soviet Russia Is Doing To-day and Why the United States Should Recognize It," "Improvement of Educational Facilities One of Russian Government's Greatest Achievements," and "Britain, Germany, Italy, and Other European Nations Busy Hunting Russian Markets."

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

[From the Washington Herald of Sunday, September 21, 1930]

UNITED STATES SENATOR WHEELER TELLS WHAT SOVIET RUSSIA IS DOING TO-DAY AND WHY UNITED STATES SHOULD RECOGNIZE IT—"PARADOXICALLY, THE YOUNG ATHEIST IS NOW THE PURITAN AND REFORMER OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNITY," HE SAYS

(By BURTON K. WHEELER, United States Senator from Montana)

To the communist in Russia or to the average communist sympathizer in America, one is either for everything the Soviet Government is doing or attempting to do or else he is, in their opinion, blinded by capitalistic prejudices.

On the other hand, if one sees anything worth while that the Soviet Government is doing and correctly reports it, he is, in the eyes of the fanatical antiliberal or reactionary groups in America, instantly a communist who seeks to overthrow this Government.

In other words, the communist in Russia is as dogmatic in the righteousness of his cause as is the blind reactionary in this country. To neither of them is there a place for the liberal or progressive.

For instance, I found that the average communist in Russia could see no good in the labor government in England or the socialist government in Germany. Any movement which has for its object the amelioration of the condition of the working classes except by revolution was to them anathema.

OPPOSITES—UNITED STATES SYSTEM AT VARIANCE WITH RUSSIA'S

It is not difficult to understand why we in America can not judge impartially the development of the soviet régime. It is because we are committed by religious, moral, and economic training to a system that is diametrically opposed to that of Russia, and we therefore judge everything according to American standards.

Mrs. Wheeler and I first visited Russia in 1923. When we came back to America, I stated that I could either paint a word picture about Russia which would shock the sensibilities of the average American or one that would look very beautiful to the same average American. This is likewise true, more or less, of practically every nation in the world.

One can pick out the bad in any city or country and paint a picture which to our puritanical American mind would be shocking.

Nevertheless, should we say—

"Let's have nothing to do with those people; let's not associate with them; let's not trade with them; let's not sell them clothes or food or even machinery."

There are thieves, bandits, and murderers in Chicago and other cities. The farm population, therefore, I presume, should say:

"Let's not sell them food."

The point I wish to make is this: If one judges the Russian Government by American standards, one unquestionably would condemn almost everything Russian, particularly the government.

Before we can judge the Russians or their government intelligently, we must take into consideration something of their background, the kind of government they had before the revolution, the economic situation of the masses.

What was the moral and economic standard of the 160,000,000 Russian peasants before the revolution? Was the Russian proletarian rich and prosperous, or was he, as most writers of Russian history tell us, a man without education, hope, opportunity, or ambition?

RETROSPECT—FORMER CONDITION OF MASSES CONTRASTED

These and many other questions American observers must ask themselves before they can either approve or disapprove of the things that are taking place in Russia to-day.

Before we condemn the Russian people for their cruelties to the ruling classes, before we condemn too severely their attitude toward the churches, we should know something of the cruelties perpetrated by the ruling classes upon the proletariat, of the utter ignorance in which they were kept and of the deception practiced upon the people by the czarist politicians in the name of the church.

One has only to visit the palaces in Moscow and Leningrad, the churches and cathedrals, to see the crown jewels which showed the extravagance indulged in by the rulers of both church and state and contrast it with the poverty, filth, disease, and ignorance of the masses to understand the reason for some of the excesses, some of the superstitions, some of the murders that have been committed since the proletariat became the ruling class in Russia.

The wonder is not that there have been excesses, not that they have failed overnight to bring prosperity to the country, but that they have been able to guide at all the destinies of a great empire which occupies one-seventh of the world's land.

The wonder is not that there is a shortage of food, clothes, and living quarters, which is their present condition, but that there is any food or clothing at all.

I found many people in 1923 and some in 1930 who were dissatisfied with the Government, but I found no one who wanted to see the old order return—not even the peasants, who undoubtedly are the most dissatisfied class and at the same time the best-fed class in all Russia.

RUSSIA TO-DAY—VAST POPULATION RULED BY WORKING CLASS

What is the situation in Russia to-day?

First of all, Russia is ruled by the working class—that is, the Communist Party, which consists, I am told, of about 600,000 members and which dictates the policies of approximately 160,000,000 people. Most of the Communist Party belong to the proletariat.

Stalin is the outstanding man within that party and, I should say, almost completely dominates it and, through it, the Government. He rules with an iron hand. No one, not even a prominent member of the party, dares speak or act contrary to the pronounced will of that organization. To a large extent Stalin's will is the will of the party.

There is no free speech in Russia. There is no trial by jury.

Workers in a factory may criticize the way the factory is run; they may make charges against the manager, which the newspapers will publish, but no one must criticize the activities of the Government in dealing with the gulak, or denounce it for its religious persecutions, or say a thousand things that we Americans deem our privilege, our right, and at times our duty to do or say concerning our Government.

If anyone has the temerity to do so he may be tried in the courts publicly or be given a hearing behind closed doors and condemned to death or sentenced to work in the woods or mines.

I was informed that four men were shot for hoarding silver coins while we were in Russia. A member of the Communist Party who accepts bribes has no chance to tamper with jurors; he is taken out and shot as a counter-revolutionist, an enemy of the Government.

In addition to a large standing army, Russia has a state police, called the G. P. U. The G. P. U. not only acts as a state police but it hears evidence and actually decides the fate of persons charged with offenses.

If it decides one is to be shot as a counter-revolutionist, he is shot; if it decides one should be sent to work in the woods or mines, he is sent there. There is no appeal, no trial by jury, and little chance to present his side of the case.

This organization takes the place of the notorious spy system built up under the Czar.

I was unable to find in the soviet constitution a provision justifying it in exercising the autocratic powers which it assumes. To me, it is unjustifiable to say the least.

All civil cases and all criminal cases that are not handled by the G. P. U. are tried before three persons designated as judges. One of the judges holds office for a year; the other two hold office for 10 sittings of the court. These two are selected from a panel in a manner somewhat similar to that in which we select a petit jury in this country.

I listened to the trial of one case. The judges heard the evidence of both the prosecution and the defendant and the arguments of counsel. They then retired to the chamber and in a few minutes returned and rendered their decision. In this instance, the defendant was acquitted.

The lawyers are paid by the Government. If anyone wants to hire a lawyer to try a case in court for him, he must go to a Government bureau. This bureau charges what it thinks the person should pay and assigns a lawyer to try the case. This charge does not go to the lawyer; it goes to the government, and the Government pays the lawyer by the month. His salary is $75.

In Moscow we visited the bureau where marriages and divorces are registered. My recollection is that they told us there were about 75 per cent more marriages than divorces. The marriage procedure is simple, but not much different from a marriage ceremony before a justice of the peace. The parties are asked their business and whether they have been married or divorced before. The whole proceeding takes about 10 minutes.

I have seen marriages performed in much less time than that and with about as little formality before a justice of the peace in this country. Contrary to the popular belief in America, we were informed that in the villages most of the marriages still are being performed by the regular church ceremony and that the babies still are being christened in the churches.

We watched several apply for and obtain divorces. They simply went to the clerk, told him they wanted a divorce, stated the grounds, and went away smiling. Unless there were children involved, there was no difficulty.

ALIMONY MUST BE PAID IF CHILDREN ARE IN FAMILY

If there were children, alimony had to be paid for their support. Either the father or the mother would be awarded the custody of the child, and the one best able to earn money had to pay for its support.

The individual in Russia has complete freedom of action in regard to marriage and divorce. What the ultimate effect of making the marriage relation entirely voluntary is going to have upon their civilization remains to be seen.

This system of marriage and divorce is repugnant to most Americans and helps to obscure one's views of some of the things the Russians are doing for the betterment of the human race.

A decided change has taken place in the religious life of Russia since our visit there in 1923. At that time we found that notwithstanding the activities of the atheists in Russia, there was a tremendous religious fervor. I was sure no amount of opposition on the part of the Government could stamp this out.

I have had to revise the opinions I formed in 1923 with reference to the headway the soviets would make in their effort to destroy the old religious faiths of the people. What astonished me on my visit this year was not that many out of the thousands of churches in Russia still were open, but that most of them were closed and that on the surface, at least, atheism was sweeping the country.

Something has happened to bring about this change. In discussing religion with a group of church leaders in Russia in 1923 they told me that the atheist propaganda that was being carried on had stimulated interest in the churches; that their followers were attending church as never before; they wanted to hear about Christ and His teachings.

But now the churches were nearly all closed and grass was growing between the cobblestones that lead up to that famous cathedral where only seven years ago Mrs. Wheeler and I attended with 10,000 people.

In Vladimir, a city about 150 miles from Moscow, practically every church was closed. The famous cathedral there was to be turned into a museum, and a merry-go-round and other amusement devices were doing a prosperous business in the churchyard on a Sunday afternoon.

What has brought this about? What has caused the people to burn their ikons or turn them over to the Government to be used in the manufacture of Russian samovars? It has been the antireligious propaganda, together with pressure from the Government on the religious leaders that has brought this astonishing change.

As an illustration of this antireligious propaganda, I call attention to a poster in the antireligious museum in Moscow depicting the sacred confessional as being used as an adjunct of the Czar's spy system.

This sort of propaganda, together with the persecution of the religious leaders, has made a tremendous impression upon the Russian youth. I talked with them and they told me that they had been furnished ample proof that the church worked hand and glove with the Government to exploit and enrich itself and oppress the masses.

SUBSTITUTE—COMMUNITY HALLS TAKE PLACE OF CHURCHES

To take the place of the church, they have built up community halls where the young and old gather for their social life. Whether this will satisfy their spiritual needs, and take the place of the church, remains to be seen.

One of the paradoxes in this land of paradoxes is that the young atheist is the reformer in the community. He talks about evils of the modern dance and denounces the intemperate. He preaches against lax morals of all sorts; he is the puritan of Russia.

Contrary to many statements that have been made, not all of the churches are closed; not all of the preachers and priests are exiled or in prison but priests and preachers must be extremely cautious of what they say or do lest they be sent into the woods or mines.

[From the Washington Herald of Sunday, September 28, 1930]

COMMUNISTS HOLD POWER IN RUSSIA THROUGH RED ARMY—SENATOR WHEELER SEES SOVIETS DEVELOPING COLLECTIVE FARMING WITH U. S. EXPERTS' AID—IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES ONE OF RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT'S GREATEST ACHIEVEMENTS

(By BURTON K. WHEELER, United States Senator from Montana, who recently returned from a visit to Soviet Russia)

What made it possible for the soviets to get such a strong foothold in Russia?

In my judgment, the thing that contributed most at the outset was the attacks made upon them by the White Armies with the aid of the Allies.

While the vast majority of the people of Russia were and are peasants living in about 300,000 isolated villages, without any particular views upon economic or political matters, they always wanted land.

One of the first acts of the soviet régime after coming into power was to decree that the land which had heretofore been a part of large estates be thenceforth the land of the peasants. Having so recently come into possession of the thing they desired most, the peasants feared the return of the old order.

They knew also that the White Armies were being aided by foreign powers, and they preferred Russians, though communists, to any foreign ruler. They therefore rallied to the support of the communists and made it possible for them to maintain themselves in power.

POWERFUL ARMY HAS KEPT COMMUNISTS IN CONTROL

What has kept them in power?

The army.

One of the first things the communists did after gaining control was to build up their army. They realized that if they were to maintain their hold they must have a strong, well-fed, well-paid, contented army, sufficient to resist attacks from without and put down any counter-revolutionary movement from within.

With a good deal of foresight, then, they recruited several hundred thousand men throughout Russia who were ragged, hungry, and shiftless. They fed them, bought them good uniforms, taught them to read and write, and in addition educated them in the principles of communism.

To-day they have an army estimated at from 800,000 to 1,000,000 men. They can put down any counter-revolutionary movement that starts in Russia. They can and will resist any attack from without.

The Russian Army is held in high esteem by all classes in Russia. Most of the young men in the villages are eager to join it. This is contrary to what one will find in almost every other country in Europe.

BENEFITS—RECRUIT RECEIVES EDUCATION IN RED ARMY

The young peasant who goes into the army is given a chance to see the country, taught to read and write, and in addition taught some useful occupation. After his two years' service he leaves the army better fitted than most of the young men in the villages to become a useful citizen.

Is there any likelihood that the Government will be overthrown?

Although the peasants rallied to its support to keep the land they so earnestly desired, they were and are not in sympathy with a large part of the communist program, and probably would overthrow the Government if they could.

An American who had traveled over the greater part of Russia during the last few years, said to me:

"The communists will be successful in their undertaking provided the peasants cooperate with them."

He then added that if the peasants ever obtained the upper hand there would be nothing left of the communist leaders except "a grease spot," and that "the leaders know it." When I inquired whether the peasants had a chance of overthrowing the Government he replied, "None whatever."

One has only to visit the villages to realize how helpless the peasants would be in attempting an overthrow of the Government.

In most of the villages we visited, where the peasants had not joined a collective farm, we found them still mowing their grain with a sickle, as in Biblical times—still threshing it with a flail made out of two pieces of wood tied together in the center.

They had never seen an automobile or an American. They appeared to be almost primitive.

While it is dangerous to predict what will happen in Russia, since conditions change so rapidly from day to day, it is my belief that the soviet régime will not be destroyed unless its destruction comes from within the Communist Party in Russia itself. If it is destroyed it will be due to the selfishness, jealousies, and ambitions of strong personalities that are bound to spring up in that and every other organization made up of human beings.

The Government claims to have made its greatest gains in its effort to industrialize Russia. Tremendous progress was made in the 7-year period from 1923 to 1930, and every effort is being made to make a success of the huge program of industrialization known as the 5-year plan.

Handicapped as the leaders were and are by the illiterate and unskilled masses of the people, with most of the so-called intelligentsia killed or driven from the country, they have gone ahead building huge electrical power plants, factories for the manufacture of automobiles, tractors, and heavy machinery of all kinds.

In addition, they are developing their natural resources, including lumber, coal, oil, iron, and manganese, and do not seem to have any trouble in selling their products to the captains of industry in this and other countries.

There are 12,000 foreign engineers in Russia to-day, 2,000 of whom are among America's best. Likewise they have brought in many skilled mechanics from the United States and other parts of the world. They are paying high salaries to the foreigners and high prices for their material.

Back of their intensive drive to build up their "heavy" industries—and this is the outstanding feature of their present 5-year plan—is the fear of war. They believe, or make their followers believe, that they expect to be attacked by one or more of the capitalistic nations of the world.

In a brief statement of their accomplishments, one certainly should not overlook what they have done in the way of mass production on their farms. In 1923 less than 5 per cent of the tillable land had been removed from individual ownership and collectivized. This year 24½ per cent of the tillable land has been collectivized and 40 per cent of this year's crop is being produced on cooperative or state-operated farms.

In March of this year, partly because of the success they attained in their collective farms and partly because of the opposition of many of the more prosperous peasants, the Government renounced its policy of forcing the peasants into the cooperatives and made it a matter of voluntary action.

Many of the peasants withdrew and drove their pigs, cows, and horses back to their respective homes.

The Government is now building up the cooperative farms by giving them Government aid—loans, seed, machinery, and experts to assist them in their management. American experts are managing some of these farms.

There is no question but what collectivized or cooperative farming offers a much easier and better living for the Russian peasant than what he has heretofore known. The collectivized farming must be efficiently managed by men skilled in the art of large-scale agriculture.

TEST TO COME—COLLECTIVE FARMING NOT YET SURE TO SUCCEED

Is it possible for this illiterate peasant to be transformed overnight from the reaper with a sickle to the operator of the modern tractor and combine?

The real test of the collectives has not been reached. We must wait until the first flush of enthusiasm has flickered out.

The improvement in the educational facilities of the Soviet Government since my visit in 1923 ranks among their greatest achievements. They set out at that time to wipe out illiteracy among the adult population.

Under the Czarist régime at least 80 per cent of their population could not read or write. Soviet officials claim that to-day 70 per cent of the population of school age is literate.

They have just inaugurated compulsory education for children from 8 to 11 years. Their facilities, however, are still inadequate. While they have a long way to go, they should be given credit for what they have done in the past seven years—particularly when contrasted with the utter lack of education afforded the children of the poorer classes in centuries before.

[From the Washington Herald of Sunday, October 5, 1930]

RECOGNITION OF SOVIETS WILL OPEN VAST TRADE TO UNITED STATES—SENATOR WHEELER SAYS SALE OF AMERICAN GOODS RUSSIA NEEDS WOULD AID UNEMPLOYMENT—BRITAIN, GERMANY, ITALY, AND OTHER EUROPEAN NATIONS BUSY HUNTING RUSSIAN MARKETS

(By BURTON K. WHEELER, United States Senator from Montana)

Will communism ultimately succeed in Russia?

I think it is an impossible task the Russians are undertaking. Many sympathizers point to the fact that they have been in existence for 13 years; that they have made remarkable progress in practically all lines, and will contend that if they make a success of their so-called 5-year plan they will have proved conclusively that communism in Russia is a success and is feasible throughout the world. I can not agree with those arguments.

I have no doubt that they will succeed in their 5-year plan. But, as I said to a very learned American observer, it is one thing to build factories and develop mines under the guidance of American engineers, but it is quite another thing to operate them successfully so that they can compete in the world markets.

He then pointed out to me that it wasn't necessary to operate them successfully according to American standards, for the obvious reason that they did not have to pay profits on watered stock or pay huge salaries to presidents, vice presidents, and directors of corporations. In addition to that he pointed out that the only cost they figured on was what they had to pay for the machinery or the material they purchased abroad.

LABOR SUPPLY IS AMPLE AND CHEAP IN RUSSIA

"Supposing," said he, "that it does take three persons to do the work of one American—what of it? They have the laborers. Every adult of their 160,000,000 population is a producer. They have no traveling salesmen, no brokerage offices, no middlemen—everyone works and produces something or he doesn't eat.

"Everyone in Russia is working for the Government."

It is like a gigantic corporation which not only governs the people's morals, their education, but their very life. The people, the timber, the mines, the land, everything belongs to the Government.

Money is simply the medium of exchange for raw materials produced in the mines, farms, and woods for the finished product made in the factory. There are no profits for the middleman. If there is a profit it goes to the Government.

It seems to me that even under the most favorable circumstances they are undertaking the impossible. Add to this the fact that they started out with an ignorant, illiterate mass of people, the great bulk of whom were living as in the Middle Ages, and one can come to but one conclusion—it can't be done.

My judgment is that the leaders will be forced to modify their views gradually, with the result that eventually there will emerge from it all a democratic form of government patterned after our own.

If they should succeed they will not only change the map of the world, but the economic theories in vogue in many countries.

If the experiment should fail to-morrow, every thinking person would concede, I am sure, that the revolution has not been in vain—that the masses of the people of Russia have been lifted out of the trough of the middle ages into the light of a new and better day.

Russia is not a land of milk and honey for the worker. It is one of sacrifice and untold hardship. Not many communists in America or in any other country could or would suffer as the Russians have suffered for a cause.

And I am informed that, although the peasants this year have a bumper crop, they will suffer more hardship than they have since the famine in 1921, because of the Government's determination to export everything it can for the purpose of getting credit and gold with which to push the 5-year plan.

Should the United States recognize Russia?

Many people believe that by recognizing a country we thereby put our stamp of approval upon its government and upon the religious beliefs, moral standards, and economic views of its people. This idea is erroneous.

There are those who think that by recognizing Russia we would help the spread of communism throughout the United States and the world in general.

To others the stumbling block to recognition is the fact that Russia has not agreed to pay the debt it incurred during the Czarist and Kerensky régimes to the United States and her nationals.

As to this debt, from my conversations with Tchitcherin in 1923 and officials in the foreign office upon my recent visit, I am convinced that the question of their indebtedness to us can be worked out on a basis satisfactory to the United States.

In my judgment, the Russian Government is so anxious for recognition that it would be willing to agree to any terms which it felt were not beneath its dignity as a sovereign nation.

With reference to the spread of communism, it seems to me that no thoughtful American who is familiar with his history would be very much alarmed by the idea that this Government could or would be overthrown by reason of the spread of communist propaganda.

The greatest friend to communism is not the soap-box orator—it is he who would exploit the workers by imposing long hours, poor wages, and undesirable working conditions upon them. These conditions are the food upon which communism thrives.

On the other hand, the greatest enemy to communism here or in Russia is not the kulak, the church, or any particular capitalistic government, but the inherent desire in the human breast for personal betterment.

UNITED STATES IS SAFE—COMMUNISM SUFFERS BY COMPARISON

If I were a leader of the Communist Party in Russia, interested solely in the ultimate success of communistic principles rather than in the immediate welfare of the people of Russia, I would not be seeking recognition or trade relations with the capitalistic nations of the world.

It must be apparent to them that if their people are given an opportunity to compare their standards of living and other conditions in Russia with those of most other countries, the contrast to them would be so great that it would tend to weaken their faith in ever being able to attain the utopian goal for which they are striving.

The fact that a goodly portion of the representatives whom the soviets have sent abroad have succumbed to capitalism instead of converting others to communism is rather persuasive proof that contact with the outside world will prove more detrimental to the soviets than to others.

Russia for 13 years has maintained a stable government—much more stable than have most of the South American and Latin American countries. They have maintained order within their borders. In fact, they have been far more rigid in that respect than many people in Russia would wish. They have met promptly the obligations incurred by them since they came into power.

By all the rules of international law and practice they are entitled to recognition.

While I am utterly opposed to a dictatorship, whether it be by the proletariat in Russia, by a Mussolini in Italy, or by the captains of industry in this country, I am convinced that our dislikes and our prejudices should not enter into our international relations if we expect to preserve the peace of the world.

But a far more important reason to the people of the United States why Russia should be recognized and why, if possible, credit should be extended to her, is the fact that she offers the greatest potential market in the world to-day for our surplus manufactured products.

The Russian people need machinery, shoes, clothes, thread, cloth, cooking utensils, and a thousand and one other things of which we have a surplus. If they could purchase these freely it would tend to solve our unemployment question.

Without credit, 160,000,000 people will have to go without food and clothes—they will have to tighten up their belts. Little children will be underfed and undernourished while the rest of the world suffers from overproduction.

While our great concerns, like the Standard Oil, General Electric, and the International Harvester, and individuals like Henry Ford, deal with the soviets on a successful basis, smaller business men are unable or afraid to take chances until this Government has established diplomatic relations with them.

Great Britain, Italy, and Germany, I am informed, are all guaranteeing purchases made by Russia from their nationals up to 60 and in some cases 75 per cent.

While we are hunting the reds and discouraging trade with Russia, Great Britain, Germany, Italy, and the other nations of Europe are hunting markets in Russia to alleviate unemployment and to enlarge their share of the trade of the world.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14675) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I wish to say just a few words to the Senate in support of the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill. I am strongly in favor of the adoption of the report which is now before us. I say that not only as a Senator from Louisiana, one of the States which has a great many people in a distressed condition, although we have not talked very much about it so far, but as a planter who has been trying to make cotton and other crops during his entire life and has been furnishing a good many people who have been making crops, and are trying to make them this year. I believe, therefore, that I am a fairly practical man when it comes to deciding upon what is meant by the proposed compromise.

I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to its wording. The only part that I think we should consider now is No. 2:

To make advances or loans to farmers for crop production for the crop of 1931.

Senators, in my candid opinion, not only as a planter or farmer, but as one who used to be a lawyer, we could not have more comprehensive terms than those used:

To make advances or loans to farmers for crop production.

What does that mean? I have been lending money for many years to the tenants and farmers on my property for crop production. I usually take a crop lien and chattel mortgage from those tenant farmers. For what purposes do I give them the money? To buy food for themselves and their families, to buy feed for their work stock, to buy an occasional work animal, to buy farm implements, to buy more or less hardware, to supplement the worn-out tools, to pay drug bills and doctor bills, to buy clothing and shoes, to give them everything, my Senator friends, that is necessary to enable men without means to make and harvest a crop. That is exactly what this language means—

To make advances or loans to farmers for crop production.

Suppose instead of "crop production" we had written in there the words "to make advances or loans for food"? That would be fine. That is one of the things for which the money is to be used, but there are a great many things needed besides food. The language could not be more comprehensive unless we had used many more words. If instead of "money for crop production" we had said "for food, for clothing, and for all things necessary to produce and harvest a crop," those words would have been about as comprehensive as are those in the pending measure. But I contend that as written they mean everything necessary. Let me inquire, Mr. President, if they do not mean that, then what do they mean? They are not vain and foolish words.

"Money for crop production." What does that expression mean if not food, clothing, shoes, and the innumerable things necessary in addition to the feed, the seed, the fertilizer, the boll-weevil poison, the oil for tractors, and every-

thing of that kind which has already been provided by the $45,000,000 bill? There can be no doubt about it. I can not for the life of me see how it can be construed in any other way.

Mr. President, the man who has to construe that language is Mr. Hyde, the Secretary of Agriculture. How did he construe a similar law in 1929, when many of the people of Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina were terribly stricken by flood? That law was worded almost exactly the same as this one, but it was tighter in its provisions. It was limited to seed and fertilizer, and yet we have heard no complaint of its construction and application. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] said two days ago on this floor that that law had been fairly and sympathetically administered in those States and in a manner satisfactory to their people.

The same Secretary of Agriculture is now in office, and I am convinced that he will administer the pending measure just as fairly and sympathetically. But suppose he attempts to act harshly. Suppose he refuses to carry out the clear mandate and wishes of Congress in this particular; what will happen? The Secretary of Agriculture is not the man to whom the Constitution looks to enforce the laws. Our Constitution provides that it is the duty of the President to see "that the laws be faithfully executed," and if Mr. Hyde should attempt to administer this law in a harsh manner, in what I consider the cruel manner which some Senators seem to fear, he would be called down at once by President Hoover.

Can it be conceived by any fair-minded Senator, whether he be Democrat or Republican, partisan or statesman, that a man who handled in such a wonderful manner the food supplies for Europe during and after the World War would be harsh and unkind to the people of his own country? Can a man from the State of Louisiana or Arkansas or Mississippi or any of the States in the valley of the Mississippi, which suffered so terribly from floods in 1927, and who saw the wonderful work done at that time by Mr. Hoover, when Secretary of Commerce, conceive that he would be otherwise than humane, kindly, and efficient in the execution of this law?

Senators, I happen to live in the very heart of the overflow section of the Mississippi Valley, and I know personally that the work which Mr. Hoover did during and after the flood of 1927 to relieve the distress among our people, caused by overflows which cost $250,000,000 in loss of property value and the lives of considerably more than 100 human beings. Mr. Hoover was not there in a formal way. He went there again and again, and he stayed weeks at a time. He traveled about the distressed regions in boats, in airplanes, on the trains, everywhere and in every manner, and personally did what I consider the most humane and remarkable work of relief of human suffering that ever was done during an overflow of the Mississippi.

I speak from personal experience. I have lived on the banks of the Father of Waters since September, 1882, a little more than 48 years. I have passed through flood after flood there, and I know what was done by every President who sat in the White House during that time and by Cabinet officers. To tell me that the man who worked so hard for humanity during the World War and afterwards and so splendidly for the people of the overflowed valley of the Mississippi would be harsh to those who are suffering from distress brought upon them by the God of Hosts through no fault of their own is so unreasonable that I consider it unworthy of consideration in this body. Let us put all of that kind of talk behind us.

Mr. President, I wish to read two or three telegrams from my State to show something of the work of the Red Cross. That organization has ever acted nobly and effectively in time of distress. Owing to the recurrence of floods from time to time in the Mississippi Valley, on more than one occasion we have had to rely upon the Red Cross, and I may say, sir, that never has it been found wanting. It has always answered the calls made upon it, and answered them splendidly. I shall read the telegrams in order that they may appear in the RECORD. The first is from E. S. Richardson, of Minden, La., who says:

MINDEN, LA., *February 10, 1931.*

Hon. J. E. RANSDELL,
Senate Office Building:

Red Cross functioning at present so far as human food is concerned. Stock too poor for work. Farmers have nothing for which to purchase farm material and farm implements. Situation grave.

E. S. RICHARDSON.

I read now from a telegram from Mr. B. F. Thompson, the chairman of the Louisiana drought relief committee, who says:

Red Cross rationing a large number of our people, but our better class of white farmers much prefer borrowing money with which to buy food than having it given to them from any source. What our State needs is some definite decision that can be depended upon.

Senators, this telegram from Mr. Thompson, the chairman of the drought relief committee of Louisiana, shows that our people are not asking gifts; they are asking credit; and this compromise will provide credit. This compromise will furnish $20,000,000 to be loaned to the people, $5,000,000 of which may be used to help organize and develop agricultural credit associations.

When those associations are developed, as all Senators probably know, the intermediate credit banks can lend ten times their capital. So, if $5,000,000 under the terms of this compromise measure is advanced for that purpose, $50,000,000 can, if necessary, be loaned to the distressed farmers. The credit of the Government will be given these people; not anything approaching dole, not anything approaching charity, but credit will be extended to them to carry on their business, and they will furnish reasonable security.

I am not in a position to speak of conditions in some sections of the country where there are miners, but I can speak of the farming sections of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas; and I say that under the terms of this compromise the Secretary of Agriculture can lend money on crop liens, as the law provides; that he will receive reasonable security from the crop liens, and, in some instances, from chattel mortgages on the work stock of the farmers. There is not a single farmer throughout that region, so far as my judgment goes—and I am familiar with it—who can not comply with the terms of this proposed law.

I will now read just a line from a telegram sent me by Mr. Harry D. Wilson, commissioner of agriculture of my State. He says:

FEBRUARY 10, 1931.

* * * Red Cross has done good work. Understand they were feeding about 40,000 families last month.

Think of it, Senators. We have not advertised that condition much on this floor, but in my State—in Louisiana—the Red Cross was feeding 40,000 families last month.

But expect to decrease that number this month. It seems that those in charge of loaning on forty-five million act functioning very slow. Very few loans have been completed and made in Louisiana. Our people must continue to receive food from some source if they are to make crop this year. Banks and supply merchants have about exhausted everything they have.

HARRY D. WILSON, *Commissioner.*

I also desire to quote from a statement of drought conditions, prepared by Mr. Wilson, as follows:

STATEMENT OF DROUGHT CONDITIONS AS SEEN BY HARRY D. WILSON, COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION

FEBRUARY 5, 1931.

* * * * * * *

It is a well-known fact that the funds that are now available to the Red Cross are not near sufficient to take care of the actual needs of the citizens in the stricken sections of our Nation.

With no intention to reflect upon our brethren of neighboring States, who have given certain and emphatic demonstration of their plight, it must be said that the drought stricken of Louisiana have grimly but silently kept their peace.

* * * * * * *

After a trip through most of the affected area in Louisiana, during which many parishes involved have been visited, the opinions of hundreds of citizens heard, and the actual state of affairs in all this territory viewed with my own eyes, I am convinced that

our only course to avoid privation and actual famine is to use every available means to impress upon the President, Congress, and the entire Nation the true situation. As much as it injures the pride of any red-blooded man to give voice to an appeal which is in itself an admission that help must come from outside sources, this is our duty.

It is difficult to comprehend that approximately 40,000 good, honest, hard-working Louisiana families have become dependent upon outside aid for life's necessities. These people are not seekers of charity. They are not looking for a dole. The Nation must be made to realize that this situation calls for the dispensation of something that can not possibly be described as charity. The Government must realize this and set in motion immediately the machinery by which these citizens can be placed again on a self-sustaining basis. They must not be allowed, no matter what the cost in dollars and cents, to become dependent for another year upon outside aid to prevent starvation and widespread misery. Through the loss of spirit and actual physical strength, brought about by their inability to take their rightful place as producers in the Nation, this condition will inevitably exist unless quick and efficient action is forthcoming.

Throughout this area of Louisiana I have also seen with my own eyes the barren and empty shelves of many of the general stores whose owners have given to the last drop of their resources to tide over their customers of long years.

They can not go further. They have reached their limit.

These conditions are all too true. As much as we deplore them, as much as our pride rebels, we must face the situation in all its gravity and make known to the world the absolute necessity that prevails in order that Louisiana's affected citizens may receive the proper relief that American taxpayers and contributors to American independence deserve.

* * * * * * *

The expressions of hundreds of leaders and the conditions which I have beheld myself during this survey convince me that the local interests will be entirely incapable of coping with the serious situation which the failure of the Government to provide food has brought about.

There is no assurance whatsoever that the Red Cross—doing as noble work as could possibly be done—can secure the needed funds with which to relieve such widespread conditions of distress. I find none who voice the hope that the Red Cross can contribute the meager rations, which amount on an average of $10 per month for the average family of five, beyond a very limited time. In our own State of Louisiana a great majority of those approximately 40,000 families now receiving aid from the Red Cross, without which many of them could not exist, have absolutely no prospect of realizing a return from their efforts to produce a crop until early fall. Between the time that Red Cross funds have become exhausted and the time when these crop funds are realized these people must be sustained.

I therefore urge every loyal citizen throughout the entire State to call to the attention of the entire Nation the urgent need for material assistance with which these conditions can be met. Congress must not adjourn on March 4 with this great problem unsolved. It must not adjourn with the possibility of starvation staring these thousands of humans squarely in the face. It is the plain duty, it is the only humane course for Congress to follow to make adequate provisions in order that there may be no question whatsoever that this issue may be met as Americans should meet it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. What will the people of Louisiana do if they are unable to borrow money from the Secretary of Agriculture in the event the Red Cross funds give out?

Mr. RANSDELL. As I understand the situation, every farmer there who is in distress and who needs money will be enabled to borrow it from the Secretary of Agriculture under the plain terms of the act, because all of those who are in distress are engaged in farming; that is the one big industry in that section of Louisiana. The same thing is true across the river in Mississippi and to the north in Arkansas. In northern Louisiana and in Arkansas and Mississippi agriculture is the one business, and every single agriculturist can avail himself of the benefits of this proposed act.

However, it is not my understanding that the Red Cross contemplates ceasing to help the people; it is going to continue to help; but even if it were to withdraw, if the $45,000,000 appropriation providing for seed, feed, fertilizer, boll-weevil poison, and fuel oil, and things of that kind, were fairly administered, and the $20,000,000 provided by the proposed compromise were fairly administered, there would not be a single suffering human being in that section of the Nation who could not get relief.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana further yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. RANSDELL. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Red Cross sent out an appeal several days ago asking for a contribution of $10,000,000. The latest report I have seen is to the effect that the Red Cross has raised something like $7,000,000. In other words, the Red Cross has not been able to raise $10,000,000 throughout the entire United States.

Just one further point: This morning the newspapers carry the information that a high official of the Government in the Medical Service had just been to Arkansas and, if the newspapers are to be believed, he reports the conditions there are bad, that they are getting worse, and will probably get much worse. That being true, and the Red Cross having trouble in raising $10,000,000, what does the Senator look forward to as a means of providing relief for his constituents?

Mr. RANSDELL. That official, I will say, was Gen. Hugh S. Cumming, the very able head of the Public Health Service. He went down to make arrangements for distributing $2,000,000 which were given to the Public Health Service to enable it to cope with outbreaks of disease that very naturally arise during a time of flood or drought or any other abnormal condition. General Cumming visited that section of the country, and he stated things as he saw them; but he has $2,000,000 to help give relief, the Secretary of Agriculture has $45,000,000 for that purpose, under this provision he will have $20,000,000 more, making $65,000,000, and I say that will go a good, long way toward helping afford relief, even if the Red Cross shall not succeed in securing the remainder of the $10,000,000.

I may say, however, that I am just as certain as that I am standing on this floor that the Red Cross will get the $10,000,000 and more from the great, big, kind-hearted American people, who never have failed to come to the relief of their brethren in distress. I have no fear on that subject. The Red Cross never has fallen down, and it is not going to fall down now. I wish to heaven we had more such institutions in this country as the Red Cross. God bless it.

Now I wish to read just a few lines——

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

Mr. RANSDELL. I will yield to a question.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator contend that in the $65,000,000 or in the $20,000,000 appropriation we are now discussing there is any relief for the man who has not any security?

Mr. RANSDELL. My friend from Montana, I am afraid, did not hear what I said or he would not have asked that question. I contend that throughout the farming regions of America every farmer will have such security as this bill contemplates; he will be able to give a crop lien. I see the Senator smiling, but I am afraid he does not know anything about farming as it is carried on in Louisiana, in Arkansas, in Mississippi, and in many other sections of the South. The system in the section where I live is for the poor farmer—and most of them are poor, and the so-called rich ones are loaded down with debts—at the beginning of the year to go to his landlord, to a merchant, or to a bank and say, "I am going to cultivate 25 acres on such a plantation, or 50 acres, and I should like to secure a loan of $300, $500, or $700. The security I have, sir, is a crop lien on so many acres of cotton and corn and products of that kind," and the crop lien is executed. The Secretary of Agriculture will have just the same kind of security. He will have a first lien on the crop. Of course we can imagine such a thing as a rascally farmer, after getting the money, not making a crop, but that is practically unheard of. Most of the farmers are honest men; most of them try to comply with their obligations; and nearly all of them cultivate lands belonging to landlords who are interested to the extent of getting their rent and the money with which they will supplement the loans made by the Secretary of Agriculture. So the provi-

sion, if adopted, is going to be carried out in a reasonable way.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator mentioned a moment ago the fact that he himself, as a landowner, is providing funds for his tenants.

Mr. RANSDELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Without any desire to be personal, and not referring to the Senator but referring to some one in his identical situation, before that person in the identical position in which the Senator from Louisiana is can secure money under existing law he must file this kind of an application—I read from one clause of the application:

> Because of incumbrances on my real estate and personal property and lack of funds I am unable to procure the aforementioned seed, fertilizer, feed, and/or fuel and oil, and a failure to receive this loan will prevent me from farming in 1931.

With that clause in the application blank, does the Senator expect that farmers in Louisiana will make application to procure money with which to finance their tenant farmers?

Mr. RANSDELL. I think a great many of them will, because the drought conditions were so bad that in the State of Arkansas, I understand, 143 banks failed. Some few of them have resumed. A great many have failed in Mississippi. I am glad to tell the Senator that very few have failed so far in Louisiana; but the officials of the bank in my home town, of which I was a director for many years, although I resigned during the last two or three months, told me that they were not able to make advances this year; that they could not collect what was due them last year, and they did not know where the farmers were going to get money in order to make their crops. So, just to bring it to myself, suppose some of my tenants want to get money and the Secretary of Agriculture is willing to advance it to them providing I waive all my rights, does the Senator think I would be so foolish as to say, "No; I will not waive my rights; I will let the land grow up in weeds"? I would not be that foolish. I would say, "Of course I waive my landlord's rights, and every other right I have, in order that my tenant farmer may get some money with which to make a crop." That will be done generally by our people.

I would rather my land be cultivated, whether I got any money or not. I do not want my land to grow up in weeds; I do not want my tenantry to move; I do not want my tenantry to join the great army of the unemployed throughout the Nation; I want them to remain independent, self-supporting men, as they will continue to be if we give them credit; but not if we give them a dole, and they are not asking for that.

Now, to continue, I have a telegram from the general chairman of the East Carroll Parish Red Cross Chapter, my home parish, and here is what he says:

> Red Cross has functioned very satisfactorily in East Carroll Parish so far, and their disposition has been to be liberal in feeding the people in this drought area. They have instructed us to use our judgment, and have left the distribution entirely in the hands of the local committee appointed by the East Carroll Parish Chapter, and have so far complied with all requests for cash grants made by our chapter. In all our dealing with national headquarters in Washington our relations have been pleasant. * * * The compromise proposition on the $20,000,000 is reasonable, and I hear approval of the plan by many citizens of this community. They expect, if proposition adopted, that those unable to obtain credit elsewhere can get sufficient funds in addition to feed, etc., to enable them to buy food and pay ordinary expenses. This is imperative, as there is a class of farmers in this section of country who must have this credit in order to be able to obtain money upon which to live and make a crop this year, otherwise they and their families will be public charges on the communities and objects of charity for the next two years.

That telegram is signed J. Martian Hamley, chairman East Carroll Parish Chapter, American Red Cross, and one of the most reliable men in my State.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. RANSDELL. I do.

Mr. WHEELER. I heard the Senator say something about a dole. Do I understand him to take the position that in the event the people have no credit, whether they be farmers or whether they be laboring men who are out of work, the Government should not extend any loans to them for food if they have not security?

Mr. RANSDELL. That does not come under the terms of this bill at all.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes, it does.

Mr. RANSDELL. I am not discussing any academic question like that. I will say to the Senator that I should hate to see a system of dole——

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

Mr. RANSDELL. Well, now, wait: The Senator asked me a question, and I am going to answer it.

Mr. WHEELER. I want the Senator to answer it.

Mr. RANSDELL. All right; I will answer it in my own way. I say, I should hate to see a system established of a dole such as they have in old England. The papers yesterday morning said it was costing $250,000,000 a year. I do not think the people in America need it. I would vote any sum to relieve people from starving and suffering; but I should like to put it in such a way that it would not be an annual dole, but a temporary loan or a temporary gift to keep people from starving. I would do it very much like the Red Cross is doing in my section now. You may call that "charity" if you will. It is charity, but it is very different from the dole as we understand that term. The dole, as I look upon it, is in the nature of a pension, and it takes away the pride of people.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not asking the Senator about a dole. I say that this "compromise," if it can be called a compromise, does not provide for the care of any person, whether he is a farmer or whether he is a worker, unless he can give security. Is the Senator in favor of our adjourning without doing something for the unfortunate man who can not give security?

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, answering the question of the Senator, I will say that I am one of those men who like to take things somewhat in piecemeal. I do not think we can legislate for all the troubles to which flesh is heir in one piece of legislation. This measure, as I understand, takes care of agriculture. There are a lot of people in cities who are suffering, and God knows they have my sympathy. I should be glad to help them in any way they could be helped. I understand that they are being taken care of fairly well by the community chests, the Salvation Army, the different organizations of the various churches—and they all are doing wonderful work in that line—also by the Red Cross; but under this piece of legislation I say that there is not a single farmer who can not give the security which the law contemplates the Secretary of Agriculture shall take. There is no reason why any men in the farming regions throughout the drought-stricken areas can not give the necessary security, if they are farmers now. They may be doing something else, and not be able to give security; but if they are genuinely carrying on farming work, they can give the crop lien or other security required.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator pardon me again?

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

Mr. RANSDELL. I do.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator explain to the Senate how a farmer who is already mortgaged at the present time, and has given a lien on his 1931 crop, can get any money under this bill?

Mr. RANSDELL. The Senator is asking an improbable question.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no, Mr. President!

Mr. RANSDELL. Pardon me; the Senator has asked me a question, and I desire to answer it.

The Senator asks about a farmer who has already given a lien on his 1931 crop. If he gave the lien, he must have received money, or he would not have given it. If he has already given a lien, and has not money enough to go on, then the man to whom the lien was given, as stated in answer to former questions, must waive his lien. I say to the Senator, as a practical farmer who knows something about these things from an experience of nearly 50 years in farming in that region, that there is not a single landlord or landowner who would not gladly waive his lien to enable these men to get the necessary feed, seed, fertilizer, boll-weevil poison, food, clothes, doctors' bills, drugs, and everything of that sort.

Mr. WHEELER. The difference between the Senator and myself is that the Senator is talking about a lot of peasant farmers or tenant farmers. I am talking about men who are not peasants. I am talking about farmers in the Middle West and Ohio and similar States who own their own land and who, by reason of the economic conditions, have gone in debt for the last several years. When the drought hit them they did not have any money, and they can not borrow any money, and they can not give any security, because everything they have is pledged. We have not any peasants out in the Middle West and the Northwest, such as the Senator is speaking about.

Mr. RANSDELL. The Senator seems to put in my mouth words that I did not use. I did not say that we had so many peasants down there. We have a good many poor people. We have a great many who are not peasants, and they are people who cultivate their land with hired labor. Those people would, of course, in borrowing money, have to get a waiver of the mortgage or a waiver of the lien, if anybody held a lien. There is no trouble about that. I again insist, Senators, that this measure will give relief in my section to nearly everybody down there, and I further insist that it is a wise provision that we ought not to hesitate about adopting, and adopting promptly.

Now, with just this thought, I am through:

Senators, if we are going to give any relief, let us do it quickly. Let me call your attention to the wording of this telegram of Mr. Thompson.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANSDELL. One moment, and then I will answer the Senator.

In this telegram of Mr. Thompson, chairman of the Louisiana Drought-Relief Commission, he says:

> Our farmers are unable in many parishes in Louisiana to make application for loans out of $45,000,000 fund. Unless this loan is available at once, it will be of little benefit to many Louisiana farmers. Many crops should be in soil now. Incomplete blanks have been sent to some parishes, thereby making it impossible to complete an application. I wired Memphis office last Friday, but no relief so far.

I talked to Mr. Warburton, of the Department of Agriculture, and he told me he had wired the Memphis office to expedite matters. Senators, $45,000,000 is a great deal of money. The Government authorities did not have this money until a very few days ago. They are putting it into effect as rapidly as they can. I am sure that by to-day all of those people have blanks, and they are beginning to get their relief. But let me say again, if Congress adjourns on the 4th of March without having passed this legislation, there is going to be very serious suffering in many portions of this Republic; and I, for one, can not afford to take any responsibility for that, as far as I am concerned.

Even if the bill is not exactly what I should like to have it, it is the best we can get. Let us pass it, and pass it quickly.

In the words of the poet it may be said:

> If it were done when 't is done, then 't were well
> It were done quickly.

Let us pass this bill to-day and put it behind us.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator just told us that his people have not received any benefits from the $45,000,000 fund. If that has not been made available, if we should pass this bill promptly, when will this be made available?

Mr. RANSDELL. The Senator must not put in my mouth words that I did not use. I said some of them had not received it. Some of them are slow in getting their blanks; but the blanks are being rushed forward, and I have no doubt by this time they are getting it. That is what I said.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator agrees, does he not, that it takes some time to prorate and use up the $45,000,000 fund?

Mr. RANSDELL. I presume it will; but that is for a different purpose than the purpose of this bill. That bill does not give food. It does not give clothes. It does not give additional work stock. It does not give money for blacksmith's bills, doctor's bills, drug bills, nor a lot of bills. They do not come under this $45,000,000 but they would come under this.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RANSDELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. On what authority does the Senator tell the Senate that food can be bought under the terms of this bill?

Mr. RANSDELL. Under the plain provisions of the bill, and the application of the ordinary rules of common sense to the wording of it. Here is what it says:

> To make advances or loans to farmers for crop production.

If you give me money to produce a crop, I will spend that money for the things necessary to produce that crop, such as food, clothes, and everything else. That is the plain wording of the proposed law itself.

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, a short time ago I asked unanimous consent that the Interior Department conference report should be temporarily laid aside to permit the taking up of the conference report on the public buildings bill authorizing the expenditure of $100,000,000. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL], who objected at that time, I understand, is willing to have it done now.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand the Senator to say that there will not be long discussion?

Mr. SWANSON. I do not think there will be. There could not be.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask because, if the Interior Department measure is temporarily laid aside by unanimous consent, I want it understood——

Mr. SWANSON. If the public buildings conference report leads to long discussion and interferes with the Interior Department report, I will withdraw it temporarily. The Interior Department conference report can be brought up at any time if there is any prolonged debate.

Mr. SMOOT. With that understanding, I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the conference report under consideration being temporarily laid aside to take up the conference report on the public buildings bill?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I do not know that I have any objection; but I do think that with a very important matter of that kind Senators who are interested ought to have the opportunity to know that the Senate is acting under a unanimous-consent agreement. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SWANSON. I shall be very glad to have that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Bulkley	Deneen	Gould
Barkley	Capper	Dill	Hale
Bingham	Caraway	Fess	Harris
Black	Carey	Fletcher	Harrison
Blaine	Connally	Frazier	Hatfield
Blease	Copeland	George	Hawes
Borah	Couzens	Gillett	Hayden
Bratton	Cutting	Glass	Hebert
Brock	Dale	Goff	Heflin
Brookhart	Davis	Goldsborough	Howell

Johnson	Morrow	Reed	Townsend
Jones	Moses	Robinson, Ark.	Trammell
Kean	Norbeck	Sheppard	Tydings
Kendrick	Norris	Shipstead	Vandenberg
King	Nye	Shortridge	Wagner
La Follette	Oddie	Smith	Walcott
McGill	Partridge	Smoot	Walsh, Mass.
McKellar	Patterson	Steiwer	Walsh, Mont.
McMaster	Phipps	Stephens	Waterman
McNary	Pine	Swanson	Watson
Metcalf	Pittman	Thomas, Idaho	Wheeler
Morrison	Ransdell	Thomas, Okla.	Williamson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report submitted by him on the public buildings bill. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Virginia whether that procedure is satisfactory to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL]?

Mr. SWANSON. It is. He has consented.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the conference report, which the Secretary will read.

The legislative 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. 16297) entitled "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," 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 amendment numbered 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 4, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 2. That the provisions contained in the act of May 25, 1926, as amended by the act of February 24, 1928, limiting the amount that may be expended annually in any one of the States, Territories, or possessions of the United States to $10,000,000 be, and the same are hereby, further amended so as to increase the amount that may be expended in any one of the States, Territories, or possessions of the United States to an amount not to exceed $20,000,000 annually from the date of the passage of this act until December 31, 1933, after which time the amount which shall be expended in any one of the States, Territories, or possessions of the United States shall not exceed the sum of $15,000,000 annually."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert, on page 3, line 6, after the word "cost," "*Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to any contract entered into prior to the approval of this act, nor to any contract entered into after December 31, 1933."

CLAUDE A. SWANSON,
SIMEON D. FESS,
W. H. MCMASTER,
A. R. GOULD,
HENRY F. ASHURST,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

RICHARD N. ELLIOTT,
FRITZ G. LANHAM,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, this report was unanimous. The conferees consisted of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCMASTER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and myself. I will state to the Senate what the various amendments were.

Amendments 1 and 2 were amendments offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who had an apprehension that when the unexpended balances were carried over from year to year, it might interfere with the division heretofore made between the District of Columbia and the United States outside of the District of Columbia. The amendment of the Senator made that clear. The House accepts the amendment. That embraced amendments 1 and 2.

Amendment numbered 3 the House accepts with an amendment. It will be remembered that the bill as it passed the House abolished the limitation on what should be spent in any one State in any one year to $10,000,000. The limitation had first been $5,000,000, and Senators will recall that we limited that, so that all the money could not be spent in a few States, and fixed up a method of distribution in the various States according to population, territory, and postal receipts.

When we increased the appropriation from $25,000,000 to $50,000,000, at the same time we thought it was proper to increase the limitation on the amount that should be spent in any one State from $5,000,000 to $10,000,000, which was done, and we thought that was fair.

Now, we increase the appropriation to $100,000,000, for distribution among all the States outside of the District of Columbia, and $15,000,000 in Washington. It was but right that the limitation should also be increased, or the large States would be prohibited from getting their pro rata part of the increase.

The House passed the bill amending the present law so that an unlimited amount might be spent in any one State. If that had been enacted, it would have been like the bill which the House originally tried to pass. The Government could have spent all the money in 1 State, 2 States, or 3 States. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCMASTER] and other Senators, including myself, insisted in the committee that that was not right; that the right thing to do was to increase the limitation to $15,000,000, as this was an increase in the authorization and appropriation under it; that that would be right. The committee adopted that view, so the limitation was fixed at $15,000,000.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. After what date?

Mr. SWANSON. That date becomes permanent. I will get to the amendment in a moment.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There is one permanent change, increasing the limitation from $10,000,000 to $15,000,000 for all time.

Mr. SWANSON. That is permanent, and it ought to be permanent, with the increase to $100,000,000.

The House agrees to that, with an amendment. It was developed here—and the department before our committee stated the situation in three States—that in New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois it was impossible to construct post offices on account of this limitation.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That was set forth in a letter.

Mr. SWANSON. It was set forth in a letter, and also appeared in the hearings. It was said it was impossible to construct a post office in New York, or in Illinois, or in Philadelphia. There has been accumulated money in unexpended balances, so that next year we will have $171,000,000, with the increased appropriation of this year.

I stated to the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], who tried to have the limitation increased to $20,000,000, that I did not think that was right, but that I recognized that this congestion in these three States at this time, with the amount of money to be spent for two years, was an injustice to his State, and I was willing to correct it, provided it did not interfere with the pro rata and fair expenditure in other States.

We have been assured—and it was stated before our committee—that the appropriation of this $100,000,000 will make it possible to construct a public building in every city in the United States where the receipts exceed $20,000 a year.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In what period of time?

Mr. SWANSON. The program is an 8-year program, but if Congress will appropriate the money under present authorizations, the program can be completed in four years, or three years, except that we limited it to $65,000,000.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. This will advance it somewhat.

Mr. SWANSON. It will advance it a good deal. What we did was to take the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts and the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah, which limit the increase to two years; that is, until the 31st of December, 1932. Then it will cease.

Mr. SMOOT. That is, the $20,000,000?

Mr. SWANSON. That is the $20,000,000. After the two years of this expenditure, in which time they expect to complete their obligations and start these offices, we go back to the $15,000,000.

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

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I understand that under this arrangement the $20,000,000 is to be given each year for two years.

Mr. SWANSON. For two years.

Mr. COPELAND. And by reason of that we may in New York and Pennsylvania and Illinois go forward with our projects?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes. It will relieve the congestion there.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator did give prayerful and sympathetic attention to my request.

Mr. SWANSON. I did.

Mr. COPELAND. So we can proceed in New York with those projects, which are national in nature, and not interfere with our local projects.

Mr. SWANSON. The department assures us that that will occur, and that it will be done without interfering with the construction in any other States.

Mr. COPELAND. Let me add that I have never had such prompt response to prayer before as in this particular instance.

Mr. SWANSON. The only other amendment is the 5 per cent amendment, offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. That is to limit to 5 per cent the contracts which could be made under the authorizations or estimates. The House provided that the Government could increase a contract 10 per cent of the estimates and appropriations made by the committee. The Senate overwhelmingly, I think by a vote of 5 or 6 to 1, agreed to reduce that from 10 to 5. The House acquiesced in that. Then they put on the amendments of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Utah limiting even this increase to two years, and the 5 per cent over estimates ceases at the end of two years, during this congestion.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I desire to make some inquiries. I have not the original bill before me. What was the limitation in the bill as it passed the House with respect to the expenditure in States, Territories, and so forth?

Mr. SWANSON. I just stated that the bill as it passed the House repealed the existing law as to the $10,000,000 limitation entirely, and left it unlimited.

Mr. BLAINE. It left it unlimited?

Mr. SWANSON. Unlimited. The Senate limited it to $15,000,000.

Mr. BLAINE. I assume, on the theory that the House left it unlimited, the conferees had authority to fix it at $20,000,000?

Mr. SWANSON. We had a right to fix it at $20,000,000, $30,000,000, $40,000,000, or any other amount.

Mr. BLAINE. Otherwise, it might be subject to a point of order?

Mr. SWANSON. It would have been subject to a point of order if the House had limited it to $10,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I now ask that the Interior Department appropriations conference report be laid before the Senate and proceeded with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That conference report automatically comes before the Senate.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14675) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHEELER. Has the Secretary of Agriculture sent his reply to the resolution of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair can not give the information.

Mr. WHEELER. Can not the Chair state whether he has sent it or not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not here.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. DILL. Since the Secretary of Agriculture seems to be away, why should we not amend the resolution and ask one of his clerks to reply? We must have some one tell us what this language means, and I think one of the Secretary's clerks might answer the question for us.

Mr. WHEELER. I understood that the Secretary of Agriculture had returned, and it was rumored that he had made a reply. I was wondering why it was, if he had sent in his reply, that it was not before the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think perhaps I can clarify the situation somewhat. The Secretary left last evening for Louisville on the 6 o'clock train, and the train had not yet arrived in that city this morning. Probably some time during the afternoon we shall hear from him.

Mr. SMOOT. The train was late, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in view of that fact and in view of the fact that we have not received a reply from the Secretary of Agriculture, I think it is unfair to those of us who want to discuss the matter to ask us to discuss it until such time as we know what the reply of the Secretary of Agriculture is to be.

Mr. SMOOT. May I suggest that the Senator has a speech to make other than upon this item?

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator knows what is in my mind better than I do, I would like to have him go ahead and tell the Senate about it.

Mr. SMOOT. All I know is what the Senator told me.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator does not know anything of the kind, because I only told him I had no speech to make except with reference to a couple of Indian items which I want to discuss.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. WHEELER. That will not take very long. I do not want to discuss those items on this occasion when they are not pertinent. It will only take a few minutes to discuss those, anyway.

Mr. SMOOT. I had understood the Senator to say there was nothing else to discuss.

Mr. WHEELER. I think this matter ought to be discussed. I think it is only fair to some Senators who want to discuss it that we should know what the interpretation of the executive department is on the piece of legislation we are about to enact. It has got to the point in the Senate at the present time where before we can interpret our own language we must have the Secretary of Agriculture pass upon it and say how he is going to interpret it and what we mean by it.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senate did that last night by adopting the resolution. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has a long speech to make. We can not lay aside the conference report except by vote of the Senate.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

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

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does the Senator from Utah think we can make very much progress on this matter until we get a reply from the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I think we can.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I was wondering if the Senator thought we could really make much headway until after we have received that reply?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes; I think we can.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I hope the Senator may be successful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah is going to insist on a vote at this time upon the conference report, I wish to move that the conference report be temporarily laid aside until the Senate gets its instructions from the Secretary of Agriculture and the executive department as to what is the meaning of the language. I understand that the Executive——

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point of order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The motion of the Senator from Montana is not in order.

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

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Montana does not understand the situation. There are a number of other amendments that ought to be debated and must be debated before we vote. It seems to me it is entirely possible to proceed with the consideration of the other amendments while we are awaiting instructions from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WHEELER. I have no objection if some Senator is ready to discuss the other amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. All in favor——

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, out of deference to those who are interested in the matter, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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	Goff	Metcalf	Stephens
Bratton	Goldsborough	Morrison	Swanson
Brock	Gould	Morrow	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Hale	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Bulkley	Harris	Norbeck	Townsend
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Trammell
Caraway	Hatfield	Nye	Tydings
Carey	Hawes	Oddie	Vandenberg
Connally	Hayden	Partridge	Wagner
Copeland	Hebert	Patterson	Walcott
Couzens	Heflin	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Cutting	Howell	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Johnson	Pittman	Waterman
Davis	Jones	Ransdell	Watson
Deneen	Kean	Reed	Wheeler
Dill	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	Williamson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I move that the pending conference report be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the so-called Howell bill, providing for the further enforcement of prohibition in the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the motion of the Senator from Montana is not in order. We can not temporarily lay aside a measure on a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana can move to proceed to the consideration of the Howell bill, but not to lay aside temporarily the conference report.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3344) supplementing the national prohibition act for the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator can, of course, move to proceed to the consideration of another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Montana to proceed to the consideration of what is known as the Howell prohibition enforcement bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, with reference to that matter, I simply want to say that I feel that we can not accomplish anything while we are waiting for the explanation of Secretary Hyde in response to the resolution adopted last evening by the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I submit an inquiry to the Senator from Montana?

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

Mr. WHEELER. I do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Would the Senator be willing to enter into an agreement to vote on the conference report at a definite time following the receipt of a message from the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that so far as I am concerned I would be inclined to agree. I can speak only for myself. I have no desire to delay the passage of the bill. I do want to see before I vote what the answer of the Secretary of Agriculture is going to be.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the Secretary of Agriculture should respond to the inquiry which has been made under the resolution of the Senate that food may be purchased from the proceeds of loans obtained under the provisions of the so-called compromise agreement, would the Senator from Montana then support the motion to agree to the conference report?

Mr. WHEELER. No; I would say to the Senator that I would wish to speak——

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator would then make a different speech from the one he would make now?

Mr. WHEELER. No; that is not correct. I intended to speak on the general unemployment situation. As the Senator knows, I have favored legislation not only to take care of the situation in the drought-stricken areas but also I think we ought to have legislation before we adjourn giving the President funds to take care of the unemployed in the cities. I shall talk briefly upon that matter. But the kind of a reply the Secretary of Agriculture makes in the matter may affect the speech I intend to make. I say that for the reason that I have here two statements which were issued by the Secretary of Agriculture. In one of those statements given out by him he said that he is absolutely opposed to Government loans for food.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator is now making a speech that has no relation to my inquiry.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes; I think it has.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Will the Senator agree to a unanimous consent to vote within a fixed time after the message of the Secretary of Agriculture is received, if one should be received?

Mr. WHEELER. So far as I am concerned, I would be willing.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] whether he would agree to fix a time to vote.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, at this time I shall agree to no unanimous-consent request fixing a time to vote and to shut off a discussion of the conference report.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have no desire to prolong the discussion of the matter after we get the reply of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. WHEELER. I want to finish what I was saying in answer to the question of the Senator from Arkansas. The

Secretary of Agriculture did specifically say—I think it was on December 4 or December 8—that he was absolutely opposed to any loan which would involve the purchase of food; and again, after the compromise was reached, he issued statements in which he repeated in substance what he had previously said. I think, in view of those statements made by him, and in view of the statements made upon the floor of the Senate that people can purchase food under these loans, it is absolutely necessary, in fairness to Members of the Senate, that they should have his interpretation, because of the fact that he is the man who will be called upon to pass upon the question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I make another inquiry of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the Secretary of Agriculture should report that the loans may be used for the purchase of food and other necessities for crop production and rehabilitation, would that make it acceptable to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WHEELER. Would it make it acceptable to me?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. It would so far as that feature is concerned. I do not want the Senator, however, to get the idea that I would be entirely satisfied with the compromise. I am not criticizing the Senator; I appreciate the condition in which the people of his State are; I appreciate the fact that he is anxious to get some help for them; I appreciate the fact that he probably felt that he could not do any better for them than to accept the compromise. I myself, however, feel that if he had held out he probably could have done more. I feel also——

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, right upon that point will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Does the Senator express the opinion that by refusing to agree to any compromise under present conditions and at this time legislation would have been possible making an appropriation for industrial relief?

Mr. WHEELER. I would not be able to say, because I am not able to read the mind of the President of the United States any more than is the Senator from Arkansas.

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

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator knows that the President has said repeatedly, and in the statement that he issued a few days ago reiterated, that until the local organizations and local political units, the cities and the States, have exhausted their ability to meet the requirements as to industrial unemployment he will not approve a Federal appropriation, but that when that time shall come, if it shall come, he will consent to drafts on the Federal resources. In view of the fact that no municipality or State has reached that condition or presented to Congress evidence of such a situation, does the Senator, as a practical legislator, believe that anything else would have resulted from a persistent stand in opposition to a compromise of the $25,000,000 item than a total failure of all legislation at this time?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course I do; and I will tell the Senator why I do. The Senator refers to statements issued by the President and the executive department. Let me again call attention to the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has on repeated occasions and the spokesmen of the White House have repeatedly said they were against a loan for food because it was a dole. If the Senator's interpretation of the language of this compromise is correct, and if the interpretation put upon it by the Senator's colleague, the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], is correct, then the President of the United States is backing down upon that proposition. If he is backing down upon that proposition, why would I not be justified in feeling that if the situation were presented to him properly he would back down upon some of the other propositions?

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

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. No question of dole, either private or public, is involved in this conference report.

Mr. WHEELER. Well——

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Just a moment. I have said that over and over. There is no dole, either private or public, in the conference report. This is a measure which provides credit, which provides loans. In accepting or promoting this proposal, no one approves of a so-called dole. Throughout this country, however, doles are being resorted to, and the Senator knows it. The Senator knows that all of the large cities of the country are already employing doles; the Senator knows that the Red Cross is giving a dole.

Mr. WHEELER. Is the Senator from Arkansas asking me a question?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The distribution of Red Cross aid is just as much a dole as if the funds employed were being used from the Federal Treasury. It is true it is not a Federal dole, but it is a private dole. There is no so-called dole, either private or public, in this provision, but there is an arrangement by which those who produce crops may secure anything that is necessary in the production of crops provided they are able to get a loan. They can not get a loan without security, and the security may either be in the form of liens on their crops or other security.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; but I have no contention with the Senator upon that question. I am simply saying that there is no dole in loaning a man money with which to buy food.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the Senator imagines——

Mr. WHEELER. Let me finish the statement.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the Senator imagines he can get a fight, either personal or parliamentary, out of me on that proposition, he has gone far outside of the imaginative qualities which I attribute to him.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator, I think, knows me well enough to know that I have not any intention of fighting with him either politically or parliamentarily or personally, or in any other way.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I mean a "controversy."

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that just because I disagree with him does not lessen my respect for him personally or as a legislator or in any other way.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I understand that, and I recognize the right of anyone to disagree with me.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me call the Senator's attention to this fact——

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I should like to make clear to the Senator that those who think that a gift or some form of charity from the Federal Government is indispensable are justified entirely in their opposition to this compromise agreement, and those who think that in addition to the charity that is already being dispensed and that is being pledged, credit arrangements such as are contemplated by the compromise agreement will prove an advantageous measure of relief are, in my judgment, justified in supporting it. The great difficulty about the whole matter is this: There is no general sentiment in the Congress in favor of adequate industrial appropriations at this time. I make the statement that I do not believe that some of those who are opposing this compromise agreement would be willing under present conditions to open the Treasury of the United States to the requirements which might be presented to it if it were done. It is fair to say that the half of the $25,000,000 embraced in the proposed appropriation under the original amendment would be inadequate, with 6,000,000 men out of employment and 20,000,000 persons all told dependent, including the unemployed. That problem, in so far as it has been met, has been met by the municipalities and by local organizations. It would require $200,000,000—yes, $300,000,000—adequately to meet the situation if we are to substitute Federal appropriations for local contributions.

I think it is fair to say that, while I believe every resource of this Nation ought to be available when the extremity

arises to supply the necessities of life to its citizens, there is in the minds of many no justification for relying completely on the Federal Treasury until the local agencies and the local political institutions have met fairly the obligations that are upon them.

Mr. GLASS and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not know who has the floor. I may have taken it from my friend from Montana, but I have said all I have to say.

Mr. WHEELER. I have the floor, Mr. President.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield first to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I merely wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Arkansas if I am correct in the understanding from what he has just said that he conceives that the amendment adopted by the Senate at his suggestion, and to which the minority Members of this body in conference were committed, constitutes a dole and that it was properly characterized by the President as socialistic?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I myself do not employ the word "dole." The $25,000,000 appropriation was intended to be used for supplying food to those in need of it who could not otherwise procure it; it was a Federal dole in the sense of those who employ the term "dole" in place of appropriation, because it contemplated charity or a gift. There is no escaping from that.

Mr. GLASS. That is what I contemplated when I voted for it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. GLASS. That it was a governmental benefaction.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. GLASS. Does the Senator call that a dole?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. No; I do not call it a dole—and the Senator from Virginia——

Mr. GLASS. Does the Senator call it socialistic?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. No; certainly I do not call it socialistic. I would not characterize it in any way other than as an emergency appropriation for the relief of those in distress. However, I want to point out the very significant fact that the Senator from Virginia, who usually is cautious in his statements, was inaccurate, in my judgment clearly inaccurate, in a speech which he made to this body on yesterday.

The Senator from Virginia made the astonishing and inaccurate statement that the only difference between the compromise agreement and the seed, feed, and fertilizer loan bill is that by this agreement the benefits of the seed, feed, and fertilizer loan bill are extended so as to permit supplying feed for livestock. The statement is found in the RECORD on page 4591.

Mr. President, in addition to the modification of the seed, feed, and fertilizer loan bill to which the Senator from Virginia referred, there is appropriated under this provision $20,000,000 to be used for two entirely different purposes. No part of the $20,000,000 can be used to feed work stock or livestock, to buy seed, feed, or fertilizer. All of the $20,000,000 is to be used for two very important purposes: First, to provide the capital stock of agricultural credit corporations. In the drought-stricken areas credit sources have dried up. Banks and mercantile establishments have failed. One of the great problems of the brave men who constitute as gallant a citizenship as this Union possesses is to procure the opportunities of carrying on their own business in the usual way without charity, and this bill extends that opportunity to them.

When the Legislature of Arkansas passed a relief bill it did not appropriate a fund to feed those who were suffering from hunger. It appropriated a fund of $1,500,000 for the issuance of bonds to establish credit associations in order that proud citizens might do what they are in the habit of doing—return to their activities and produce their crops without being compelled to accept charity.

The measure of relief carried in that State appropriation is, of course, inadequate; but if this bill passes, at least $5,000,000 will be available for that purpose and the remainder of the $20,000,000 will be available for direct loans to farmers—not for seed, feed, fertilizer, fuel oils, or to feed livestock, but for some purposes outside of that, and the purposes stated in the agreement are crop production and farm rehabilitation.

It is all right to denounce the Secretary of Agriculture if Senators wish to do so; but I ask them now, what use can be made of the remaining $15,000,000 unless it is to be employed for the ordinary purposes of crop production and farm improvement?

Months have gone by. The session is about to end. We are confronted with this situation: While denouncing the President and the Secretary of Agriculture we are in danger of displaying more inefficiency in the Congress than can be charged against either of them, because we have done nothing so far except to appropriate money for loans for feed, seed, and fertilizer.

Do not forget, my friends who are opposing this compromise in the hope that it will prevail and that your people will get the benefits of it without your taking the responsibility for its enactment, that if this compromise arrangement fails there will result, in all probability, complete failure of any form of relief.

I thank the Senator from Montana for permitting me to interrupt him.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas evidently did not hear or read the speech that I made in the Senate on yesterday. I ascribed to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the other House the statement that the only difference between this compromise proposition and the proposition which the Senate had attached to the Interior Department appropriation bill was that while the former appropriation of $45,000,000 enabled the farmer to feed his livestock, this proposed compromise permitted him to feed his cows.

So far from neglecting to point out the difference between the two measures, I devoted not an inconsiderable part of my address to showing that we had these credit facilities in abundance through the drought-stricken region of the country, and that under the existing law, under its terms and import, they could be availed of. Now, however, we have reached the extraordinary point that the Senator from Arkansas, upon whose motion the Senate acted and incorporated in this bill a provision to feed distressed and destitute people, is turning upon his own colleagues whom he invited to conference and reproaching them with following his leadership and making an appropriation for a purpose that was not needed—making an appropriation before the local communities and the States had exhausted their resources to take care of the situation.

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

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I thank the Senator; and I will not trespass upon his time much further.

The Senator from Virginia impliedly says that the criticism which I made of his remarks yesterday is unfounded because he attributed to the Secretary of Agriculture the statement he made, that the only difference between the compromise and the seed loan law is to be found in the fact that the seed loan law is extended so as to take care of livestock.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the Senator does not want to be inaccurate. I did not attribute it to the Secretary of Agriculture. I attributed it to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; I apologize. I did state it wrongly—the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House. I propose to quote the Senator's own

language to show that he did, if the ordinary interpretation of language is to be accepted, make the declaration to which I have referred.

He said on page 4591:

> The only difference between this alleged "compromise" and the existing law was pointedly stated by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the other House.

And then he goes on to refer to the feeding of cows; which, of course, means that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee said it truthfully, and said it well; and on the other column of the same page he makes the statement that already adequate credit facilities exist, and impliedly concludes that for that reason this is not a measure of relief.

Is it necessary for me again to point out the fact that the great problem in at least a part of the drought region is to provide credit; that the credit institutions have failed or broken down; that from the beginning, in so far as my colleague and I are concerned, we have insisted upon and begged for the opportunity to restore credit? The $60,000,000 item reported in the joint resolution of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] was not charity. It was exclusively credit; and that has been our position, in so far as drought relief is concerned, from the very beginning of this controversy. It was made necessary by the fact that the banks have failed, the other ordinary credit institutions have failed, the existing intermediate credit banks or agricultural credit corporations are entirely inadequate, and the capital can not be procured to organize new ones or enlarge the old ones. In some instances the capital was arranged for, placed in banks, and the banks themselves failed; so that in some counties having a population of 50,000 each, there is not a single credit institution available.

We have not asked for charity. It may surprise some people to learn that ours are a proud people. They are pure American stock. They are devoted to this country and to our institutions. The legislature of the State has not even considered a measure appropriating public funds for charitable purposes. From the beginning we have said that, in so far as the drought regions were concerned, if you will give us credit, give our people a chance to maintain their self-respect and to earn their own living, they will work from early morn till late at night in an effort to maintain their manhood and to maintain their self-respect; and if you will do that, please God, they will accomplish that end. I am sincere in the declaration that I would prefer Federal credit to Federal charity. It is better for the people, it is better for the State, it is better for the United States.

If credit can not be obtained, we must have charity, and charity in an increased amount; for the people of this country are entitled to receive the support first of their local agencies and institutions, and then of the centralized agencies and institutions.

I make no apology for that attitude. We are asking here that the quarrel over what should be done shall not be continued until the worst possible results have been realized. If some system of credit be not provided, there will be a thousand fields that could be made fruitful that will produce no crops. There will be hundreds of thousands of hands that could be profitably employed that will continue idle. I hope that my friends will not put me in the attitude of having a complete failure of any kind of relief because the full measure of relief desired can not be obtained.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. Of course it is obvious to the Senate that I do not agree with the Senator from Arkansas about the credit facilities in the drought-stricken regions of the country. Yesterday I attempted, upon the basis of official figures, to show that there were unutilized credits in the banks of the drought-stricken region approximating $3,000,000,000. The Senator now says, however, that from the first it was his idea to provide increased credit facilities. If that be true, is it not extraordinary that in the proposition which he offered to the Senate, and which the Senate adopted, and which the minority conference indorsed, there is not a word said about credit?

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Twice the Senate had, by practically a unanimous vote, incorporated loan provisions in legislation. Twice, by the firm opposition of the House, those provisions had gone out. Then I did introduce the amendment which forms the basis of this discussion, and I hoped that it would pass. I did everything in my power, exhausted every possible resource at my command, to secure its enactment. But when the body at the other end of the Capitol voted down the amendment by almost 100 majority, and when its leadership announced that under no circumstances would the amendment be accepted, I then thought that unless Congress was to prove its inefficiency and incapacity in times of emergency to accomplish legislation in spite of differences over the form that the legislation should take, I was justified in attempting to secure a compromise.

Now, the responsibility is upon the Senate and upon the House to determine whether this arrangement shall be carried into effect. If it is not, I see before me a pitiable and pathetic spectacle, three months expended in wrangling over what kind of relief shall be granted, and nothing done; three months used in criticizing the Secretary of Agriculture for his failure fairly to administer an act already passed; three months gone by and suffering and idleness and improvidence stimulated and encouraged.

On the other hand, I see that after the fullest possible measure of debate, when personalities which have been indulged in have run their course and have cast no light upon any issue involved in the controversy here properly to be considered, after the smoke of the battle has cleared away, after the clouds of confusion have been dispersed, I see the Congress of the United States reaching a conclusion which those who have studied the situation most carefully believe will be helpful and advantageous. I see the sunshine of hope beginning again to smile on a hundred thousand desolated homes. I see hundreds of thousands of workers in the agricultural regions returning to their toil and profitable results coming from their efforts.

One can behold a better system than that which now exists growing out of the ruin of a system which has been tried and in some respects found wanting. If this conference report is rejected what do Senators expect shall come forth as final legislation?

We may have an extraordinary session. There is no assurance then that we can pass over the Executive veto a measure which he states is objectionable to him. There is no assurance that the extra session will be called until the late spring or the early summer. There is certainty that prolonged delay will produce a most disastrous result in so far as the people who are most vitally interested are concerned.

Mr. President, I plead with my friends for a decision in this matter. I plead with those who object to this conference report, with those who may be willing to see its benefits, if any, conferred upon their constituents who will at the same time divest themselves of all responsibility; I plead with them to let the matter come to an issue. If nothing is to be done, then let the disappointment which must result come quickly. Let hope be banished from a million hearts.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from Montana for asking permission to interrupt him again.

Mr. WHEELER. That is all right.

Mr. GLASS. I shall not enter upon any discussion with respect to the plea the Senator from Arkansas makes for the adoption of this conference report. What I am objecting to is that those of us who followed his leadership and voted for this proposition of his in the Senate and in the conference defied the House of Representatives and the President of the United States, challenged them to this very issue, and put them upon notice that we would stand here

even for an extra session if they did not yield to this Government benefaction, should now be reproached by the Senator as having done something we should not have done, something which was inexpedient, which was uneconomic, which would have put to shame his own people had it gone through and been consummated into law. That is what I am objecting to.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator wishes to make a statement like that. I have said nothing whatever that justifies any such conclusion.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, now that I have the floor again, I may say that I took it that the Senator from Arkansas was reproaching me and other Members of the Senate because of the fact that we have stated, and state now, that we wanted to see an appropriation similar to the appropriation he himself sought for the purpose of taking care of the unemployed in the cities. The Senator states that there is no sentiment in this Congress for it. Yet the minority Members of this body were called into conference. For days and days and days the pitiful conditions which existed in the State of Arkansas were pictured here upon the floor of the Senate until at last the Members on the minority side, whether we agreed with the Senator's proposition or not, simply promised and agreed to stand by him. The senior Senator from Virginia announced on the floor of the Senate, and other Senators announced on the floor of the Senate and in the public press, that unless the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas were passed that they would force an extra session of Congress.

Now, we find ourselves in a dilemma because of the fact that we followed our leader in the matter. We find ourselves reproached and practically denounced upon the floor of the Senate, and we are told that the President was right when he called it a dole.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator ought to put words like that in my mouth.

Mr. WHEELER. I can not come to any other conclusion from the remarks the Senator made.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator, of course, can draw his own conclusion.

Mr. WHEELER. I am drawing that conclusion.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. But I do not think the Senator ought to say that I have said things which I have not said.

Mr. WHEELER. I say that one can not draw any other conclusion from the statements that were made upon the floor of the Senate, but that the President of the United States was right and the members of the minority party who were following him were wrong. He says there is no dole in this bill, and I agree with him, there is no dole in this bill. I want to say to the Senator from Arkansas that I am not for a dole, but I am for taking care of our people, whether they are in Arkansas, whether they are in the city of Boston, or whether they are in the city of New York, when they are out of employment and are out of employment through no fault of their own. I say that not the President of the United States, and I say that no man upon the floor of the Senate, is justified in saying that that brings shame upon honest workers or honest farmers because of the fact that they are unable to get employment because of the uneconomic distribution of wealth in this Nation.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Does the Senator mean to attibute such a statement to me?

Mr. WHEELER. No; I said that neither the President of the United States nor any Senator was justified in making that statement. But let me call attention to what the Secretary of Agriculture said. Here is his language. I am not guessing at it; I am quoting his very language. He said:

> I have heretofore expressed approval of the principle of the proposed Federal loans to farmers who have suffered severely from the drought, provided such loans are limited to the purpose of purchasing seed, feed for work animals, and fertilizer. Loans made for such purposes provide the stricken farmer with the means of starting his agricultural operations anew.

What did they mean when they wrote this, saying in the second item "to make advances or loans to farmers for crop production"? What did the President of the United States mean? What did the Secretary of Agriculture mean? Did he mean that there was food in it? Of course he did not, because he says in this statement of December 8:

> Providing such loans are limited to the purpose of purchasing seed, feed for work animals, and fertilizer.

If my memory serves me right, it was the Senators from Arkansas who stood upon the floor of the Senate and criticized the Secretary of Agriculture for making those statements.

I have not stood upon the floor of the Senate and criticized the Secretary of Agriculture with reference to this. I have not stood upon the floor of the Senate and said that the President of the United States was not a good American because of the fact that he did not agree with me. I have not stood upon the floor of the Senate on any occasion during this debate and criticized the President of the United States. Those words have not come from my lips. But the Secretary of Agriculture did say this:

> There are a great many objections to the Government making loans for human food. From a national point of view, this latter class of loans approaches perilously near the dole system, and would be a move in the wrong direction.

Who is going to execute this loan? Who is going to execute it? The Secretary of Agriculture is going to execute it; and he says that he is against any sort of a loan under which the farmers of this country are to be permitted to buy food with the money.

We are told that when this provision says "for crop production" it means medicine, it means clothes, and it means everything else, and we are denounced on the floor if we criticize that construction being placed upon it. It is said that no good lawyer would put that construction on it. I say to the Senate here and now, without fear of contradiction from any good lawyer, that you have to strain a point when you say that "crop production" means that a man may furnish his family with medicine. You have to put a strained construction on it when you say that "crop production" covers the buying of clothes for your wife and your children. You have to put a forced construction upon it when you say that it covers buying milk and food for your babies.

I say, Mr. President, that there is not a court in the United States which would say that, under the terms of this compromise, if the Secretary of Agriculture carries it out, one can buy milk for starving babies. It does not mean that one can buy clothes for his wife and his kiddies who are going naked and hungry; it does not mean and can not mean buying clothes and food and medicine.

I am making this argument on the floor of the Senate, not because of the fact that my people in Montana are demanding food and demanding clothes, but I have listened to the appeals made by the Senators from Arkansas, and I think those appeals touched the heart and the very soul of every man upon the floor of the Senate.

So far as I was concerned, while I was unable to attend the conference and while I did not believe that money should be appropriated from the Treasury of the United States and turned over to the Red Cross for distribution, yet because of the fact that the pleas of the Senator from Arkansas had so touched me, I was perfectly willing to do anything under the sun to appropriate money out of the Treasury of the United States and turn it over to any institution or anybody whom it was thought would give relief to the hungry and starving people whose plight was pictured here on the floor of the Senate. Then when I criticize and say I do not agree with the compromise, when I say that we should insist that it should be provided that these people may purchase food, and when I go one step further and say I am not only sympathetic with the people of Arkansas who are in this plight but I am likewise in sympathy with the people in the factory towns of Massa-

chusetts and Ohio and Connecticut and any other State where help is needed, then I find myself being denounced and I find that it is said the policies which I am proposing are such that there is no sentiment in the Congress for them.

One would have thought that I myself for the first time was offering the proposition that is now before us. I did not offer it. It was offered, Mr. President, by the Senator from Arkansas himself, and I was merely following his leadership. I do not think this is a compromise. Candidly I think, when we come to read the language of the compromise and to put upon it the construction that is put upon it by the Secretary of Agriculture himself, we can not say that it is a compromise. It is an absolute surrender.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture goes on to say:

> There are a great many objections to the Government making loans for human food.

Think of it, Mr. President; think of it! "There are a great many objections to the Government making loans for human food." Yet because the President of the United States writes a letter to us saying the Secretary of Agriculture will give this sympathetic consideration, because the President said that in the administration of the measure "the Secretary of Agriculture assures me he has no other intention, and that he will interpret it fairly and sympathetically," we are told that we are entirely wrong about it. Wrong? Listen to what the Secretary of Agriculture said:

> There are a great many objections to the Government making loans for human food. From a national point of view this latter class of loans approaches perilously near the dole system and would be a move in the wrong direction. Under the relief plan proposed by the administration a very large sum of money will be made available for road work, for rivers and harbors, and other purposes in the drought States. The road work especially has been proposed with the object in view of giving the farmers an opportunity to find employment during the winter and thus provide themselves with food and clothing.

How many farmers in the State of Arkansas, how many farmers in the State of Ohio, where down in the hills, according to reports from Ohio papers, there is just as great suffering as in the State of Arkansas, have been relieved in this way this winter? How many have been able to buy food and clothing from their earnings from road work which they have been given by the administration?

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. Right on that point, let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that Mr. Hyde's own council of advisers from the 21 States have been importuning him for weeks and weeks to apply the road fund to farm-to-market roads in order that if farmers should be employed and engaged in this work they would not have to desert the farms, but might work on roads near by; and he has turned a deaf ear to their appeals.

Mr. WHEELER. I am very glad the Senator called my attention to that point, because I know of at least two such instances in my own State where Indians upon Indian reservations were literally going hungry and without clothes, and when we tried to have some of the money used for that purpose it was said that it must be used on main-line roads. How many men are employed in the making of roads when we have great road-making machinery in use? How many clothes can a man buy for himself or his family on the farm when this great modern road-making machinery is used?

The Secretary of Agriculture said what? He said:

> To include loans for human food in the Federal drought relief bill would remove the occasion for an increase in the highway work in the States.

Something was said about Congress criticizing the President and the Secretary of Agriculture. This is the first time I have stood upon the floor of the Senate and criticized them. I say now, however, that the act of writing that letter was the height of asininity. Think of a man occupying the great office of a member of the Cabinet of the United States and think of a President of the United States, in view of the statements issued by the Secretary of Agriculture which I have just read, saying that "in the administration of it, the Secretary of Agriculture assures me he has no other intention and that he will interpret it fairly and sympathetically." Are we so simple-minded in this party of ours that we are going to take that statement of the Secretary of Agriculture to mean anything at all? Does the President of the United States say in that letter that he means food? Has he changed the compromise one iota? Has he gone back on one single statement he has made?

No one in this body has more sympathy and wants to do more to help the drought-stricken farmers in the situation in which they find themselves in Arkansas and elsewhere than I. I know it may be said because of the fact that I am not willing to bend the knee and do what the administration tells me I should do, that I am not sympathetic. There is no provision in this compromise for the poor, unfortunate farmer who can not give any security. There is nothing in the compromise to give a solitary cent to the farmer who has not any money and who has not any security.

Mr. President, I am curious to see what the Secretary of Agriculture will say in his answer to the Senate of the United States. Will he repudiate the statement that he issued on December 6? Will he repudiate the statement that he issued on February 8—one on December 6 and one on February 8? Will he repudiate the statement wherein he said:

> The provision in the pending bill would answer the needs of all those who can offer security. It will relieve the burden upon charity by aiding to restore normal credit conditions.

The Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] asked if it would not help by relieving the Red Cross. I want to say that I have had the highest regard always for the Red Cross, but I think they have made a miserable spectacle of themselves in this instance. I am told that the testimony which was given before the committee of which the Senator from New York is a member was, to say the least, inaccurate, and that the Red Cross did have at that very time much more money in their treasury than the chairman of the Red Cross said they had.

Let me read further from what the Secretary of Agriculture said:

> The provision in the pending bill would answer the needs of all those who can offer security. It will relieve the burden upon charity by aiding to restore normal credit condition. It leaves to the Red Cross the responsibility of the field as agent for human relief to those—

poor devils! He does not say "poor devils"; that is my own expression; but he says—

> to those who do not have security and to whom Government loans for food, such as were at one time proposed, would have been mere charity by creating obligations from large groups far beyond their ability to pay.

I would like to have the attention of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], who is apparently about to leave the Chamber in response to a call. I invite his attention to this statement. I want to call his attention to the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am familiar I think with the numerous statements of the Secretary of Agriculture. I have expressed on the floor of the Senate repeatedly my criticism of his action and his interpretation. But I wish to impress upon the Senator that there is no proposal here and there has been no proposal and I do not well see how there can be one effectuated that would deprive the Secretary of Agriculture of the administration of these acts. He is the responsible officer to whom such work is usually intrusted. I do wish to say, too, that I think the course of procedure here may have illuminated his judgment to some extent. If it has not we are unfortunate; that is true.

Mr. WHEELER. Here is a statement that was made right after the compromise agreement was published, not in December, but on February 8. He then said:

> It leaves to the Red Cross the responsibility of the field as agent for human relief to those who do not have security and to whom Government loans for food such as were at one time proposed would have been mere charity by creating obligations from large groups far beyond their ability to pay.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Part of that statement is entirely correct. I think I have said a dozen times during the course of the discussion that there is no charity in the compromise. It does not provide for supplying food to those who have no security. It does, however, in my judgment, provide for loans which may be used in the purchase of food just as well as in the purchase of anything else. Assuming that the Red Cross is now supplying and will continue to supply the requirements of those who are without any security, such security as this compromise contemplates, it is my opinion that the arrangement contemplates a fair measure of relief.

I realize, in spite of all that any human agency that has been organized or that is in contemplation can do, that there will be suffering in many places; but if the Red Cross continues the work that it is doing, supplying those who are without a crop or a purpose to grow a crop upon which to execute liens, and then this arrangement is set up by which loans may be made to those who do intend to grow a crop on the security of the crop or other security, it will meet, in large part, the requirements of the conditions of the drought region.

I wish to say to the Senator that I recognize a measure of justice in the criticism of this arrangement to the extent that it affords no industrial relief. My statement a few minutes ago was not intended as a "denunciation" of anyone, when I said that, according to the conditions as they now exist, there is no strong purpose upon the part of Congress, as I see it, to go forward now with adequate appropriations, such appropriations as would be required if the Federal Government is to assume the task of taking care of those who are out of employment. Enormous expenditures would be required, and until the local agencies have exhausted their resources or their efforts it is not likely that we are going into that feature of the matter to any great extent.

It is entirely true that the compromise arrangement is limited in its benefits to the drought region; but it is also true that the provision for which it is a compromise, the provision which was offered by myself under circumstances which have been repeatedly referred to and which have been stated by the Senator from Montana, would have been inadequate, as we all know; it would have been a beginning but not adequate to meet in any considerable degree the requirements of the unemployed. Still the chief reliance would have been in the local institutions and organizations.

The Senator has referred to having been denounced.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not see what other conclusion one could come to from the statement of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Of course, I stand on the language I employed, but I did not regard it as a "denunciation" of anybody. It was an emphatic statement of some views I had previously stated.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. WHEELER. Since the question of relief has arisen, I desire to say that my views are these: The Congress of the United States is about to adjourn, on March 4. There is not any one of whom I know who can say what the conditions in the industrial sections are going to be two months or three months from now. Every prediction that has been made as to probable conditions in the United States in the last year by the President, by the Commerce Department, and also by the great industrialists of the country has turned out to be absolutely wrong. The President of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, and other heads of departments have constantly and repeatedly told the country that prosperity was just around the corner; they have repeatedly told us that unemployment was not so great as it had been, but each time their statements have proven to have been erroneous.

Now Congress is on the eve of adjournment. All I am asking be done is that the Congress of the United States shall appropriate money and place it at the disposal of the President of the United States so that in the event a catastrophe shall arise and it shall become necessary to take care of the unemployed the President of the United States in his wisdom may use the money for that purpose; but apparently he and the members of his administration are afraid to have the Congress of the United States appropriate money and turn it over to the President of the United States or to some bureau or head of a department which he may designate for use in the event that it becomes necessary when Congress shall not be in session.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CUTTING. The Senator is discussing the question of what might be done when the Congress of the United States shall not be in session. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether he has heard the rumor that the Soviet Government of Russia is contemplating the appropriation of $20,000,000 to relieve destitute and starving American citizens?

Mr. WHEELER. I had not heard the rumor, but I presume that the President of the United States would think it perfectly proper for some other government to appropriate money to feed the hungry of this country, although he would not feel that it was proper for the Government of the United States to do so.

Mr. CUTTING. The purpose of my inquiry is this: We have it on the highest authority that it is un-American and indefensible for us to appropriate money to feed our own destitute and starving citizens. We have it on equally high authority that it is perfectly proper and our duty to feed the destitute and starving citizens of Russia. Does the Senator see any reason why turn about should not be fair play and why it would not be appropriate for the soviet government to provide for the relief of our citizens in distress?

Mr. WHEELER. I presume that the President of the United States would think that that was perfectly all right.

Now, Mr. President, I want to return to the statements made by the Secretary of Agriculture. I want again to call attention to what he said with reference to loans. He said:

> The present bill rounds out the program of economic rehabilitation in a much better fashion than the legislative proposals heretofore made. It fills out pattern of the measures necessary in drought territory. First, human relief by the Red Cross to farmers and to industrial people who have no resources in the drought region.

In the first place that statement of the Secretary is not true, because the compromise agreement does not provide one nickel for workers in industry.

> Second, loans for seed and fertilizer secured against the coming crop; and finally, this last provision aimed to restore credit facilities for those who have security to offer.
>
> This program avoids doles or direct charity from the Federal Treasury or any implication thereof.

"Any implication thereof"—meaning any implication of loans for food.

Again in his statement of December 8, he said:

> There are a great many objections to the Government making loans for food, from a national viewpoint. This latter class of loans approaches perilously near the dole system and would be a move in the wrong direction.

In one breath he says that loans for human food are perilously near a dole system, and then in the second breath he says that the compromise agreement does not mean that the Government is going to give any doles and it does not mean that the Government is going to make any loans for food.

I submit, Mr. President, that when Mr. TILSON of the House stated, as I understand he did state, in substance, that it did not contemplate loans for food, he was right. By the greatest stretch of the imagination there can not be found in the provision regarding crop production any authority to make loans under that term to include loans to be used by a man in purchasing food for his children or clothing for his wife or medicine for his family.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BLEASE. I ask the Senator, is it not within the province of the Senate and the House to put in the word "food"?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course it is.

Mr. BLEASE. And not ask the Secretary of Agriculture what his opinion is or what it might be? Could not we settle the matter in that way?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, we could. Let me repeat to the Senator what I said last night that, in my opinion, we are acting like a lot of children.

Mr. BLEASE. I think so, and uneducated children at that.

Mr. WHEELER. We are saying here that the word "food" must not be written into the provision because if it shall be written into it, the President of the United States will not sign the measure. We must not provide in the compromise provision that loans for food can be made, because if we should do that, the President of the United States would not sign the bill. On the other hand, both the Senators from Arkansas and the Senator from Utah say it means food. Well, if it means food, why can we not write the word "food" into the measure? Will somebody tell me why?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WHEELER. I will yield in a moment. Mr. President, when the President of the United States says, "The Secretary of Agriculture assures me he has no other intention than that he will interpret it fairly and sympathetically," we must take the words "fairly and sympathetically" to mean food, notwithstanding the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture on December 8 and on February 8 said that he is against loans for food and that in fact it means doles when Government money is loaned for food. Now I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the Senator recognizes that this body, or a majority of it, not only was willing to write the word "food" into the provision, but a majority at the other end of the Capitol absolutely blocked it. So the responsibility is not on us, and it would be a futile thing for us to write it in unless we could get both branches of Congress to enact the law in that form.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator is not entirely right in that respect, because we do not have to get the consent of the other branch of Congress. What we have got to do is to get the consent of the President of the United States.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have been here a good while, but I never knew before that Congress, in passing an act, was obligated to obtain the opinion of the Executive before it could express its own opinion as to legislation.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator knows that in this case, however, the so-called compromise agreement was not written by the conferees. If I understand, it was written by the executive department and not by the conferees. When the conferees were in session and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] offered an amendment to write in the word "food" he was told that the compromise had been agreed on, not by the conferees, but agreed to by whom? By somebody outside of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I shall be extremely anxious to see how the Secretary of Agriculture answers the resolution which the Senate passed yesterday.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is a rumor around here that the Secretary of Agriculture has answered the resolution, but that his answer is so unsatisfactory that the Republican leaders are trying to fix it up. Does the Senator know anything about that?

Mr. WHEELER. I have heard the rumor.

Mr. BARKLEY. The rumor is here. I should like to know if the Senator can confirm it.

Mr. WHEELER. Not being in the confidence of the Republican leaders with reference to this matter, I will say to the Senator that I can not answer.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think perhaps the rumor originated in the Senator's brain.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; I have been told about it by four different men, and I had not even thought of it until then.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator from Utah would consult the press gallery, I think he would find out where the rumor originated—not on the Senate floor; but I will say that it is common rumor.

I appreciate, however, that the Senator from Utah is not the man who will rewrite the answer, if it is rewritten. He probably will not have any more to do with rewriting the answer of the Secretary than he did with writing the compromise that took place.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WHEELER. I do.

Mr. BLEASE. I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks the Secretary of Agriculture had anything to do with writing the answer. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. I can tell the Senator better when I see it; but it will be interesting to see his letter in view of the statement he made on December 8, saying that he was against loans for food; and it will be interesting to read his letter in view of his statement on February 7, saying:

> It leaves to the Red Cross the responsibility of the field as agent for human relief to those who do not have security and to whom Government loans for food such as were at one time proposed would have been mere charity.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, does the Senator know the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. WHEELER. I have seen him before the committee.

Mr. BLEASE. Has the Senator ever had much conversation with him?

Mr. WHEELER. I never have.

Mr. BLEASE. I thought, if the Senator had, that I would ask him if he expected anything very intelligent to come from the Secretary of Agriculture. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the ridiculous position in which the Senate of the United States finds itself at this time ought to be perfectly obvious to everybody. On two different occasions we have passed amendments through the Senate. One of them carried an appropriation of $25,000,000 to be turned over to the Red Cross. Then, if you please, after these amendments were made by the Senate, we find the House turning them down, the House refusing to agree with them. We find the House committee, I am told, even refusing to hear anybody who wanted to be heard in favor of the second amendment. Then all of a sudden we find outside parties not connected with the Congress of the United States, not connected with the committee that had to deal with the amendment, writing a compromise agreement; and we are told that we must not dot an "i," that we must not use the word "food." Then we hear Senators upon the floor of the Senate saying that if food is not included in the conference report, their votes have been gotten under false pretenses; and yet we can not write into it the word "food."

Why? Will the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] answer that? Will he tell me why he and the rest of the members of the committee refused to have the word "food" written into the conference report?

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not want that statement to go unchallenged when the Senator says "the rest of the members of the committee." I offered an amendment, and it was voted down. I did not agree to it.

Mr. WHEELER. I said that the Senator from Tennessee offered an amendment to put in the word "food," and that

was rejected; and I asked the Senator from Utah if he could tell me why it was that the word "food" could not be put in the conference report, if that is what they intended to say and that was included in this amendment.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. WHEELER. I do.

Mr. CUTTING. Even if the word "food" could be written into this conference report by implication, who is going to get the food?

Mr. WHEELER. If "food" could be written into it, then of course the only people who are going to get the food are those who have security.

Mr. CUTTING. In other words, the hungrier you are the less food you will get?

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly. If you are hungry, you will have to go to charity. You will have to go to the Red Cross. You will have to take what the Red Cross give; and it was testified here, I think, that they were giving a few cents a week to the hungry.

Mr. CUTTING. Is it not the Senator's idea that the people who will be benefited by the compromise will be the wealthy planters, and that nobody else will get anything, except as it passes down from them to the ordinary starving people?

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes. I was told that one reason why I ought to be for this "compromise" was because of the fact that it would take care of the dairymen of the country; it would perhaps take care of the cattlemen of the country; it would perhaps take care of the sheepmen of the country. But, Mr. President, I thought when we were making this fight we were making it for the hungry and the needy of the country rather than for the stock people and the dairy people and the sheep people.

Mr. CUTTING. Is it not true that this compromise is going to benefit property rights at the expense of human rights? And if the function of government is to protect life and property, is it not fair that at this time life should be put on at least a parity with property?

Mr. WHEELER. Apparently not, in the minds of those who drafted this compromise; and I understand that it was drafted by the executive department.

Where is the Senator upon this floor who wants to go home and say to his people, "Yes"——

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask the Senator to yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, because I think probably there is an important communication to be given to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. WHEELER. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON. 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	Fletcher	McGill	Shortridge
Barkley	Frazier	McKellar	Smith
Bingham	George	McMaster	Smoot
Black	Gillett	McNary	Steck
Blaine	Glass	Metcalf	Steiwer
Blease	Goff	Morrison	Stephens
Borah	Goldsborough	Morrow	Swanson
Bratton	Gould	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Brock	Hale	Norbeck	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Harris	Norris	Townsend
Bulkley	Harrison	Nye	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
Dale	Jones	Reed	Watson
Davis	Kean	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Deneen	Kendrick	Schall	Williamson
Dill	King	Sheppard	
Fess	La Follette	Shipstead	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. If the Senator will yield——

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[Telegram]

LOUISVILLE, KY., *February 12, 1931.*

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
The Capitol:

My attention has been called to the resolution of inquiry directed to me regarding the proposed amendment to Joint Resolution 211, for relief of farmers in the drought-stricken areas, approved December 20. As I have already indicated, it is not my understanding that the reason for this legislation is to provide loans for food, but for purposes beyond those already made by the joint resolution referred to, which may be necessary to secure a crop and where the emergency for such assistance exists. The provision of food, medicine, and clothes by gift is the major purpose of the Red Cross, who are now generously meeting this need, and are able to do so. Their services are particularly necessary to the great numbers of tenants and others who have no security to offer for loans, and to whom the creation of a debt for food would be a hopeless burden. On the other hand, it is my understanding that the major purpose of this additional legislation is, in effect, to restore the weakened credit situation, and that when loans under any part of the amendment are made to those who have the securities indicated for that purpose and for making the next crop and for rehabilitation from drought there could be no prohibition against the proceeds of such loans being used for food or other supplies if they were necessary to effect the purpose. I am confident that the organization and relief by the combined agencies will adequately care for the drought sufferers. Fair and sympathetic interpretation of authority granted to the Department of Agriculture would be only natural in view of its close contacts and particular interest in those affected. The department will certainly give such administration.

ARTHUR M. HYDE,
Secretary of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The communication will lie on the table.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to suggest to the Senator from Montana that the telegram is a good deal like the Wickersham report. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that as far as food is concerned——

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator that he was in the middle of a question when he was interrupted by the arrival of the message to be read. I do not like to be left in suspense. I would like to have the Senator complete the question.

Mr. WHEELER. It would not be the first time the Senator has been left in suspense.

Mr. MOSES. By the Senator from Montana, that is to say?

Mr. WHEELER. Knowing the Senator as I do, I know he has been in suspense many times.

I want to emphasize to the Senate the language the Secretary has used in his telegram. He said:

As I have already indicated, it is not my understanding that the reason for this legislation is to provide loans for food but for purposes beyond those already made by the joint resolution referred to which may be necessary to secure a crop and where the emergency for such assistance exists. The provision for food, medicine, and clothes by gift is the major purpose of the Red Cross, who are now generously meeting this need and are able to do so.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would it not now be proper to introduce a resolution to refer this telegram to the Attorney General, asking him, as a lawyer, what the Secretary of Agriculture meant?

Mr. WHEELER. I am sure there are not two lawyers on the floor of the Senate who will agree as to what it does mean, and if we are in any better position now to know what is in the mind of the Secretary of Agriculture than we were last night, I miss my guess. He said:

As I have already indicated—

What has he already indicated?

As I have already indicated—

This is what he has already indicated, what he indicated on February 8—

it—

The compromise—

it leaves to the Red Cross the responsibility of the field as agent for human relief to those who do not have security and to whom Government loans for food such as were at one time proposed would have been mere charity.

Then again, as he had already stated on December 8, he said:

There are a great many objections to the Government making loans for human food. From a national point of view this latter class of loans approaches perilously near the dole system, and would be a move in the wrong direction.

Has he said anything in this telegram that would change those statements? I submit that he has not. He says what? That the major purpose of this additional legislation is, in effect, to restore the weakened credit situation. I submit that that is an admirable proposition. I agree that that was an admirable thing to do, to help the credit situation.

And that when loans under any part of the amendment are made to those who have the securities indicated for that purpose—

When he says "for that purpose" what purpose does he mean? That when loans are made for the purpose of trying to restore the weakened credit situation, when they are made for that purpose, "and for making the next crop and for rehabilitation from drought, there could be no prohibition against the proceeds of such loans being used for food or other supplies if they were necessary to effect the purpose. I am confident that the organization and relief by the combined agencies will adequately care for the drought sufferers."

In one breath, I submit, his telegram says that he is not for loans for food, and in the next breath he says that the major portion of this is to build up the weakened credit situation, and that when loans are for that purpose, there could be no prohibition against the proceeds of such loans being used for food. Then he says also:

And for making the next crop and for rehabilitation from drought, there could be no prohibition against the proceeds of such loans being used for food or other supplies.

In other words, the telegram is contradictory.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. May I suggest that the telegram be sent out to the reporters and copies struck off so that Senators may have an opportunity to attempt to interpret this ambiguous language?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That order will be entered.

Mr. WHEELER. If he means what he says in the first part of the telegram, then he means that no loan should be made for food. If he means what he says in the last part of the telegram, then he means that when money is loaned for crop production it can be used for the purchase of food. If he means what he says in the first part of it, he is perfectly consistent with the statements made on December 8 and on February 8. If he means what he says in the last portion of it, then his statement is entirely inconsistent with the statements he issued on December 8 and on February 8.

So we are left, as a matter of fact, in just about the same position we were in before we got the telegram, and if anybody can rise upon the floor of the Senate and tell me why it is that you can not write into this legislation the word "food" I would like to have him do so at this time. I would like to know from the Senator from Utah why it is that he objected to the word "food" being written in there. Will the Senator from Utah tell me why he objected to the word "food" being written in there?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this was a House amendment, which the Senate conferees agreed upon.

Mr. WHEELER. That is not my understanding.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator just wait a woment, if he wants my answer?

Mr. WHEELER. I can not hear the Senator. Will he not speak louder?

Mr. SMOOT. I took the position, as a conferee, that under the wording of the amendment as presented by the House, wherever a loan is made under the provisions of the amendment, the borrower can buy food or anything else he wants to buy, and there was no necessity whatever of putting the word "food" or anything else in. That is what I said yesterday and what I have said two or three times during the debate on the bill, that is what Secretary Hyde says, and that is exactly the construction that was put upon that language by the conferees.

Mr. WHEELER. It is not the construction put upon it by Mr. TILSON; it was not the construction put upon it by the Secretary of Agriculture when he issued his statement on February 8. Yet the Senator says that in view of that statement he did not want the word "food" written in there.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not say that I did not want it.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator objected to it.

Mr. SMOOT. I said there was no necessity for it, and I say so now.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator voted against it.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; because we were acting on a conference report, when we either vote for the conference report or vote it down. That is all we can do.

Mr. WHEELER. If there had not been any arguments on the floor of the Senate no person would ever have been able to get food.

Mr. SMOOT. I deny that.

Mr. WHEELER. I submit that under the terms of this language a person borrowing money for use for crop production would have no right to buy food for his children or to buy food or clothes or medicine for his family.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator and I disagree.

Mr. WHEELER. It is not the first time we have disagreed.

Mr. SMOOT. I am just as positive as the Senator is that if this becomes the law borrowers may purchase food with the money.

Mr. WHEELER. I hope the Senator is correct, and I hope the Secretary of Agriculture will carry out the last portion of the telegram he has sent to the Senate, which is absolutely contrary to the statement he issued on February 8, and absolutely contrary to the statement he issued on December 8, with reference to food.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no doubt in the world but that if this becomes the law loans will be made, and that the persons borrowing the money may purchase food, and will purchase food, if it is necessary.

Mr. WHEELER. Assuming that what the Senator has said is correct, and that they would be permitted to purchase food, it still leaves us in this predicament: That we are appropriating $20,000,000 to lend to credit organizations and to farmers who have security, and that the great bulk of the farmers of the United States, who have not security, who have not the money to put in a crop, and can not put in a crop, or who have mortgaged the crop and have not the money, must appeal to charity. They must appeal to the Red Cross. They must take what the Red Cross is doling out to them, they must take whatever little they can get, wherever they are located in this country.

It likewise means, as I said before, that the Congress of the United States is going to adjourn on March 4, that you are not going to appropriate a dollar to take care of the children, the babies, the wives of the miners of the country; you are not going to appropriate a 5-cent piece to take care of the workers in the factories who are out of employment and can not get work; you are not going to appropriate a 5-cent piece to take care of literally millions of people who are starving throughout the country because of an economic situation over which they have no control.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Before the Senator leaves the subject of the destitute farmers who are unable to afford security, and therefore will be unable to get any food, I would like to

direct his attention to a dispatch appearing in the Washington Daily News of February 11, by a staff correspondent, from England, Ark. In the dispatch there appears this statement:

Seventeen thousand out of thirty-five thousand in this county are receiving food, clothing, and medicine from the Red Cross. After March 1 there will be no more rations, Red Cross officials have warned.

Has the Senator any information on that subject?

Mr. WHEELER. I am sorry to say I have no information on the subject at all.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think we should have some information about it.

Mr. WHEELER. We have heard the cause of the people of Arkansas pleaded here, but we have not heard anything said about the people in the other parts of the country at all. One would think that the only section of the country where the farmers are suffering from drought and economic causes is in Arkansas. I hold in my hand an article appearing in an Ohio paper, written by Hugh Fullerton, dated New Lexington, Ohio, January 31. The editor's note reads as follows:

The following article has been prepared by Hugh Fullerton, Dispatch staff writer, as the first of a series to appear in this paper depicting true conditions in the drought-stricken hill area of Ohio. Mr. Fullerton's statements are not based on hearsay, but are written only after a personal tour of these sections in which he has discovered appalling conditions.

The article itself reads as follows:

NEW LEXINGTON, OHIO, Jan. 31.—Shadows of hunger and want have settled like a miasmatic fog over the drought-stricken hill area of Ohio and, through the mists, gallops the ghostly white horse of pestilence.

From where the drought-dwindled majestic Ohio river turns southward below East Liverpool clear down to Cincinnati there is hunger, privation, hopelessness, and suffering, and, in places, there is near starvation. Along a line from Steubenville southwestward to Cincinnati, since last March the land has panted for water and all the people of the hill land are feeling the pressure of want.

ATTITUDE OF DESPAIR

Thousands of children are huddled in poor homes without clothing or shoes to attend school. Thousands of others are hungry and undernourished, easy prey to disease. Fathers, unable to find employment, go gaunt and hollow-eyed, and mothers stare at a stranger vacantly. There are few tears—merely despair.

There are black spots in the gray of the hopeless area. Vinton and Meigs Counties, parts of Scioto, of Belmont, of Washington, the southern end of Perry, and wherever the country depended upon coal, upon clay products, or upon oil for employment, that is mostly gone.

The merchants who have striven to carry their communities on credit either are broke or on the point of breaking and have been for the most part compelled to go on a cash basis, and there is little cash.

SMALL FARMERS SUFFER

Men are cutting coal for 40 cents a ton loaded in the mine and in one district for 25 cents a ton. Men are supporting large families on an average of less than a dollar and a half a day when they work—and begging for two or three days' work a week.

The drought left the small farmers and the farm hands without winter supplies. Gardens and small farms failed. Brickyards, railroads, mines reduced work. The entire district, wherever one strikes coal or clay-products sections, has been, since 1921, poverty stricken, the buying power exhausted, wages low, employment part time, families large.

COUNTY HOMES CROWDED

The situation is desperate in many districts. The State board of education, the county superintendents of schools, local committees, and the Red Cross are doing fine work in many places. Children are being fed in the schools. In almost every community relief committees are striving to reach the most desperate cases. Every county infirmary and every children's home in every county we visited is overcrowded, and finding it difficult to care for the cases forced "on the county."

Every county agent we called upon reported extraordinary demands for county help, over and above the usual midwinter pressure. Every county reported funds low and being stretched to the limit in the effort to relieve the conditions.

Every parent-teacher association reported undernourishment, hunger, and lack of food and clothing, and insufficient supply of milk for the undernourished children.

The worst cases are mostly old American stock, sons and daughters of the men and women who carved the empire out of the wilderness. Yet the greater part of the relief is being extended to the imported workers, many of whom were brought in during the industrial wars in the mining districts.

I am not going to read the full article, Mr. President. I merely wish to quote just another brief portion, as follows:

I have talked with relief workers, local committees, country school superintendents, heads of schools in towns, villages, and in the country, have visited the mines and brickyards, and seen reports of work done.

There is no disposition to exaggerate conditions. In some districts one laughs through tears at the idea that the fathers of these men destroyed slavery in this country—and see them in worse condition than the slaves ever were—and more hopeless.

Mr. President, where are the men and women who are described in this article going to get any relief under the compromise? Where are the coal miners who are out of employment and whose families are huddled together in barracks going to get any relief out of this bill? Where are the workers in the cities going to get any relief out of it? Go back home, if you will, and tell the people of your State, the starving miners, the workers in the factories, the people who have not money to produce the crops and therefore can not produce crops, "I voted to appropriate money out of the Treasury of the United States to loan to the man who had security to offer, but I refused to vote to appropriate money out of the Treasury of the United States to give to the man who did not have any money and who did not have any security."

Say to such men that you voted to appropriate money to relieve the wealthy farmers. Say to them that you voted to appropriate $160,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States to relieve the rich during the panic on Wall Street. Say to them that you voted to relieve the tariff barons of the country by giving them the highest tariff that has ever been known in the history of the country. But when a plea is made for the people who do not have any money, who are suffering and hungry and starving—when a plea is made for little children, hundreds of whom are living in barracks and going hungry, when pestilence is sweeping the country, then say to them that you stood in your place and refused, because you said it would be a bad thing for the American people, to vote for money to buy food and clothing for them. Tell them that you did this because you believed it would not be good for the American people to have money given to them if they were poor, but it would be all right to make loans to them if they were rich. Go home and say that to your constituents if you dare.

Mr. President, what is the philosophy back of all this? I am going to read a portion of an article that appeared in the New Republic:

Why does the President insist that giving food to starving farmers through the Red Cross is the "American" way, while giving it to them through the agencies of government is at all costs to be avoided?

Giving money to them through the Red Cross will not injure them, but giving it to them out of the Treasury of the United States will break down their morale! The article proceeds:

Why are governmental loans to keep cattle alive and to help raise future crops legitimate, while governmental loans to keep alive the people who must care for the cattle and raise the crops constitute a "dole"? The distinction does not lie in mere academic logic chopping; it is a real enough one with practical consequences in the minds of conservatives like Mr. Hoover.

The theory behind it is the theory that the Government is not and should not be responsible for the economic welfare—or even the lives—of the citizens. Whether they prosper, whether they have even enough to eat, depends solely upon their individual efforts. The Government may properly, though in extremely rare cases, help to finance them in business or farming enterprises in which they may produce wealth or sustenance, but it must never give them directly any wealth or sustenance which they have not won in the world of competition. If persons get hungry or jobless or meet with other economic misfortune, it is never the fault of the civilization in which they live or of the governmental agencies of that civilization; it is either the fault of the unfortunate persons or the result of some natural calamity.

Think of that, Mr. President. The idea of saying that in this country of ours it is not the result of economic laws that many of our people are going hungry to-night. Everybody knows in this country of ours that the reason why there are starving people in our cities to-night is because that condition has been brought about to a large extent by economic

laws enacted by the Congress of the United States. Everybody knows it is because of the fact that there is an unequal distribution of the wealth of the Nation.

The article continues:

When persons in this state of mind speak of the "demoralization" caused by a "dole," they do not really mean that destitute persons should be left to perish. Nor can they logically mean that a payment from the Government really injures self-respect or pride any more than a gift from a huge bureaucratic organization like the Red Cross or an organized charity. What they have in mind is more subtle than that.

They mean that relief from governmental sources would imply that the destitute have a right to aid, that organized society has a duty in the matter, while relief from voluntary contributions carries only the assumption that the more fortunate citizens are generous and deserve credit for their generosity.

The State is an agency by which the citizens may, through their representatives, appropriate money to be raised by the imposition of taxes. If the voters once get the habit of using the State to transfer wealth from opulent to the indigent, or employ State machinery in any other way for an equalitarian economic purpose, there is no telling where they might stop. Conservative get frightened at the merest hint of such a thing.

It would be dangerous to their dogma that everyone prospers according to his deserts. The "demoralization" caused by the "dole" is in the realm of ideas; it fosters the idea that the people may legitimately demand something they have not won by private enterprise.

That, of course, is the philosophy back of men like Mr. Hoover, who say that the Government can appropriate money to loan to those who have, but can not appropriate money out of the Treasury of the United States to loan for food and to give to people who have not anything. That is the reason why Mr. Hoover feels that it is all right for the Government of the United States to appropriate money for the Albanians, for the Italians, for the Russians, or for the Turks, but it is not right to appropriate money to feed hungry Americans. Go home and tell your people that you feel it is all right to appropriate money and turn it over to Mr. Hoover to feed the Italians who are starving in their country, that it is all right to appropriate money for the Russians, that it is all right to appropriate money for the Albanians, the Turks, the Chinese, and the Japanese, but not when your own people, your own brothers and sisters, are going hungry in this land of ours, in this land of plenty that boasts of its great wealth, and see what the answer of your people will be. Tell them that you said, "No, Mr. President, it is wrong; it is against our political philosophy to appropriate money for any such purpose."

Tell them that and see what their answer at the polls will be. The article goes on to say:

It would be dangerous to their dogma that everyone prospers according to his deserts. The "demoralization" caused by the "dole" is in the realm of ideas; it fosters the idea that the people may legitimately demand something they have not won by private enterprise.

If misfortune is relieved by charity only, those who have the money retain the right to decide whether there is need, how pressing it is, and how much they should contribute to its relief. Though their judgment may be wrong, their generosity belated, and the activity of charitable organizations haphazard and inefficient—as in Arkansas, for instance, denying food to starving families because the supply of blanks had run out—all this is infinitely preferable, they would say, to contributions enforced by public authority. As a matter of fact, they are usually reluctant to admit that need exists or that their way of relieving it is inefficient.

This frame of mind has a peculiar urgency at present, because of the imminence of a Treasury deficit. Business men are being warned in unmistakable fashion, both publicly and through confidential sources, that an increase of taxes is inevitable, and that the more money Congress appropriates, the greater the increase will be.

They know well enough that when taxes are increased, not much additional revenue can be derived from tariff duties, sales taxes, or other imposts which take money from everyone's pockets; the easiest and most feasible way to increase governmental receipts is through the income tax or the inheritance tax.

Even if such an increase is not so adjusted as to bear progressively on the larger incomes, as it is likely to be, still all those subject to the tax constitute but a small fraction—the richer section of the Nation.

This is the group which, in general, is the most powerful in public affairs. It contributes to campaign funds, influences newspaper policies, sustains lobbies, and surrounds most of the men in public office.

How well we know it! How well, Mr. President, we know—and every Member upon this floor will admit it privately if not publicly—that it is the man who comes here who has contributed large sums to the campaign fund who gets special favors at the hands of Congress, but when the poor fellow who has not any money to contribute to campaign funds—all he has is his vote—comes knocking at the door of Congress, what does he get?

Here we have, Mr. President, the richest Nation in all the world. We boast of our riches; we boast of our prosperity. We have more gold in our Treasury than has any other country in the world; we have more wealth. The wealth is here to-day just as it was two years ago; it is here just as it was four years ago; and yet we have poverty stalking our streets, pestilence in our mining camps among the babies, the children, the widows, and the orphans. When they ask that their Government, the richest Government in all the world, appropriate money out of the Treasury of the United States to aid them in their distress, a deaf ear is turned to their pleading.

Is it any wonder, my friends, that some men are shivering in their boots because of the fact that they are fearful of radicalism? Is it any wonder that some people are worrying about a little handful of communists who, for publicity purposes, come to the Capitol, and we surround ourselves with policemen and make ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of the world? And yet, Mr. President, when poverty is stalking our streets we refuse to give money to those suffering and in distress because of a political dogma! The article goes on to say:

Even if such an increase is not so adjusted as to bear progressively on the larger incomes, as it is likely to be, still all those subject to the tax constitute but a small fraction—the richer section of the Nation.

This is the group which, in general, is the most powerful in public affairs. It contributes to campaign funds, influences newspaper policies, sustains lobbies, and surrounds most of the men in public office.

Some Members of the Senate are fearful as to what the press of the Nation is going to say about them, when most of us know who controls the press. The article continues:

Coolidge and Mellon maintained high repute by repeated reductions of its tax rates. Hoover, with his eyes fixed on renomination and reelection, knows well enough that he can strengthen himself immensely if he becomes its champion by boldly fighting to keep down future levies against it.

Thus does economic determination work through politics to throttle public relief of distress. If a larger amount of money is appropriated by the Government, its collection will be assessed systematically in accordance with ability to pay; if a smaller amount is raised by a "drive," the bulk of it will probably come from small contributions by employees, and the rest from those who are more willing to give than to be taxed.

Nobody on any side of this controversy maintains that the destitution caused by the drought and unemployment is really the fault of the victim. The stern refusal to sanction public relief for them is a startling indication of the lengths to which conservatives are ready to go in order to prevent the Government from interfering with the game in which they have been the winners, in any way which would help the losers. If the plain and generous people of America once realized the cruel dogmatism on which this refusal rests, and the sordid interests which it serves, the incident would do more than anything has done in a long time to discredit the ruling group in the country.

Mr. President, I for one am unwilling to vote for a compromise which does not take into consideration the farmers of the country who have no credit and no security to offer. I am unwilling to stand for a compromise which leaves out of consideration those men and women, workers in factories and other industrial plants, who are out of employment; and I challenge any Senator to stand upon this floor and say that under such conditions this is a dole.

I was not the one to offer this amendment. I repeat, Mr. President, it was offered by the senior Senator from Arkansas, the Democratic leader. It was offered by him in an effort to take care of the workers in the city; it was offered by him to take care of the farmers who did not have any money and who could not give security; it was offered by him to take care of all classes of our citizens who may be in distress. Now, are those who stood by him, those who made it possible for him to make a compromise, to be condemned by those who sponsored the amendment?

I submit this compromise ought not to be agreed to; but I realize that when the Democratic leader on this side gets

together with the Republican leaders upon the other side those of us who are unwilling to go along with such a coalition will be outnumbered and outvoted. I wish, however, to say to some of the Senators on this floor that the issue will not be ended with this session; it will be back here at the next session of Congress; it will be back here in a year from now and two years from now. Senators upon the other side of the Chamber who vote against it will have to answer to their constituents, and Senators upon this side of the Chamber who were first willing to vote for it and then willing to compromise and leave out the workers in the cities in their States and also the farmers in their States will have to answer to their constituents.

Mr. STEIWER obtained the floor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana referred to the situation in Ohio. Were it not for that I would not take one moment of the time of the Senate, and I intend now to occupy not more than two minutes at any rate.

The southern section of Ohio, I think, suffered from the drought about as severely as any section of the country. The people who live there represent as high a grade of citizenship as may be found anywhere, and I feel quite certain that there will be no difficulty whatever in the State rehabilitating conditions there.

The article to which the Senator from Montana referred was written by a very facile newspaper man who represents the Columbus Dispatch, which is published in Columbus. The Legislature of Ohio is now in session there, and one of the main features of the legislative program is a measure to provide for taking care of the drought-stricken section to the degree that the local people can not do so. I have no letters, save one, and that was sent to me by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HATFIELD], come to me from the State of Ohio making any representation whatever about the situation there beyond what can be taken care of locally.

Mr. Fullerton, as I have said, is a very facile newspaper writer. He is trying to stimulate the sentiment of the people in the city and vicinity where the newspaper is published in order to get some reaction on the part of the State legislature to assist in providing relief. I want to say to my friend that there will be no difficulty whatever in the State taking care of its own people. So far as I am concerned, the Senator knows that if distressed people in any section of the country could not be cared for by local agencies or by the Red Cross, I would be one of the very first to vote to give them the necessary assistance, but I should make that the very last resort, for I think it would be a very unwise policy upon which to embark.

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

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. All I say is this:

The Congress of the United States is going to adjourn. I can see no reason why the Senator or anybody else would not be willing to appropriate money and intrust it to the President, so that he can use it, in his discretion, in case an emergency arises in any of these cases which the Red Cross and the other charitable organizations are unable to meet. Can the Senator see any objection to that?

Mr. FESS. I think that would be a tenable position to take. If the Red Cross could not take care of the people who have no credit, and therefore can not get loans under this legislation, and there was nothing left other than the Federal Government to assist, I think it is a function that the Federal Government should enter upon.

Mr. WHEELER. Then I take it that the Senator would not object to an appropriation to be used at the discretion of the President during the recess of Congress for the purpose of taking care of such cases as that in the event that they arise?

Mr. FESS. I should not object to that if I thought the situation would warrant it; but I do not believe that the situation to-day would warrant anything of the sort.

Mr. WHEELER. I am frank to say to the Senator that I do not know as to that. As far as my own State is concerned, while the economic conditions are bad, I have had no appeals for charity. My own State was the first State that complied with the Federal Government's proposition to build roads for the purpose of taking care of the unemployed. I have been impressed, however, if I may say so to the Senator from Ohio, by the impassioned appeals that have been made on this side of the Chamber and on the other side of the Chamber with reference to conditions that exist in other States than my own; and I assume that the Senator from Ohio has enough confidence in the President of the United States to feel that if we appropriated money he would not use it except in the event that it was necessary during the recess of Congress. That would make it unnecessary, in case there was an emergency, for us to be called back in an extra session of Congress for the purpose of dealing with it.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. STEIWER. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. BROCK. I send to the desk a short resolution which I ask to have read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 449) was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Whereas in the drought-stricken area of the United States actual want for food and other necessities of life now exist; and

Whereas it is desirable that the members of the Senate should keenly sense this need; and

Whereas it is believed that the personal experience of pangs of hunger will bring to individual Senators a more complete appreciation of the needs of those now suffering, through no fault of their own: Be it

Resolved, That until the pending bill providing for the relief of those in destitution be voted upon by the United States Senate, the Members of the Senate pledge themselves to eat nothing but bread and water.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee, who has more means than some of us, will start in upon that, I think probably it might be very helpful to him.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to 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, requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WASON, Mr. SUMMERS of Washington, and Mr. WOODRUM were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bill and joint resolution:

H. R. 10576. An act to authorize exchange of lands with owners of private-land holdings within the Chaco Canyon National Monument, N. Mex., and for other purposes; and

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

The message further announced that the House had agreed severally to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 13518. 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;

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. 15930. 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;

H. R. 16116. An act to adjust the boundaries and for the addition of certain lands to the Bryce Canyon National Park, Utah, and for other purposes; 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.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3644) for compensation in behalf of John M. Flynn, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9872) to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Andrew J. Brown, a former rural mail carrier at Erwin, Tenn., with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and also that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the said bill.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 8583) for the relief of the State of Maine and the city of Portsmouth, N. H., and it was signed by the Vice President.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to 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, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JONES. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. KEYES, Mr. SMOOT, Mr. JONES, Mr. GLASS, and Mr. BROUSSARD conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROHIBITION OF IMPORTATIONS OF GOODS MADE BY CONVICT AND SLAVE LABOR

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for a short time with respect to a subject which is only indirectly related to the pending question.

Upon this day, Mr. President, throughout the Republic the people of America are paying tribute to the memory of the martyred Abraham Lincoln. Among those memories, probably the thought that is uppermost is the thought of Mr. Lincoln as the Emancipator, and of his philosophy with respect to human liberty.

I feel, it is fitting therefore, in order that I may in a measure translate his philosophy into the discussion of this Chamber to-day, that I should discuss briefly the question of convict labor and slave labor as they affect the imports into our country.

The importation into the United States of products manufactured wholly or in part by convict labor is condemned by the policy of our Government, and for at least 40 years our tariff acts have prohibited the entry of such products. The tariff act of 1930 broadened this policy of exclusion so as to prohibit in addition the importation, in certain cases, of the products of "forced" and "indentured" labor. Under the terms of the act, the new provisions do not take effect until January 1, 1932. The existing law is contained in section 307 of the tariff act of 1930, and reads as follows:

All goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced or manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labor or/and forced labor or/and indentured labor under penal sanctions shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of this provision. The provisions of this section relating to goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured by forced labor or/and indentured labor, shall take effect on January 1, 1932; but in no case shall such provisions be applicable to goods, wares, articles, or merchandise so mined, produced, or manufactured which are not mined, produced, or manufactured in such quantities in the United States as to meet the consumptive demands of the United States.

"Forced labor," as herein used, shall mean all work or service which is exacted from any person under the menace of any penalty for its nonperformance and for which the worker does not offer himself voluntarily.

The new matter excluding products of forced and indentured labor was no doubt prompted chiefly by revelations of economic and labor conditions in Russia, although it has repeatedly been asserted that forced and indentured labor are employed in Czechoslovakia, in Sumatra, and in various other countries of the world. Since the enactment of the tariff act additional facts concerning labor conditions in Russia have come to the attention of the public and of the Government, and in this Congress a number of bills have been introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives seeking to make more effective the provisions of section 307, above referred to, to make the provisions relating to forced and indentured labor operative at once or at an early date, and further to define the meaning of the phrases "forced labor" and "indentured labor." Still other bills provide embargoes against all importations from Russia.

Since the emancipation proclamation the policy of our country has been one of universal freedom in labor. Our great achievements in industrial growth and our leading place in the commercial affairs of the world have largely been founded upon the idea of perfect freedom in employment. By various laws Congress and the legislatures of the several States have sought to prevent the exploitation of those who toil. Social and welfare legislation occupies a prominent place in the program of legislative assemblies. Many States have enacted legislation prohibiting or restricting the sale of goods produced by convict labor. By act of January 19, 1929, Congress removed the interstate character of convict-made goods, even though shipped across State boundaries, in order to permit the several States to regulate or prohibit commerce in such articles within their borders. Section 307 of the act of 1930 and the corresponding sections of prior tariff acts were designed to protect American labor against importations of goods whose convict origin would make their sale illegal in many States if they were of domestic manufacture.

I shall not here and now take the time to present extended arguments against the sale of goods produced by convict labor or against the importation into the United States of such goods. The objections to such importations are too obvious to require comment. It is worth while, however, to say that under our institutions the freedom to choose employment is part of the inherent right of man. It is recognized and guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. Our history has proved that such freedom is conducive to the happiness of those who labor, that it has raised our standards of living and resulted in improved industrial and economic conditions, and, without doubt, has elevated and strengthened our people in independence and citizenship. This right of absolute freedom of contract with respect to employment is distinctly an American principle.

I do not, therefore, view section 307 of the act of 1930 as merely an administrative provision of the tariff law. In the most substantial sense it is the declaration of principle by which the Congress of the United States seeks to protect American labor from a species of unfair competition from foreign countries, a species of competition that we do not tolerate in our own country. It could well have been enacted as a separate act. This aspect of the law makes it of paramount interest; and the question of its enforcement and application is of continuing public importance.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator suffer an interruption?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I was detained from the Senate and did not hear the opening statements of the Senator. Is he favoring a law prohibiting all imports from Russia?

Mr. STEIWER. No, Mr. President. I will come to that more in detail later; but I am not suggesting laying embargoes against all importations from any country.

Mr. KING. I was about to observe that if the Senator favored that it is pretty difficult to differentiate between the various groups and classes of people of Russia. As the Senator knows, they have a communistic republic, or a congerie of republics; and all who live in the Soviet republics are subject to the same laws and the same servitude, if we call any part of the activities of the people a condition of servitude.

I see but little difference between the people along the Volga, the people living up in the timbered regions, and those living in Siberia. They are all amenable to the communistic rule. They are minutemen. They go where they are directed to go, and they engage generally in those employments where the communist régime indicates that they shall labor. So I was going to say that it seems to me to be very difficult to draw the line of demarcation with respect to the goods which may be shipped out of Russia, and say, "This is the product of indentured labor," and "This is the product of a free people."

Mr. STEIWER. I thank the Senator for his observations, and later in my remarks I shall make some allusion to the difficulties that already have been encountered by the Bureau of Customs in connection with this matter.

With what success is this law being enforced? It is a startling fact that customs officials do not appear to have been able to apply the law effectually. I am advised that for at least 25 years no shipments of foreign goods have been excluded upon the ground that they were produced in whole or in part by convict labor. Recent feeble and ineffectual efforts for its enforcement have thus far resulted in a net record of complete defeat of the efforts of the Government to protect its citizens from the unfair competition of convict-made importations. Certain criticisms have been directed against the Treasury Department for its failure in this regard. I am not yet prepared to acquit the Treasury entirely for this failure; but I desire at this time to point out that Congress is in no position to criticize the Treasury or the Bureau of Customs until an inquiry is first made with respect to the sufficiency of the law which Congress has enacted. It is certain that the definition of "forced labor" contained in the law is far from satisfactory, and the phrase "indentured labor" is not defined at all. These terms are not as specific and definite as the term "convict labor," and it is obvious that if the law can not in its present state be effectively enforced against importations of goods produced by convict labor, there is little hope of protection to American labor and industry against importations of goods produced by forced and indentured labor when the provisions relating thereto take effect on January 1, 1932. A fundamental difficulty which has arisen is the necessity, under the present act as it is interpreted by the Treasury, of identifying a specific importation as convict made. A moment's reflection shows the impossibility of effective enforcement under such circumstances.

The evil consequences of the failure to provide adequate means of enforcement can not be too strongly emphasized. American standards can not be maintained, and free American labor can not be employed, if the Government of the United States fails to provide protection against importation of commodities produced by slaves and convicts. This is essentially true because such articles and commodities are produced without the normal labor costs. They will displace our commodities and deprive us of every advantage which we have won by superior workmanship and improved methods of manufacture, and by the employment of American capital and skill.

Let me review the experiences had by the lumber industry in its effort to secure the protection of section 307 of the tariff act of 1930 against importation of convict-made lumber from Russia. I will limit myself to this one illustration because the development of the use of convict and forced labor in the Russian timber industry is probably greater than in other industry and because also it is found in an industry with which I am quite familiar. The subject, however, is of greatest interest to those engaged in producing wheat, coal, and other commodities.

General information concerning the use of convict labor in the Russian timber industry first came to my attention in 1929. In the early part of 1930 the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association took the matter up informally with the Bureau of Customs, and during the spring of 1930 certain additional information was obtained by that bureau concerning labor conditions in the Russian lumber industry. In July, 1930, the Treasury detained two cargoes of lumber from entry. Subsequently the cargoes were released and entry permitted, the department stating that although they had general information concerning the use of convicts in northern Russia, they had no proof that the particular cargoes detained were manufactured by convicts.

On July 25, 1930, on the basis of additional information, a general order was sent to all collectors of customs directing them to withhold from entry all pulpwood imported from Russia. Public hearings on protests against this order were held on July 31 and August 1, at which it was contended successfully by the importers that the particular cargoes detained were not produced by convicts. The cargoes were then released and the exclusion order revoked. I am informed that the Treasury had in its possession proof that the cargoes detained had been handled and loaded by convicts, but had no evidence that they were manufactured by convicts. The Treasury declared that the law, section 307, prohibited imports of articles manufactured by convicts but did not apply to the use of convict labor in handling or loading.

On November 24, 1930, the Treasury published a new regulation providing that when investigation indicated the use of convict labor in an industry in any country, findings to that effect would be published, and thereafter importation of the class of articles covered by the finding coming from the region indicated would be prohibited from entry until the importer had established by a preponderance of evidence that the particular importation offered for entry was not produced by convicts. On the day following the issuance of this regulation, the lumber industry of the United States, through its national association petitioned for the finding as contemplated in the regulation just issued. On November 25 I wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury urging prompt action on this petition. No acknowledgment of this letter was received from the Treasury until December 5. Accordingly, in the meantime I introduced Senate Resolution 351 requesting that the finding be made; this resolution was permitted to go over under the rule and has never been acted upon by the Senate. Finally, on February 10, 1931, a finding was published by the Treasury covering all pulpwood and lumber produced in four named areas which include practically all of north Russia. It appears that the long delay and uncertainty of the Treasury Department as to its course of action was due to various causes:

First. Section 307 does not include transportation, loading, and handling;

Second. The Treasury is unable to prove that an individual importation of lumber is the product of convict labor;

Third. It is unable to use in formal proceedings the information applied by customs agents and other officers of the Government from which they know to a moral certainty that convict labor is used throughout the Russian lumber industry; and

Fourth. It has been subjected to constant pressure not to take action by interests who fear that such action would interfere with our export trade with Russia.

The finding referred to is as follows:

To Collectors of Customs and Others Concerned:

Upon the evidence which has been presented to me, I have ascertained and hereby find, in pursuance of Treasury Decision 44385, of November 24, 1930, that convict labor is used in the

production of lumber and pulpwood in the following localities in European Russia:

Kola Peninsula (including Murman coast), Karelian Autonomous, Soviet Socialistic Republics, northern area, and Zyryan (Komi) autonomous area.

Therefore, on and after the date of the publication of this finding, collectors of customs will require compliance with the regulations published as Treasury Decision 44385 upon the importation of lumber or pulpwood originating in the localities specified above, or articles manufactured or produced in other localities from such lumber or pulpwood.

F. X. A. EBLE,
Commissioner of Customs.

Approved.

A. W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

A governmental finding made after investigation that convict labor is employed in north Russia ought to be conclusive, but if there is doubt in anyone's mind whether, in fact, convict and forced labor are being used throughout the Russian lumber industry resort can be had to laws, decrees, and news items relating to that subject which have appeared and are daily appearing in the official Soviet press. I quote from article 61 of the criminal code of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic as amended on June 28, 1930:

Refusal to do forced service, national tasks, or work of national importance: For first offense, a fine imposed by the pertinent government organ up to five times the value of the imposed task, compulsory service or labor; for second offense, imprisonment or compulsory labor for a period not exceeding one year. For the same acts committed in conspiracy by a group of persons, accompanied by active resistance to the government organ in charge of the forced service, tasks, or work, imprisonment not exceeding two years with confiscation of the whole or part of property, with or without banishment from locality.

I quote also from the Moscow Economic Life, an official publication, of December 10, 1929:

SVERDLOVSK, December 8, 1929.—The Ural oblast committee has resolved, in view of the shortage of labor, to mobilize in the oblast 10,000 Communist Youth Unionists to help in the timber-cutting operations. This mobilization is to be completed by February 1, 1930.

I quote also from an advertisement in the Moscow paper, For Industrialization, of September 20, 1930:

Ivan Vasilievitch Guskov has deserted from work. All organizations, institutions, and persons knowing the whereabouts of citizen Guskov are requested to give information to the Middle Volga Timber Trust, Samara, Chapaevskaya Street, No. 232.

I quote also from the For Industrialization of September 26, 1930:

In the western oblast the timber-floating operations are taking place under the control of shock brigades.

I quote also from the Moscow Pravda of September 27, 1930:

STALINGRAD, September 26.—The Praesidium of the City Soviet has declared compulsory labor services from September 24 up to the end of the unloading work. In the first 10 days of September discharging work has become worse; instead of 105,000 logs only 94,760 logs have been unloaded.

I quote also from the For Industralization of October 2, 1930:

* * * Energetic measures are being adopted for improveing the prevailing situation. A broad mobilization of the laborers of the sawmills, or collective farm workers, of bedniaks, and farm laborers, is being carried on with a view to supplying man power to the timber-floating operations.

I quote also from the Moscow Izvestia of October 7, 1930:

The central committee of the Communist Union of Youth has resolved to bind all committees and germ cells of the union in timber-floating regions, particularly in regions where the timber must be immediately taken from the water, to organize detachments, battalions, collective groups, and brigades of members of the Communist Unions of Youth who are not occupied in the cities and villages, and to use them until the end of the timber-floating operations for taking the timber out of the water.

I quote also from the Pravda of October 9, 1930:

LENINGRAD, October 8, 1930.—* * * The regional executive committees and the village soviets have made very poor use of the compulsory labor law and are not applying sufficient measures of coercion with respect to those who do not report for work.

I quote also from the Pravda of October 19, 1930:

ARCHANGEL, October 18.—* * * The public prosecutor of the territory as well as the courts are adopting rigorous measures for intensifying the punitive policy in respect of kulaks who are maliciously evading participation in the timber-floating operations. * * * Thus, for instance, the kulak Ilyin, who refused to take part in the timber-floating operations and who induced a group of raftsmen to follow his example, was sentenced by the Kargopol rayon court only to a fine of 200 rubles. The kulak Vereschchagin was sentenced to three months at forced labor, with a deduction of 50 per cent from his wages for having refused to participate in the timber floating.

I quote also from the official telegraphic news service of Russia, Rosta, date of October 21:

ARCHANGEL, October 21 (Rosta).—The labor mobilization, declared by the regional executive committee for floating operations, is taking place successfully. Individual villages are sending 400 to 500 raftsmen for floating work. The peasants of many villages have shown an example of exceptional conscientiousness. In the Vinogradov region, 720 peasants of the Pavlina village voluntarily turned out for floating operations. Some economists and opportunists met the labor mobilization with great dissatisfaction. The manager of the Goginsk timber camp sent 100 mobilized men back to their homes. The brainless persons and saboteurs have been turned over to the court.

I quote also from the Pravda of October 27, 1930:

* * * As a result of the misunderstanding in the matter of labor man power, the kulaks now and then succeed in escaping from the timber procurement and floating operations.

The significance of the foregoing material is immediately apparent when one reflects that article 61 of the Criminal Code provides penalties for refusal to do forced service, national tasks, or work of national importance, and that repeated announcements in the official Government publications disclose that these penalties are actually being enforced; and they disclose further that the "brainless ones" are punished and only a few escape.

Forced labor is a mild term to use for labor working under such conditions in the lumber industry in Russia. The labor may be voluntary in the sense that the peasants are more willing to perform the allotted and required work than risk the consequences of nonperformance; but to describe such labor as in fact voluntary is a perversion of terms. In many respects labor performed under such circumstances is downright slavery, with the difference that in the past five centuries in most of the slave countries of the globe those in bondage have been more generously treated than are these "free" peasants of Russia.

I have here an original affidavit from a convict who escaped from a Russian timber camp. I have deleted the name and shall read only certain passages:

On September 15, 1929, I was arrested in Odessa by the G. P. U. for agitating—not against the Soviet Government, but against the tactics pursued by said Government. After my arrest I never received a hearing before any court, and after serving three months in prison I was sent to the Solvoki concentration camp.

* * * * * * *

Uslon is a separate federation under the administration of the G. P. U. Each concentration camp is divided up into departments, and in each of these departments there are 50,000 prisoners. Each department has a chief, appointed by the G. P. U., and an administrative staff. For example, in Solvoki (Solowetzki) there are eight departments with 50,000 prisoners in each, making a total of 400,000 prisoners. All eight of the departments come under the chief of the Solvoki concentration camp, with headquarters at the port of Kem.

* * * * * * *

The only money in circulation in these camps is scrip money made by the G. P. U. A photostat copy of this money is herewith attached, also a translation of the Russian wording on said scrip money. (Please note the word "convict" as it appears on the scrip. The original money has been turned over to the Fish congressional committee.) This money is not given to the prisoners for their labor. It is given to them to replace any money that the prisoners may have on them when they arrive at the prison and for any money which they may receive from friends or relatives while they are in prison. Prisoners receive no pay whatsoever for their labor.

I might observe in connection with that statement that this affidavit was taken in New York. It was translated into English and signed in its present form. I hold the original in my hand. The man who made the affidavit was later brought before the Fish committee, and there gave his testimony.

I read one further excerpt from his affidavit:

The prisoners that were physically perfect and accustomed to hard work would cut their allotment of logs in from 16 to 18 hours, but many prisoners were unable to cut that number and were severely punished. They were cudgeled and sometimes even

killed with clubs by the guards, and were given no food on their return to the prison camp. As another punishment they were sometimes stripped of their clothing, forced to stand on a stump in a prison camp yard in the most extreme cold weather until they dropped because of the cold. Any prisoner who refused to work was shot on the spot. This is in pursuance of a routine order, which was known to all convicts. In February, 1930, there were three prisoners, peasants, who tried to escape, and in March, 1930, two former Army officers also tried to escape; all five were shot.

That is one affidavit. But the case is not based on one affidavit. I have photostatic copies of a number of others in my possession from which I shall read some extracts:

NO. 2

I was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment on Solovetsky Islands. Immediately I was sent with a group of 200 others to Kem and from there to Vonga. At this point was a concentration camp for prisoners and at that time included about seven or eight barracks and probably about a thousand prisoners. After spending a day at Vonga we were sent in small groups to another camp in the woods about 12 kilometers north of Vonga, where I remained until the end of April. This was one of the camps scattered all throughout the woods of this part of Karelia. During our stay there we were engaged in cutting trees and branches from felled logs and gathering the logs together in piles of 10 each. * * * After the logs had been piled we had to drag them on sledges to the roadway whence they were dragged by horses to the shore of the White Sea. At the end of April the prison camps were moved to the White Sea and we were put at work floating and rafting the logs. * * * So far as I know there was no free labor employed in these districts.

NO. 3

* * * I was arrested with 231 others from my town and charged with counterrevolutionary activities. * * * I was sentenced to eight years' imprisonment. After receiving my sentence I was sent to the north of Russia. * * * The large trees which we cut during this period were floated on the River Lusa, which flows into the Dwina and down to Archangel. While I can not estimate the number of convicts engaged in this work those I came in contact with were all convicts and were working over an area of many hundreds of square miles. I was told by others that there were between 27,000 and 37,000 altogether working in this region. About March 20, 1930, we were sent to Archangel. * * * During the time I was in Archangel I observed no labor being employed other than convict labor, except that the higher officials—the foremen were free men. This statement applies not only to the loading operations but to all work done in the pulp yards and the timber mills which I had an opportunity to observe.

NO. 4

* * * I was handed a slip stating that I had been sentenced to five years at convict labor and five years exile thereafter. At this time about 500 others were also sentenced and we were all taken to the north to work in the woods. The convoy with which I was sent included 137 men and was taken by rail to Parantola on the Murmansk Railway and from there we walked about 75 kilometers north and slightly west to a camp in the forest. Here there were two barracks with about 1,000 prisoners, all of whom were engaged in cutting, trimming, hauling, barking, and piling logs. In this same region there were about 4,000 convicts working.

NO. 5

* * * I was sentenced to five years' imprisonment and sent to Saratov where I worked in a sawmill. * * * From this place about 1,600 of us were sent to Archangel during the first part of May, 1930. In Archangel we lived in Camp No. 2 where I was engaged in peeling bark from pulpwood bolts. During all the time I was in Archangel I observed that all labor being performed in and about the timber mills and pulp yards was done by men working under guards and living under the same conditions as myself.

NO 6

* * * In July, 1927, I was sentenced to three years at convict labor. I was immediately sent to the prison concentration camp at Kem with about 200 others. We were then sent on by rail about 350 kilometers to the north. * * * Here we lived in some old buildings and railway cars and for the next two months we were kept at hard work floating logs to the sawmill at Kandalahti, where I was then sent. * * * We arrived at Archangel on April 8, 1930. Here I was no longer a prisoner because my sentence had expired but I was required to report to the police at least once weekly. In the mills which I saw both free, exile, and convict labor was employed. Specifically, in mills Nos. 4, 5, and 6 convict labor was employed. While exiles were free to live in and around Archangel and received pay for their work, the convicts were not paid and lived in prison camps surrounded by barbed wire and guarded by armed watchmen. There was one large concentration camp near the railway station across the river from Archangel which had several thousand prisoners, another large camp at Kotlas, and many others both above and below Archangel. * * * I noticed in traveling back to Vologda from Archangel that at every station where logging operations were conducted there were also convict camps surrounded by barbed wire and guarded by armed watchmen and that these convicts were used in woods labor. At many places there were also large camps of exiles who, however, were not guarded but lived in what looked like separate villages composed of many rows of sod huts.

NO. 7

* * * I was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment. * * * In early May, 1930, we were sent by rail to Archangel, where I lived in camp No. 2 in a barrack with about 400 other convicts. While here I was engaged in peeling bark from pulpwood bolts, in piling logs, and also loading cars and ships with timber and pulpwood. During all my work in Archangel I observed no other labor than that performed by convicts, either inside or outside the timber mills.

These quotations are selected from affidavits of the same general tenor and kind as an accumulation of several hundred procured by American agents in the countries surrounding the Russian timber area and now in the possession of the Treasury of the United States, and, I am told unofficially, also in the possession of the State Department.

Additional affidavits from escaped convicts almost to any number desired can readily be procured. I am advised by a responsible man who has just returned to this country after an investigation of this question in Europe that if it is necessary, or if the evidence already collected is not sufficiently convincing, he can personally conduct any Government official who may be assigned to such task to at least 200 men who have escaped from convict camps in the Russian timber region. The fact of the employment of convict and forced labor is thus abundantly proved; it is practically admitted in official soviet publications, and it is now determined and found by official finding of the United States Treasury.

But it is being said that the United States need not fear any considerable increase in lumber importations from Russia; and that the present volume of such importations is too small to be hurtful to our industry or to take employment from American labor. It is true that importations have up to now not been large, but no correct conclusion can be drawn with relation to this subject without some examination of the facts.

Prior to the war Russia led the nations of the world in exports of lumber and wood products. Immediately following the war Russia was so demoralized economically that for several years there was no lumber for export. But in the past five years a most radical change has taken place in the Russian export situation.

Lumber exports from Russia in feet, board measure, for the years 1926 to 1930, inclusive, were as follows: 1926, 640,000,000; 1927, 892,000,000; 1928, 1,120,000,000; 1929, 1,658,000,000; 1930, 2,200,000,000. The most significant development is shown by imports of Russian lumber into the British market. The importations for the last five years are as follows: 1926, 436,000,000 board feet; 1927, 690,000,000 board feet; 1928, 740,000,000 board feet; 1929, 1,034,000,000 board feet; 1930, 1,100,000,000 board feet. These figures show adequately the capacity for expansion which exists in Russia.

The next important question relates to the conditions on which this expansion of the Russian lumber industry is based. The answer to this question should determine the possibilities, if not the probabilities, of danger to the American lumber industry.

The Soviet Government has acquired without cost and now owns a forest area comprising more than 2,000,000,000 acres—an area greater than the entire continental United States. It is asserted that this area includes more than one-half of all the softwood timber in the world. These tremendous forests have been acquired by them without expense; they are not burdened with the heavy carrying charges which fall on forest owners in the United States and other forested countries due to the necessity of providing adequate protection against fire and other hazards. I need not elaborate on the fact that they are also tax free.

The Soviet Government has also acquired, through the confiscation of private property, the entire plant and equipment of private owners engaged in forest operations before the war. These plants were then sufficient to place a volume of over two and one-half billion feet of lumber in the export market after taking care of all domestic demands. The present government is adding to existing plant capacity at a

rapid rate; the expansion costs are really the only money cost chargeable to their lumber production.

The Soviet Government is using, as I believe I have already demonstrated, immense numbers of convicts and slave laborers in their timber production. Official soviet sources, according to information I have, have admitted the employment at labor of 137,000 convicts in 1927 and 261,000 convicts in 1928. Walter Duranty, Moscow correspondent of the New York Times, asserts that there are now a million people in the "northern concentration camps" which I am told is a polite name for "prison."

For transportation the Soviet Government has its own railroads and the tremendous river systems of north Russia. It is able to make much more advantageous use of its rivers than is customarily true because it is a matter of relatively slight concern whether it takes 1, 2, or 3 years for the logs to arrive at the mills, so long as the log supply arriving is sufficient for current needs. They need not concern themselves greatly about interest on investment nor the losses due to broken rafts and "sinkers" (the logs which become water-soaked and sink).

With these advantages in production it is not surprising that their most direct competitors in the European lumber market—the Finns and the Swedes—who are perhaps the most efficient operators in the world, have been unable to compete. From year to year the market for woods from countries other than Russia has grown smaller to the extent that Russia has increased its exports. As the quantities of Russian lumber entering world markets increased and more difficulty was encountered in disposing of Russian stocks, prices were dropped. Within the past two months a group of British timber merchants, forced by the necessity of avoiding something worse, have concluded a contract under which they agree to buy from Russia during 1931 a quantity of lumber totaling about 1,200,000,000 feet for sale in Great Britain, and to take over unsold Russian stocks in the country which are estimated to total between 240,000,000 and 300,000,000 feet. The price fixed is so low that it is literally almost impossible to make a sale of Finnish or Swedish lumber even in grades and sizes not readily available from Russia. The timber industries of these two countries are faced with bankruptcy.

But now Russian sales to the European trade have reached the saturation point. Difficulties in disposing of the increased volume of lumber available during the past two years have demonstrated the necessity of finding new markets. It is now their announced plan to make the United States market their next objective. The Moscow Soviet Trade, official organ of the Soviet Commissariat of Trade, on July 11, 1929, asserted:

> The successes on the basic markets are not sufficient, and we should gradually expand the field of our export activity by means of conquering new markets, particularly of such large markets as the United States, the annual capacity of which is about 15,000,000 standards (30,000,000,000 board feet); in other words, three and one-half times larger than the total imports of sawn goods by the whole of Europe.

And again on November 20, 1929:

> That market (the United States), with its enormous annual capacity of 15,000,000 standards, should become in the course of the next few years one of the large consumers of our timber; this should be made the most urgent task of our export trade, for the expansion of which new markets must be conquered.

What stands in the way of this publicly announced plan to invade the American market? Competition from American producers? There can be no competition against lumber produced by convict and slave labor in confiscated mills from free raw materials. Tariff barriers? The existing tariff rate is so small as to be quite useless against this competition, and it is difficult to conceive of a rate high enough to be effective. Transportation charges? The water rate from the Russian timber mills on the White Sea to the vast markets of New England and New York is lower than the corresponding rate from Oregon to Washington, and far less than the rail rate paid by the southern pine lumber which goes into that market. In fact, nothing stands in the way of the Russian plans. The quantity of lumber which Russia may put into this market has been and is a matter of choice, and will be decided by them according to their own best interests.

Until the present time it has been their choice, and quite logically so, to conquer first the markets which were ready at hand—that is, the markets of Europe and Great Britain—and this they have now done. They first sent lumber to the United States in 1927, but the total was only three cargoes—less than 10,000,000 feet. In 1928 six cargoes totaling about 24,000,000 feet were entered. In 1929 there were obvious reasons for failing to increase materially their shipments to this country aside from the fact that they were able to dispose of their exports readily in Europe. Rapid increase in exports to this country at that time would have given material support to the plea for a duty on lumber then being asked by the American lumber industry.

In 1930 there was continued agitation for the enforcement against Russia of the provisions of section 307 of the tariff act, which undoubtedly restrained them. In fact, it was at that time asserted that several cargoes of lumber destined for the United States were redirected to Belgium after having started for the United States. Yet, in the face of this agitation, Russia increased its lumber exports to the United States from 37,000,000 feet in 1929 to 71,000,000 feet in 1930.

As to probable imports of Russian lumber in 1931, it is impossible to make an estimate. The total may be more or less than 1930; the total may be 50,000,000 feet, and it may be 500,000,000 feet; both figures are equally possible. The answer does not rest with us but with the Soviet Government and will be determined not in accordance with our needs or desires but according to their estimate of the amount that may be safely disposed of in this market. If the Congress of the United States and the Treasury Department fail to give adequate protection against the products of slave labor, it will be a direct invitation to them to proceed without fear.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator suffer an interruption?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

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

Mr. KING. As I recall, the total consumption of lumber and timber in the United States amounts to several billion feet.

Mr. STEIWER. Oh, yes.

Mr. KING. And the imports from Russia, as I understood the Senator, are considerably less than a hundred million feet.

Mr. STEIWER. That is right.

Mr. KING. That is a very small percentage of the consumption in the United States.

The Senator is aware, I presume, that our exports to Russia are three or four times as great in value as our imports from Russia, so that if we should place an embargo upon Russian imports we would lose more, perhaps, than Russia would lose. Is not that true?

Mr. STEIWER. No, Mr. President, I wish I could conclude that the Senator is right.

Mr. KING. At any rate we are exporting to Russia very much more than Russia is exporting to the United States.

Mr. STEIWER. Oh, yes. Russia's shipments to this country last year were valued at something less than $30,000,000, while our shipments to Russia were valued at nearly $130,000,000; but there are some sinister features to that commerce with Russia. The greater part of our shipments, or at least a great part of our total outgoing commerce with Russia, is machinery which the Russians are buying in this country on credit and which they are setting up in their own land to enable them to compete further with American producers in fields in which we heretofore have been supreme.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STEIWER. I will yield in just a moment. I want to remind the Senator that at no time in my remarks to-day have I suggested an embargo upon Russian goods. I seek, as will be presently shown, only to restrain the importation of goods to this country that are convict tainted or slave tainted.

I should add that the total importations of lumber from Russia last year and the total importations of wood pulp, the two combined, were scarcely two and a half million dollars in value as against their aggregate shipments to us of something like $30,000,000; and it is difficult to conceive that our foreign trade with Russia would be seriously impaired if we merely apply a rule which would cut out two and one-half million dollars of goods in a total trade which amounts both ways to $160,000,000.

Mr. President, we have refused to recognize Russia. The action that we might take now with respect to protecting our people against alien goods that are of such a character that they can not be sold in the United States, were they domestically produced, would be trivial compared with our action heretofore in failing to recognize Russia; and nobody can believe that the people of Russia are trading with us because of love or affection for the American people. They buy here because they can buy more advantageously here, and if we shall protect our American labor against slave goods and convict goods I believe that the Russian people will still buy here if they can buy here more advantageously than they can buy elsewhere in the world. So I am not at all alarmed by the suggestion that seems to be implied in the question of the Senator from Utah, and I am sure that if he will analyze the figures, as I have recently done, he will come to the same conclusion.

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

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. KING. May I say to the Senator that I do not think the United States, with all of our professions of altruism and humanitarianism, trade with other nations because of any particular love for them; we trade with other nations because we believe that we will make a profit?

I will say further to the Senator, if I may, that our exports in 1929 amounted to $5,269,000,000 and our imports to $4,470,000,000. Our exports were almost $1,000,000,000 in excess of our imports. Does not the Senator think that we benefit by exporting our surplus products?

I should like to ask one other question if I may be permitted to do so. Is it not a fact that the depression which to-day overshadows our land is in part traceable to the falling off of our exports, particularly our exports to Canada, which in 1929 bought nearly $950,000,000 worth of our products, and to Great Britain, which during the same year purchased more than $860,000,000 worth of our products? Does not the Senator think if we now had the same outflow of our domestic products as then that the depression which is now overshadowing our country would not be quite so severe and intense as it is?

Mr. STEIWER. The answer to the Senator's question might be better understood if we will first reflect that our total buying power or consuming power in our domestic markets when times are reasonably good is something like $90,000,000,000, and that the total of our foreign trade, if we count both exports and imports, when conditions are normal is something like $9,000,000,000. As against this aggregate total of $100,000,000,000 there is not so much involved when we are talking about the importation of Russian lumber and Russian pulpwood, the total value of which is only two and a half million dollars.

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

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact also that the conditions in the world are quite different this year from what they were during the year preceding. The people of foreign nations have not purchased the usual quantity of goods; they have not been able to purchase them, just as the American people, passing through the present period of depression, are not purchasing or using the quantity of goods that they did a year ago. The condition is world-wide, and, of course, under such conditions existing in the world our exportations can not be what they were during the year preceding.

Mr. STEIWER. That is true, and I thank the Senator for that observation.

Mr. President, I wish to say further, in answer to the question that was asked me a moment ago by the junior Senator from Utah, that I have no desire, of course, to break down American foreign commerce. No Member of this body would desire to break down our foreign commerce. I do not apprehend, however, that any action we might take with respect to the protection of free American labor is going to contribute substantially toward the breaking down of that foreign commerce. I think economic laws will still obtain, and that we will still be able to operate almost on the same basis as we are now operating; but, Mr. President, if I knew this measure taken for the protection of free American labor would definitely reduce our commerce with Russia and with other nations of the world, and that such reduction in trade was the price which we were bound to pay for the protection of the free labor of America, I would willingly pay that price before I would submit the American people to unfair competition from slaves and from convicts abroad and see brought into our country great volumes of goods which are ultimately bound to break down American standards, not only standards of living but standards of citizenship, and which would result, in the long run, in undermining those principles of freedom of employment which we hold so dear in this country.

Mr. President, our American industries can not endure against the competition of convict and slave labor on any such augmented scale as is obviously contemplated by the Soviet Union. With such labor the Soviet Government has within its hands the power completely to destroy the American lumber industry, to make impossible the payment of reasonable wages, and to make the possibilities of reforestation—the growing of timber for profit—a childish dream.

American industries are already suffering from a most serious business depression, with serious losses both of domestic and foreign markets; with depressions in prices, which have resulted in the unemployment of tens of thousands of American citizens in the lumber sections of the West and the South. The paralysis of prices is made worse by the ever-present menace of Russian importations. The importation of a thousand feet of Russian lumber in the face of the known facts concerning the use of convict and slave labor in that country does more than deprive an American firm of a sale; it constitutes a notice to the American lumber industry that the standards on which their industry is based, on which their investments were made, their business built, and their labor paid will not be protected; and that in the future they may exist only if they can meet on even terms the competition of slave labor.

As a reasonable indication of the present state of the American lumber industry I ask leave, Mr. President, to have printed in my remarks at this point a table showing average wholesale mill prices received by west coast lumber manufacturers in dollars per thousand feet during the past 20 months. The figures exhibited in the table show a steady and almost constant decline for the 20 months last past, with a total price drop of approximately $5 per thousand, and with a decidedly lower market level at this time than obtained in this country at the time of the enactment of the tariff act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The table referred to is as follows:

Average prices received by west coast lumber manufactures

(In dollars per 1,000 feet)

	1927	1928	1929	1930
January		17.01	19.15	17.57
February		17.30	19.70	17.65
March		17.21	20.15	17.20
April		17.26	20.18	16.73
May		17.38	20.18	15.88
June		18.30	20.09	15.31
July		18.63	19.88	14.93
August	18.09	19.03	19.66	14.45
September	17.96	19.22	19.28	14.10
October	17.61	19.35	18.69	14.08
November	17.17	19.32	18.30	13.82
December	16.86	18.61	17.81	13.50

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, the widespread employment of convict and slave labor in Russia in producing articles destined for shipment to the United States is a definite threat against the maintenance of free labor in this country; and it is my opinion that Congress will fail to discharge one of its most sacred functions if it fails to give complete protection to the workers of this country against the labor system which prevails in Russia.

In the United States a workman can work where and when he wishes, and can choose his occupation and his place of employment freely. This is the essence of freedom as contrasted with slavery. In Russia there is no free-labor market. Work can be secured only through constituted government labor bureaus under such conditions as they may prescribe; the worker must register with such bureaus and accept the work offered him.

In the United States the worker may live as and where he pleases, and under such conditions as his means permit; he may refuse to work if living conditions or working conditions are unsuitable. In Russia the employer fixes the place of residence and the quarters. The worker may be transferred from plant to plant or from task to task at the will of the employer. The employer is the state, and the interests to be served are those of the state and not those of the worker.

In the United States, if the worker is dissatisfied, he may leave his work and seek employment elsewhere. In Russia, desertion from work is a crime, and is treated accordingly. By refusing to perform allotted tasks, a worker loses his right to seek work, or is permitted to work only at occupations and in places where, because of harsh conditions, it is impossible to secure labor which is termed "free" labor.

In the United States the worker is protected by his trade-union and his right to strike is protected by law. In Russia the right to strike is refused, and the worker is not protected by his trade-union, which is an organ of the state and not of the worker.

In the United States the worker may eat what he wishes and purchase food according to his own will and ability to pay. In Russia he can procure food and clothing for himself and family only by means of cards procured from his employer—the state—which permit him to buy only limited quantities of foods and clothing.

A host of such comparisons may be drawn. A compilation of laws and regulations issued by the Soviet Government to put into effect their system of slave labor would fill volumes. But there is no need for such compilation here. The examples I have given are adequate to show that in Russia labor is an essential but inert part of the mechanism of the state, to be used, moved, and treated as the interests of the state dictate.

In an effort to deal with the problem which I am discussing, certain bills were introduced in this session of the Seventy-first Congress by my colleague and myself. The bill which I introduced was S. 5370; and subsequently Congressman KENDALL introduced H. R. 15927, which is a bill practically identical with S. 5370. Still subsequently Mr. KENDALL introduced a revised bill, which is H. R. 16517. Hearings were held before the House Committee on Ways and Means, and upon February 11, 1931, that committee reported favorably, with amendments, the House bill—the revised bill.

Referring to this amended bill it changes existing law in three respects.

In the first place, it moves the effective date from January 1, 1932, up to April 1, 1931, with respect to indentured and forced labor.

In the second place, it provides an inhibition against goods that are "handled, transported, loaded, or unloaded" by convict or indentured labor, in addition to the prior inhibitions against goods which were mined, manufactured, or produced by such labor. Still in addition to these amendments is a third, which is possibly more important than either one; namely, a provision that in any formal proceeding in the enforcement of the act, depositions of officers of the Government and agents of the Treasury may be received in evidence.

This proposal is most important on account of the difficulty which the Treasury has so far experienced in proving the convict-made character of the goods with which it was dealing.

The amended bill, as so reported, reads as follows:

That all goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, manufactured, transported, handled, loaded, or unloaded, wholly or in part, in any foreign country by convict labor, or/and forced labor, or/and indentured labor under penal sanctions, shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of this provision. The provisions of this act relating to goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, manufactured, transported, handled, loaded, or unloaded by forced labor or/and indentured labor, shall take effect on April 1, 1931, and shall remain in full force and effect until Congress provides otherwise, but shall not be applicable to goods, wares, articles, or merchandise so mined, produced, manufactured, transported, handled, loaded, or unloaded which are not mined, produced, or manufactured in such quantities in the United States as to meet the consumptive demands of the United States.

"Forced labor," as herein used, shall mean all work or service which is exacted from any person under the menace of any penalty for its nonperformance and for which the worker does not offer himself voluntarily.

In any proceeding under or involving the application of any provision of this act reports and depositions of officers or agents of the United States shall be admissible in evidence.

The House bill, as favorably reported, does not lay an embargo against all imports from any country. Its provisions would merely restrain the importation of goods tainted because produced or transported by convict, forced, or indentured labor. The bill, therefore, is directed against the evils complained of; it is not directed against any country; it mentions no country by name. It, therefore, will not destroy our entire commerce with any country, and it will permit a resumption of importations, even with respect to commodities which have been tainted, as soon as the evil is removed—that is to say, as soon as the employment of convict and slave labor is discontinued. For these reasons, I am firm in my belief that the bill will not be substantially injurious to foreign trade, but will be a definite aid in excluding the importations which are denounced by our governmental policy.

This bill ought to be passed by Congress. It is supported by numerous important industrial groups of the country. It is sponsored especially by the American Federation of Labor; and I desire to digress here to express my appreciation and admiration for the magnificent stand which that organization has taken with respect to the protection of the American people against the menace of slave and convict importations. I am proud to align myself with it in this fight.

And now, Mr. President, I conclude by expressing the hope that the patriotic impulses of the Members of Congress will be aroused to such an extent that adequate and effective steps may be taken, before the adjournment of this Congress, for the maintenance of American standards of living, and for protection against alien encroachment upon the industrial liberty of the American people.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS WITH CHINA (REPT. NO. 1600)

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to a report made by a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations under Senate Resolution 256, which was passed at the last session of Congress. Under this resolution the subcommittee was authorized to investigate and report upon the depression of United States trade and commerce with China, and to study treaty regulations relating thereto.

The subcommittee has held extensive hearings, and made a most thorough and excellent report, it seems to me. I ask to have it printed in the RECORD, and also printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received; and, without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD and also as a Senate report.

The report is as follows:

PARTIAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE ON TRADE RELATIONS WITH CHINA AND CAUSES AND REMEDY FOR DEPRESSED CONDITIONS OF COMMERCE

FEBRUARY 11, 1931.

To Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH,
Chairman Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Your subcommittee, appointed under authority of Senate Resolution 256 to investigate and report upon the depression of United States trade and commerce with China, to study treaty stipulations relating to same, and to make recommendations to alleviate disturbing conditions, begs leave to submit the following interim report and recommendations:

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

Our commerce with China has been retarded for several years by reason of war and other conditions in China affecting her production, development, and prosperity. The sudden, unusual, and destructive depression in our commerce with China since the 1st day of January, 1930, can not, however, be accounted for by reason of conditions that have existed for several years. It is this unusual and sudden depression with regard to which your committee reports.

Your subcommittee at numerous hearings has taken the testimony and written statements of officials of the United States Department of Commerce, bankers, exporters and importers, shippers, and others, all of them familiar from long experience with our commerce in many countries, particularly China. Such testimony and written statements are in the form of published hearings, which are herewith submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DECREASE IN COMMERCE WITH CHINA

During the first 11 months of 1930, being the months for which we have statistics, our exports to China were 27 per cent less than our exports during the same period in 1929. Our imports from China during such period in 1930 were 36 per cent below our imports during the same period of 1929. The reports received from the Department of Commerce, so far as they have been obtained for the months of November and December, disclose that our commerce with China continues to decrease, although war conditions were greatly improved during those months.

CHIEF CAUSE OF DECREASE

The chief cause for the abnormal and sudden decrease in our commerce with China during the latter part of 1929 and 1930 was the sudden great and unprecedented fall in the price of silver. Silver is the only money in China, and it is the sole measure of the wealth and purchasing power of its people. From July, 1929, to date the price of silver dropped one-half.

PRICE OF SILVER

The pre-war price of silver—that is, in 1913—was 60 cents an ounce. This price has been about the average or normal price for many years. The annual average price of silver per ounce during the past four fiscal years was:

	Cents
1926	58
1927	57½
1928	57
1929	46

It will be observed that the average price of silver, unlike other commodities, did not increase over the pre-war price, but maintained about the same average price. This price we may still call normal.

The price of silver commenced to drop in January, 1929. In January, 1929, the average price of silver was 57⅓ cents an ounce. To-day it is 26½ cents an ounce.

MONEY OF CHINA

China is now and always has been a silver-standard country. China possesses no gold. The standard measure of money is the tael, which is approximately an ounce of pure silver. The sycee is the chief representative of money and medium of commerce and trade. It is a piece of silver shaped like a shoe or slipper containing 50 taels.

There are some silver coins in China. They are silver dollars minted and issued by the Government of China and the Mexican dollar, each containing a similar amount of silver to the standard silver dollar of the United States. In addition to these there are subsidiary silver coins comparable with the dimes, quarters, and halves of the United States.

The value and purchasing power of the tael, sycee, and silver coins fluctuates daily and is determined by the daily quoted price of silver in London. A board of brokers in London daily fix the price of silver, which is accepted throughout the world.

DECREASE IN PURCHASING POWER OF CHINA'S MONEY

The people of China must pay for our goods with gold, and they buy gold with silver. They are now compelled to pay twice as much for gold with their silver as they did a year ago, which, to them, means that they are paying twice as much for our products. The abnormal, sudden, and unprecedented fall in the price of silver has cut in half the wealth and the purchasing power of the people of China, restrained them from purchasing other than the necessities of life, destroyed credit, and stagnated trade.

The price of silver from May, 1928, to the present time has steadily dropped until it has now reached the lowest level for all time of less than 26½ cents an ounce. In June, 1928, silver was 60⅓ cents an ounce.

CREDIT SYSTEM DESTROYED

Not only has the purchasing power of China been cut in half and the cost to them of our exports doubled, but the credit situation has been even more seriously affected.

In fact, it is testified by exporters without contradiction that all transactions with China at the present time must be on a cash basis. This is due to the fact that the price of silver has not only been steadily decreasing but the cause of this decrease continues to exist, and under such conditions a further great decrease in the price of silver is constantly threatened and is expected. In this uncertain condition no safe agreements can be entered into as to future payment for goods sold.

ACTUAL AND ARTIFICIAL VALUE OF SILVER

The artificial parity price of silver established by various governments has not measured and, in fact, has had no relation whatever to the actual price of silver or what might be termed its normal value in the world market.

For instance, the parity price of our subsidiary silver coins—that is, dimes, quarters, and halves, with relation to gold, is $1.38 an ounce. Yet the market price for silver in the United States to-day, even that produced in our own mines, is now 26½ cents an ounce.

Our Government buys silver in the open market for 26½ cents an ounce and manufactures it into subsidiary coins and sells such coins to banks and to commerce in the United States at the rate an ounce, $0.955.

To illustrate, the United States Government sells to commerce and banks 50 dimes for $5. These 50 dimes contain 3.623 ounces of silver. So the silver in the dimes is sold at the rate of $1.38 an ounce. The value of the silver in these 50 dimes—and such would be the value outside of the United States—is, at 26½ cents an ounce, $0.955.

Those coins in the United States, for limited purposes, have a purchasing power equal to $1.38 an ounce, although they are not full legal tender. Their purchasing power on a ratio with gold of $1.38 an ounce is maintained because in the United States they are accepted at face value. It must be remembered that our subsidiary coins are only a very small portion of our money, and are intended and only used to facilitate minor domestic transactions. Such use of silver is maintained to a certain extent in some other countries.

In China, Mexico, Central America, South America, India, and Asia the situation is entirely different. In our country the basis of all of our domestic and foreign commerce is gold, and we have the gold. In the other countries named the foundation of all commercial transactions, both domestic and foreign, must be based upon silver because they have silver and little or no gold.

In India the silver rupee has a certain ratio with gold, but these rupees are only a small part of the silver wealth of India, and they are now being melted up and sold as bullion under the policy and practice of the Government of India.

HOW SILVER IS CONSERVED IN ORIENTAL AND LATIN COUNTRIES

Silver has been pouring into China, India, and other Asiatic countries from the dawn of history. In fact, China and India since our earliest history have consumed annually two-thirds of the world's production of silver. Little of this silver has been preserved in the form of silver coins, but is absorbed in the form of raw silver called bullion, or in the form of silver jewelry and trinkets in which form the oriental and South American people generally conserve their wealth.

The women of India and most Asiatic countries are not permitted to inherit property. Therefore a custom has long existed for the women to accumulate, over long periods of time, silver coins, and then melt them up and manufacture them into jewelry. This silver jewelry is the measure of their wealth and purchasing power; it is their reserve; their bank account.

ILLUSTRATION RESULT OF LOSS PURCHASING POWER

This is the wealth that enables such peoples to purchase our exports. It is largely the measure of their domestic economic soundness. The disaster that follows the destruction of the purchasing power of such wealth and its value as the basis for credit, is obvious.

Let us illustrate this proposition: The chief market of the world for cotton textiles is in the tropical climates of China, India, Asia, Mexico, Central America, and South America. These people find that they have to pay twice as much for a piece of cotton goods as they did a year ago—that is, they are compelled to give twice as much of their money, which is silver, than they paid a year ago for the same article. The result is that they buy only that which actual necessity compels them to have. Our cotton textile mills commenced to suffer at the same time that silver began to drop. The textile mills of Manchester, England, commenced to suffer at the same time that the price of silver started to fall. With the decreased demand for cotton textiles came the fall in the price of cotton, until to-day cotton is about half what it was a year ago. The same condition applies in a more or less degree to all of our exports to those countries such as wheat, lumber, automobiles, radios, electrical appliances, and machinery.

RESULTS ARE WORLD-WIDE

While it is true that the most alarming results of the depressed price of silver has been felt in those countries that have only silver as money, yet the evidence discloses that its depressing effect has reached the entire world. The United States and other

countries that are suffering at the present time most intensely from the inability to dispose of surplus production are to such extent directly affected.

Cotton is our greatest export product, and when the value of that product is reduced one-half by reason of the reduction in the purchasing power of those people who are the greatest consumers of cotton cloth, then the purchasing power of our citizens engaged in the cotton-raising industry is reduced one-half. And we see the same effect to possibly a lesser degree on our wheat farmers and on our manufacturers.

With the destruction of our market for our surplus production, reduction of production must take place, carrying with it inevitable unemployment. In the opinion of the subcommittee, therefore, the great sudden decline in our trade with China is due primarily to the extraordinarily depressed price of silver.

SAME EFFECT ON OTHER SILVER-USING COUNTRIES

The same cause is equally applicable to our depressed commerce with the other silver-using countries that have been designated in this report.

During the same period our exports to and our imports from such silver-using countries decreased as follows:

South America, decrease in exports 37 per cent.
South America, decrease in imports 32 per cent.
Mexico, decrease in exports 13 per cent.
Mexico, decrease in imports 33 per cent.
India, decrease in exports 19 per cent.
India, decrease in imports 30 per cent.

The people of these countries constitute a large portion of the consuming public of the world. In fact they embrace over half of the population of the world and 90 per cent of the nations of the earth.

Upon your subcommittee was imposed the duty of ascertaining not only the cause of the depression but the possible remedy, or remedies, if any, for such unfortunate conditions. It being evident to your subcommittee that the depressed condition of our commerce with China, and, we may say, with other silver-using countries, being due chiefly to the depressed price of silver, your subcommittee sought next the reason for this sudden and unusual depression in the price of silver.

CAUSE OF CONTINUOUS FALL IN PRICE OF SILVER

No overproduction

The annual reports of the Director of the Mint of the United States give the annual production of silver in every country in the world for a period of over 50 years. These reports disclose that the annual increase in the production of silver has been only on the average of much less than the normal increase of the average production of all other commodities and is not commensurate with the increase in population and commerce.

To illustrate, as far back as 1913 the production of silver amounted to 223,686,823 ounces. In the 16 years following it fluctuated up and down. In 1923 it reached 240,169,264 ounces, in 1928 the total world production was 254,869,163 ounces, during the prosperous year of 1929 the world production was 261,265,718 ounces, and the estimated production for 1930 is approximately 225,000,000 ounces.

It will be noted that the price of silver was decreasing while production was falling off.

The increase from 1923 to 1929 was only 21,000,000 ounces, and the increase from the high mark from 1913 to 1923 was less than 15,000,000 ounces.

The decline in 1930 reduces world production back to practically the world production of 1913.

As approximately two-thirds of the world's production of silver is mined as a by-product of gold, copper, lead, and zinc, silver production varies with the production of these other metals.

The production of silver, therefore, is automatically regulated and controlled by the production of gold, copper, lead, and zinc. When world conditions are prosperous and there is therefore a great demand for such metals there is an increase in production of such metals with a by-product increase in the production of silver. When the world is unable to buy such metals, as is the case now, then the production of such metals decreases, and with it decreases the production of silver. It is evident, therefore, that there is little or no danger of an overproduction of silver.

The consumption of the world production of silver may be illustrated through the distribution of silver for the year 1929. In that year the consumption was as follows:

(In millions of fine ounces)

India:	
Imports from the United States, Canada, England, France, Egypt, Australia, and others	79.2
Supplies from government reserves sold in India	7.3
	86.5
Less exports	4.7
Net Indian consumption	81.8
China:	
Imports from the United States, Canada, and England	133.3
From India and Japan	3.4
Chinese consumption	136.7

Most of India's melted silver coins exported through England.

Germany: Imports from the United States, Mexico, England, and others	12.0
Arts and manufactures:	
In the United States and Canada	37.0
In England	6.5
Coinage:	
United States mint	2.5
Poland	-----
Russia	3.5
Holland	3.0
Hong Kong dollars	16.0
Unaccounted for	12.5
Total	311.5

Such 311,500,000 ounces of silver are divided as follows: Production, 261,265,718 ounces; supply derived from melting up silver coins, 50,234,282 ounces.

There was no surplus production of silver in 1929 or 1930. In fact, there has never been, according to the evidence, any surplus of silver. The mine production of the world was remarkably uniform and the consumption of the world was equally uniform. The annual mine production was always consumed, and commerce and business had so adjusted themselves to such production that the demand was measured by the production. The evidence conclusively proves, therefore, that the sudden fall in the price of silver from the average level of 58.18 cents an ounce in 1928 to 26½ cents an ounce at the present time was not due to overproduction.

Root of the trouble

While there was no overproduction, there was an oversupply of silver in the markets of the world. This oversupply arises from two sources, namely, (1) the debasement of silver coins or, in other words, the reduction of the amount of silver in silver coins, and (2) the selling of the surplus silver so derived and the melting up of silver coins in India and the sale of such silver as bullion in the market of the world.

The cause of the sudden, large, and unprecedented fall in the price of silver was the dumping upon the market of the world of large and unusual quantities of silver bullion derived from the melting up of silver coins in India and the debasement of silver coins in Great Britain, France, and Belgium.

The British Government for India in 1926 adopted the gold-standard policy for India. The carrying out of this policy contemplated the acquisition of approximately 300,000,000 dollars in gold through the melting up of Indian silver rupee coins and the sale in the world market of the bullion derived therefrom.

The British Government for India commenced to sell in 1927. During 1927 and 1928 she sold 31,700,000 ounces; in 1929 she sold 25,000,000 ounces; and in 1930, up to December 1, she sold 29,500,000 ounces.

According to the financial column of Cotton and Finance for January, 1931, a magazine published in Bombay, the Indian Government in December, 1930, sold 2,938,000 ounces of silver, at a time when silver was only 31⅞ cents an ounce.

It is difficult to obtain exact data on recent shipments of silver by the Indian Government, as the Indian Government seems to treat the matter in somewhat the nature of a confidential transaction. There is no doubt, however, that the Government of India has been shipping silver into the market of the world during the month of January, 1931. We are informed by silver brokers of high standing that such is the fact. Some of them inform us that the Indian Government trade returns show that from January 1, 1931, to date the Government of India shipped to London 14,630,000 ounces of silver and 10,700,000 ounces of silver to Hong Kong. The exact amount is not so material as is the fact that the Government of India is continuing its disastrous policy and practice, even when the price of silver has reached the lowest level in all history.

The Indian Government is still maintaining and carrying out its policy of melting up silver rupees and disposing of the silver as bullion. According to reports, the Government of India still has at least 400,000,000 ounces of silver in such rupees that it can throw upon the world market as silver bullion.

The program of the British Government for India to date has been not only a failure so far as carrying out the policy is concerned, but it has been destructive of the wealth, purchasing power, and prosperity not only of the people of India but of every country that uses silver for money, and indirectly injurious to the prosperity of the world. Even in 1930, when silver had reached the then all-time low of 34 cents an ounce, India under such policy threw on an already saturated market 29,500,000 ounces of such silver. The last thread of confidence and hope in the minds of the people of the silver-using countries was broken, and speculators in silver in all countries commenced to dump silver on the market.

Although the people of China still hold tenaciously to their silver, the speculators of China are no exception in the bear movement that has developed. They know now the result of the dumping policy in India. They know that with an available 400,000,000 ounces of silver, which India could and apparently intends to continue to dump under the policy referred to above, there is no advantage to be gained in the holding of silver. Thus, when extensive Indian sales are noted, world silver speculators sell panically.

As to the sale of silver in China under such conditions, it may be justly stated that a nation whose purchasing power largely depends on the price of silver is to be pitied rather than criti-

cized when economic conditions force it to sacrifice its wealth by selling on an alarmingly depressed silver market.

Furthermore, it is manifest that at least one factor forcing the sale of silver in China is the absolute necessity of the Chinese to sacrifice their silver in an effort to meet their obligations, a fact which additionally adds to their economic burden.

The money of half the world must be stabilized

No commodity could withstand such an attack. Take out of use any product to-day and throw it on the market of the world and its value would be equally affected, as has the value of silver by the act of the British Government for India. Silver is a commodity. By a series of laws enacted in various countries, including our own, during the past fifty-odd years it has been demonetized in the most powerful governments of the world.

This action was taken notwithstanding the fact that there was no overproduction of silver nor threat of overproduction of silver. Since the beginning of time, so far as statistics are had, the production of silver has been 14 ounces of silver to 1 ounce of gold. The United States Department of Commerce in its Economic Paper No. 8, published in 1930, under the title "Summarized Data of Silver Production," says:

"Demonetization became possible through the enormous increase in gold production that followed invention of the cyanide process in 1887 and development of the gold fields of South Africa, yet a number of countries still retain the silver-gold standard. Most orientals use silver as a medium of exchange almost to the exclusion of gold. Silver may thus be regarded as a second line of defense for the maintenance of the metallic foundation of monetary systems, but the future of its production will be influenced largely by the course of gold production.

"In conclusion, it is of interest to note that, although the value of gold to silver now stands at a ratio of about 40 to 1 and was formerly fixed in the bimetallic monetary standard at 16 to 1, the ratio of production of silver to gold in the whole period since the discovery of America has been about 14 to 1."

Evidently at the time such paper was prepared the price of silver had not dropped as low as it is now because at the present time the ratio of gold and silver is on the basis of over 60 ounces of silver to 1 ounce of gold. It is true that at the time the actual demonitization of silver took place there was an extraordinary production of gold, which created, if it did not justify, the opinion in the minds of economists that silver would be unnecessary as a standard for monetary purposes.

The interim report of the gold delegation of the financial committee of the council of the League of Nations in 1930 found as a fact and reported that the burden upon gold for monetary purposes had been steadily increasing for years, that the production of gold was increasing at a very low rate, and that unless conditions of production changed, and such conditions were not in sight, there would be an actual shortage of gold in 1934. This report appears in part 4 of the hearings, which are herewith submitted.

Silver is more than a commodity with over half of the people of the world. It is more than a commodity in all the countries of the world except six or seven. In fact, with the exception of those countries that have both established the gold standard and have the gold to back such standard, silver always has been and is now money, the only measure of wealth, and the only monetary instrument of trade and commerce.

Silver crisis same in oriental and Latin countries

The moving cause for the great and abnormal depression in the price of silver still exists and threatens a further and unlimited depression. The situation is even more serious than that arising from the silver crisis in China. The same silver crisis exists in Mexico, South America, India, Asia, and all other silver-using countries. Our exports to these countries have greatly depreciated. The wealth of the peoples of all of these nations, representing over half of the population of the world, is measured in silver. They have received and hoarded silver during the ages. It has been their instrument of trade and commerce. They have little or no gold. Their purchasing power, like the people of China, has been reduced one-half, their credit destroyed, trade restrained, and their utter ruin threatened.

A few of the governments of the peoples mentioned are on a gold or semigold basis. Of these governments none appear to have anywhere near an adequate gold reserve, while the rest of such governments either have no gold reserve or such reserve is utterly deficient.

According to the report of the Federal Reserve Board, the monetary gold of the world is $10,909,000,000.

There appear in the RECORD tables taken from the January, 1931, bulletin of the Federal Reserve Board showing the gold stocks of central banks and governments of the leading gold-possessing countries of the world, the gold movements to and from certain other countries, and foreign-exchange rates (yearly averages) from 1922 to 1930.

The relevancy of these tables is based upon the committee's consideration during hearings of certain statements made by witnesses as to existing and future shortages of gold and the relationship of this shortage to world commodity prices and international trade and credit.

It will be noted from the first table that in November, 1930, the total gold holdings of central banks and governments in 45 countries was $10,909,000,000.

Of this amount, the holdings of the United States alone amounted to $4,220,000,000. France had $2,037,000,000; England had $767,000,000; Germany, $519,000,000; the Argentine, $417,000,000; and Japan, $409,000,000.

India in November, 1930, had $128,000,000 in gold, which amount was exactly the estimated gold holdings of India in November, 1929. This is the present basis of the proposed gold standard for India with its large area, great trade, and 300,000,000 people.

The holdings of the United States in the year from November, 1929, to November, 1930, had increased by $220,000,000. The gold holdings of France increased in the same period from $1,600,000,000 to $2,037,000,000.

The table gives the gold holdings in detail for 16 of the 45 countries from which statistics were gathered; 29 of the countries are lumped together, with an estimated total of $693,000,000, but this figure is more than $20,000,000 less than these 29 countries were shown to have held in November, 1929.

China is included within the lump-sum figure of the 29 countries. China's gold is negligible, as will be noted from the table in the hearings

The silver problem is aggravated by the equally serious gold situation. Gold-standard governments are experiencing great difficulty in obtaining gold to meet their budgets and pay their obligations. People in gold-standard countries are competing with each other in the sale of their products to obtain gold with which to pay their debts. The whole world is suffering from the destruction of silver money and the hoarding, stagnation, and maldistribution of gold.

Remedies recommended

Your subcommittee is aware of the impropriety of questioning any monetary policy adopted by any government. Your subcommittee is of the opinion, however, that, having knowledge of the character of the British people, of their extensive commerce with all nations, their interest in the welfare and prosperity of all peoples, they will not consider it improper if the President of the United States should seek a discussion of the advisability of the British Government for India suspending such policy with regard to the melting up and sale of India's silver coin for a reasonable period of time until other readjustments can be devised.

It is impossible, in the opinion of your subcommittee, to accomplish the restoration of the normal purchasing power of silver or to prevent its continued decrease in purchasing power and its continued instability as a basis of credit unless and until the British Government for India announces a determination to suspend its present policy. The question of the suspension of such policy is an emergency and should be undertaken first. While it is of vital importance to restore the normal price of silver, it is possibly of more importance to assure against violent fluctuations of the price. Credit transactions can not be successfully undertaken with countries that use silver for purchases until some plan or plans have been agreed upon that will assure to a greater extent than now exists the stabilization of the purchasing power of silver.

To this end it appears to your subcommittee that the President of the United States, under authority heretofore granted to him by Congress under an act approved March 3, 1897, chapter 376, section 312, Revised Statutes of the United States, entitled "An act to provide for the representation of the United States by commissioners at any international monetary conference hereafter to be called, and to enable the President to otherwise promote an international agreement," or under his general constitutional powers, should invite or obtain the governments of the world, or those who express an interest, to enter into an international conference, or conferences, where plans, policies, and agreements may be discussed and arrived at, if possible, looking to the remedying of the present uncertain and dangerous status of silver throughout the world.

Reviving China

Our commerce with China may be aided in other ways. China is the natural market of the United States. With the exception of Japan, our country is China's closest powerful neighbor. Her people admire and respect us, as we do them. Our friendship has existed from time immemorial. They prefer our products and purchase them except when compelled to purchase cheaper products through extreme poverty. China has an area almost as large as the United States and Mexico combined. It contains a population of from 400,000,000 to 450,000,000 of normally peaceful, intelligent, industrious people. They seek an opportunity for peaceful employment. If we give these people employment and prosperity, for years to come they will furnish a market for most of our surplus production.

It was testified before our subcommittee by exporters who know China and its customs that with the pacification and revivification of China our entire wheat surplus would be consumed. The Government of China, according to all the testimony we received, is a good government and is satisfactory to our citizens engaged in trade and commerce in and with China.

There must be work provided in China or there will be war. War lords are impatient because of the inability of the National Government of China to carry out its program. The people of China, through lack of work, have been compelled to fight in armies for food. To-day China is practically at peace with the exception of bandit bands still seeking food and property through raids. As has been aptly remarked, a large number of Chinese are forced to "loot to live."

The National Government of China can not carry out its program without the moral, intellectual, and financial support of those nations that prosper by virtue of trade with China and that are able to render such aid. What China needs most is transportation. It is impossible to get products into or out of the

interior of China. Transportation to any extent only exists along the seacoast. There are only seven or eight thousand miles of roads in China over which an automobile may be safely driven. There are only 7,500 miles of railroads—fewer miles of motor roads and fewer miles of railroads than we would find in one of the small States of our Union. The passable roads in China, with the exception of those on the seacoast, are built out from the capitals of Provinces and are not connected. Your subcommittee has seen maps of the proposed road system of China. The commission that visited your subcommittee asserted that $20,000,000 would so connect up these isolated roads as to give a comparatively satisfactory national road system. When this system is completed there will be safe and expeditious transportation by motors and trucks from the extreme north of China to the south and from the seacoast to the western border.

The United States to-day sells to China 80 per cent of the automobiles that it uses. With the inauguration of the proposed road system there will be thousands of miles of motor roads added to the present system. Not only will production be tremendously facilitated but China will become a great user of motors and it will be opened up to a new and great tourist trade.

It has been testified before your subcommittee that with the pacification of China and the establishment of transportation the commerce of China would increase manyfold in a very few years.

Your subcommittee has taken a great deal of evidence as to the best manner in which financial aid may be granted to China. Labor in China is to-day largely paid in rice by reason of the scarcity of coins. Gold will not be used in China at least for many years to come. The people for ages have become accustomed to the use of silver as money, silver in its raw state, silver in chunks, called sycee, silver chipped off bullion, and a few silver coins, and it is hard to change the customs of thousands of years. The measure of wages is so small in China that a laborer would probably have to work months to get a gold piece sufficiently large to conveniently keep.

While the people of oriental and tropical countries are suspicious of paper money, there is a stronger reason why they have always used silver. They require a metal and they could not and can not obtain gold. Silver is practically indestructible. It may be buried in the ground. It may be worn as jewelry, and it may be carried in the loin cloth without destruction or injury. Paper money is subject to destruction, and when placed in the loin cloth, in a few hours it is in a condition beyond circulation. So China requires silver.

The proposal to lend China two or three hundred million ounces of silver has met some objections. It is urged that there may be a change of government, or that the government may fall into incapable hands and the money lost or stolen or squandered and not accomplish the pacification and revivification of China. To meet this objection your subcommittee suggests that a silver fund or pool might be established; that silver might be advanced to China from time to time as needed to be minted into suitable-sized coins for the payment of wages to labor and the purchase of material to be used upon certain specific projects that meet the approval of those handling the pool or fund. It would be advisable, in the opinion of your subcommittee, to invite those Nations interested in China's development and commerce to participate in such a pool. The director or directors of such pool would collaborate with the Government of China with regard to the laying out and consummation of such projects. Such advances therefore would only be made during the periods in which the Government of China was in a position to assure the carrying out of the purposes of the advances and the repayment of such advances in accordance with the agreement.

It has been suggested that such advances be measured in ounces of silver rather than in dollars. It is urged that by such process it would only be a loan of a commodity to be returned in kind, and that the difficulty of establishing a price at which such silver should be loaned and repaid would be avoided. Governments might hesitate to dispose of silver at the present price, while, on the other hand, China might not deem it wise to borrow silver at a higher price than the market price.

The question arises as to where the silver could be obtained. There is no known large surplus of silver outside of the Treasury of the United States except silver coins in circulation.

It is not to be expected that any government except India would melt up its circulating silver coins. Other countries desiring to participate in the pool could, of course, obtain silver from current production to carry out their part of the program. The United States might use a portion of the standard silver dollars now lying inert in the Treasury. These silver dollars were used in 1918 under the Pittman Act to supply Great Britain with 208,000,000 ounces of silver to meet an emergency redemption of silver notes in India. The absence of these silver dollars from the Treasury until they were later replaced worked no harm and caused no embarrassment. Federal reserve notes were temporarily placed in the stead of the silver dollars removed as security for silver certificates outstanding against the dollars in the event that there were not sufficient silver dollars remaining for such redemption. As a matter of fact, as silver certificates reached the Treasury they were canceled and none of the Federal reserve notes were used for such redemption.

There are now in the Treasury of the United States, according to the last statement, 495,874,458 silver dollars for redemption of outstanding silver certificates. Very few, if any, of these silver certificates are ever presented for redemption, and the standard silver dollars are a frozen asset of the Government, unused, and bearing no interest. A safe plan could probably be devised by the Treasury Department for the use of some of these silver dollars in connection with advances to China. The advances, of course, would be construed as a loan, and would be for a long period of time at a small rate of interest. The interest might be received in the form of silver and used for the purpose of restoring the standard silver dollars to the Treasury, or for subsidiary coinage.

All that the Senate may constitutionally do with regard to any matters herein suggested is to advise the President of the United States of the opinion of the United States Senate, and thereafter, if he deemed it compatible with the interest of the Government, the manner, the method, and the detail of such consummations must be in his hands as the sole authority under the Constitution clothed with the power and duty to negotiate agreements upon behalf of the United States.

Your subcommittee annexes to this report statements of Government officials and others, official Government tables and authorized statistical data, taken from the testimony of our hearings, for the purpose of ready reference in support of the statements made herein and a few additional statistical tables of official character, dealing with collateral issues such as the present distribution of gold holdings and estimates on the supply of and demand for gold in the near future.

Your subcommittee respectfully urges upon the Foreign Relations Committee, and upon the United States Senate through the Foreign Relations Committee, the adoption of this report and a favorable report upon the two resolutions introduced in the Senate by Mr. PITTMAN, chairman of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, on the 11th day of February, 1931, being Senate Resolutions Nos. —— and ——, now pending before your committee, copies of which resolutions are hereto attached.

Senate Resolution —— embraces two subjects, namely, the suspension of the policy and practice of the Government of India in melting up her silver rupee coins and disposing of the silver derived therefrom as bullion upon the market of the world, and the sale of silver by other governments derived from the debasement, or, in other words, the reduction of the amount of silver in silver coins.

The other subject embraced in the resolution anticipates international action looking to a more definite understanding or agreement as to the use or status of silver as money throughout the world, or as between the governments that may become parties to such agreements or understandings.

The first subject involves a question of great emergency, and it is hoped that the President, through diplomatic conversations and discussions, may speedily bring about its consummation, which is the first prerequisite in any effort to restrain the continued depression of the price of silver and restore it at least to its normal purchasing power.

The subcommittee recognizes that the second subject is more involved, that the procedure is more difficult, and that a longer time will be required for the consummation of the purpose involved in the subject. Yet your subcommittee considers the solving of the problems involved in such subject of vital importance to the world, and hopes and believes that the President, through aid which he will receive from many governments, will be successful and without unreasonable delay.

Senate Resolution —— suggests to the President action looking to an additional and special remedy for the depressed condition of our commerce with China.

The evidence and data collected by your subcommittee are included in four volumes, or parts, and such hearings are herewith submitted to you with the suggestion that they be submitted to the Senate, together with the report upon said resolutions, so that in the event of the passage of said resolutions such hearings may be delivered to the President with said resolutions and the reports thereon.

Your subcommittee is impressed with the seriousness of the situation, and it is of the opinion that these questions should be submitted without delay to the Senate and by the Senate submitted to the President of the United States.

While your subcommitee will make further studies of related problems and suggest additional measures which may seem advisable and proper at a later date, there is no doubt that there is a demand for action with regard to the matters discussed in this report from all over the United States—from industry, labor, and the farmer. In fact, a study of the records that your subcommittee has prepared and submitted will convince you that the demand for friendly, cooperative action is world-wide.

Respectfully submitted.

KEY PITTMAN, *Chairman*.

COPY OF RESOLUTION TO BE INTRODUCED IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11

Mr. PITTMAN submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolution

Resolved, That the Senate, having had under investigation and consideration, through its Committee on Foreign Relations and a subcommittee thereof, our commercial relations with China, the causes of the great and sudden depression in such commerce and remedies for such depression, and such committee having reported to the Senate, the Senate finds from such report:

During the first 11 months of 1930, being the months for which we have statistics, our exports to China were 27 per cent less than our exports during the same period in 1929. Our imports from China during such period in 1930 were 36 per cent below our

imports during the same period of 1929. The reports received from the Department of Commerce, so far as they have been obtained for the months of November and December, disclose that our commerce with China continues to decrease, although war conditions in China were greatly improved during those months.

China is now and always has been a silver-standard country. China possesses only a negligible quantity of gold. The standard measure of money is the tael, which is approximately an ounce of pure silver. The sycee is the chief representative of money and medium of commerce and trade. It is a piece of silver shaped like a shoe or slipper containing 50 taels.

There are some silver coins in China. They are silver dollars minted and issued by the Government of China and the Mexican dollar, each containing a similar amount of silver to the standard silver dollar of the United States. In addition to these, there are subsidiary silver coins comparable with the dimes, quarters, and halves of the United States.

The value and purchasing power of the tael, sycee, and silver coins is the value of the silver contained therein, which fluctuates daily and is determined by the daily quoted price of silver in London. A board of brokers in London daily fixes the price of silver, which is accepted throughout the world.

The situation is even more serious than that arising from the silver crisis in China. The same silver crisis exists in Mexico, South America, India, Asia, and all other such silver-using countries. Our exports to these countries, from the same cause, have greatly decreased. During the same period as applied to China our exports to and our imports from such silver-using countries decreased as follows:

	Per cent
South America, decrease in exports	37
South America, decrease in imports	32
Mexico, decrease in exports	13
Mexico, decrease in imports	33
India, decrease in exports	19
India, decrease in imports	30

The people of these countries constitute over half of the population of the world and 90 per cent of the nations of the earth. Their purchasing power, like the people of China, has been reduced to an alarming extent, their credit impaired, trade restrained, and utter ruin threatened.

The price of silver has fallen one-half since January, 1929. In January, 1929, the price of silver was 57½ cents an ounce. Today the price of silver is 26½ cents an ounce. The normal price of silver—that is, the average price for a number of years prior to 1929—has been approximately 59 cents an ounce. The fluctuations were very slight and did not interfere with credit or commercial transactions, with the exception of the unusually high price of silver during the war period.

The pre-war price of silver—that is, in 1913—was 60 cents an ounce. During the years 1926, 1927, and 1928 the price of silver averaged 57½ cents an ounce.

The sudden and unprecedented fall in the price of silver was not due to overproduction. The reports of the director of the mint disclose that the annual increase in the production of silver has been much less on an average than the normal increase of the average production of all other commodities and is not commensurate with the increase in population and commerce. The production for certain years is given as follows:

	Ounces
1913	225,686,923
1923	240,169,264
1928	254,869,163
1929 (during great prosperity)	261,265,718
1930 (present estimates)	225,000,000

While there was no overproduction of silver, there was an oversupply of silver in the markets of the world.

The cause of the sudden, large, and unprecedented fall in the price of silver was the dumping upon the markets of the world of large and unusual quantities of silver bullion derived from the melting up of silver coins by the Government of India and the debasement of silver coins by Great Britain, France, Belgium, and other countries.

The British Government for India since 1928 has dumped large quantities of such silver upon the markets of the world, and is continuing such policy and practice notwithstanding the alarmingly low price of silver. According to creditable reports the Government for India still has available from such source 400,000,000 ounces of silver that it can and will dump upon the markets of the world unless said policy is suspended.

It will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to restore silver to its normal price or to restrain further depressions of the price unless and until the Government of India suspends its silver policy and practices.

Therefore, the Senate submits to the President these findings of fact, together with reports, hearings, and other data in respect thereto, with the respectful request that he shall, if he deem it compatible with the best interests of the Government, enter into discussion or negotiation with the Governments for India, Great Britain, France, Belgium, and other governments, looking to the suspension of the policy and practice of governments melting up or debasing silver coins and sales by governments of silver, and that he take such other and further action in the premises as he may deem necessary to eliminate the abnormal fluctuations and depressions in the price of silver.

The Senate further suggests that the President, if he deem it compatible with the best interests of the Government, call or obtain an international conference, or international conferences, to the end that agreements or understandings may be obtained with respect to the uses and status of silver as money.

COPY OF RESOLUTION TO BE INTRODUCED IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1931

Mr. PITTMAN submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolution

Resolved, That the Senate, having had under investigation and consideration, through its Committee on Foreign Relations and a subcommittee thereof, our commercial relations with China, the causes of the great and sudden depression in such commerce and remedies for such depression; and such committee having reported to the Senate, the Senate finds from such report:

The Government of China, according to the unanimous testimony submitted to the Senate, is a good government, and is satisfactory to our citizens engaged in trade and commerce with China.

China, for several years, has suffered from internal strife and the demoralizing effects of war. The wars, however, were not waged so much against the National Government of China as against the administration of the Government. War lords were impatient because the administration of the National Government of China did not, or was unable to carry out its pledges and programs for the development of China. The masses of the people, who are normally peaceful, industrious, honest, and capable, were compelled to enlist in armies that they might obtain food. The National Government of China has been victorious and internal strife has practically ceased except for raids carried on by bands of bandits.

The National Government of China is without money to expeditiously institute internal development and furnish employment to its millions of hungry and idle people. The revenues available to the Government of China are largely hypothecated for national obligations. It is difficult, if not impossible, by reason of treaties and internal conditions, to greatly increase taxation under the present conditions in China.

The development of China is retarded by lack of transportation facilities. Such facilities are limited chiefly to the seacoast. There are only seven or eight thousand miles of roads in China which would be termed in the United States automobile roads. There are 7,500 miles of railroads.

Authentic reports indicate that 20,000 people have died daily in China from hunger and exposure. There must be work provided in China or there will be continuous war.

The National Government of China can not carry out its program of development and pacification without the moral, intellectual, and financial support of those nations that prosper by virtue of trade with China and that are able to render such aid.

The testimony before the Senate shows that with the pacification of China and the establishment of transportation facilities the commerce in China would increase many fold in a very few years.

The people of oriental and tropical countries are suspicious of paper money. They have always used silver as money because it is practically indestructible. They preserve it by burying it in the ground, by manufacturing it into jewelry and wearing it as ornaments, and by carrying it in their loin cloths. They contend that paper money is subject to destruction, and, when placed in loin cloths, in a very few hours it is in a condition beyond circulation.

The wages are so low in China that a laborer would be compelled to work for months before he could save a gold piece sufficiently large to conveniently preserve. The conditions in China and the customs of its people are such that, even if possible, it would require years to establish a gold standard or any other standard than silver.

China, to meet the present emergency, requires silver. The advancing to China of silver, for the minting into small silver coins to pay for labor and buy materials for internal developments to be approved by those supplying the silver, would bring about the pacification and prosperity of China and an increase in her commerce with the United States and other countries.

China is the natural market of the United States. With the exception of Japan, our country is China's closest powerful neighbor. Her people admire and respect us, as we do them. Our friendship has existed from time immemorial. They prefer our products and purchase them except when compelled to purchase cheaper products through extreme poverty.

China has an area almost as large as the United States and Mexico combined. It contains a population of approximately 400,000,000 of industrious people. They seek an opportunity for peaceful employment.

If we can aid China in her internal development and furnish her people with employment, they will for years furnish us a market for a large portion of our surplus production. China, if and when pacified and developed, will have ample resources to meet any advances that are wisely used in such development.

Therefore, the Senate submits to the President these findings of fact, together with the reports herein and other data in respect thereto, with the respectful request that he shall, if he deem it compatible with the best interests of the Government, enter into discussions or negotiations with the National Government of China, and with such other governments that have treaty relations with China, as China and the United States may consider it advisable, looking to the moral, intellectual, and financial aid of the National Government of China; that it is suggested that the President, if he deem it compatible to the best interests of our Government, discuss and ascertain the advisability: (a) Of the establishment of

a silver pool or fund from which to supply the National Government of China with silver for coinage, to be used for certain specified purposes and in certain specified manner to be agreed upon, and to be repaid at a time and in a manner to be agreed upon; (b) to consider the practicability of utilizing some of the standard silver dollars now in the Treasury of the United States in connection with such silver pool or the supplying of silver to China for coinage purposes; (c) that he consider the practicability of supplying such silver in kind without reference to its ratio to gold or its market value, to be repaid in kind.

ANNEX

TO INTERIM REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE ON TRADE RELATIONS WITH CHINA

In this annex the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, acting under authority of Senate Resolution 256, herewith presents such statements, tables, and data as are considered pertinent to the interim report to which this annex is added:

President Hoover, speaking before the American Bankers' Association at Cleveland, October 2, 1931, said:

"The buying power of India and China, dependent upon the price of silver, has been affected."

Julius H. Barnes, chairman of President Hoover's National Business Survey Committee, in an article written by Mr. Barnes in the New York Times, November 2, 1920:

"The final mistake was made of treating silver as a commodity, although it still represented resources and capital and credit to more than half of the population of the world. Silver, which had been a standard money of the world for 20 centuries, was in a few months to be treated in the market as a commodity, without mature consideration as to the effect on the initiative and confidence of a thousand million people. A price of silver which fluctuated from $1.35 some few years ago to 35 cents to-day and yet symbolizes the credit and resources of a great people, could not but harm the business structure of the world."

Thomas W. Lamont, as reported in a recent press article:

"One of the chief causes of world depression is the scarcity of gold and the depressed price of silver."

George E. Anderson, noted writer on economic and financial problems, in the Annalist:

"The effect of the general slump in the price of the metal (silver) has been more far-reaching than had been anticipated. The drop in the price of the metal, of course, directly affects silver producers in the United States, Mexico, Canada, and various South American countries; but its chief effect upon the world of trade is in those countries using silver as a monetary medium—China, Abyssinia, and a few minor nations, but chiefly China. * * * The uncertainty of the financial situation naturally has stopped further purchases abroad. In short, the silver situation goes to the very heart of commercial and industrial China with paralyzing effect."

Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH, chairman Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate, as quoted, made the following statement January 12, 1931:

"I do not know of a more important phase of our economic depression than that which arises out of the treatment of silver. It is estimated that the monetary stock of gold for the world is about $10,000,000,000 or less. Of this amount 65 per cent is controlled by the United States and France. In July, 1930, France had about $1,900,000,000, the United States $4,516,000,000. These two nations have a population of about 170,000,000. The world population is about 1,930,000,000. So about 1,760,000,000 of the world's population must do business with about $3,694,000,000 of gold. In other words, about 1,700,000,000 throughout the world have a gold supply of about 20 cents per capita.

"These naked figures of themselves seem to me to present the unanswerable argument in favor of doing something for silver. There are at least 800,000,000 to 900,000,000 people in the world who want to use silver as money. Through long years of custom and practice they have become used to silver and they are anxious to have it. But the cruel and brutal financial policy which has dominated of late years has deprived them of an opportunity to have silver except at a most reduced value.

"After England forced the gold standard upon India and India began to unload her silver upon the world, silver went from about 64 to 31 or 32 cents. The purchasing power of these millions of people was reduced by half. What we need in this country is fewer appropriations from the United States Treasury and more markets for our goods. Those markets, so far as a vast amount of the human race is concerned, can be restored to a marked degree by a proper treatment of silver.

"I do not believe that the United States alone, however, can solve this problem. I think it would greatly damage our cause to advocate any such theory. The silver problem is really a phase of the world's economic problem, and as such we ought to treat it. But I do believe that by the United States taking a lead, we might bring about an international agreement establishing a proper ratio between silver and gold which would enable these people who want silver to use it, and which they undoubtedly would do."

Francis H. Brownell, president American Smelting & Refining Co., in a recent pamphlet on the silver question:

"The fall in the price of silver of nearly 15 cents per ounce during the spring of 1930 caused a rapidly increasing demoralization of the exchanges, particularly of China and Mexico. The United States sells to China large quantities of cotton, machinery, oil, leaf tobacco, and many other commodities.

"Mexico and other silver-using countries experienced a like disastrous effect from the fall in the price of silver. The purchasing power of all silver-using countries became seriously impaired and their ability to acquire commodities of the United States and leading European countries substantially lessened. * * * The possibility of silver returning again to its former levels is largely, if not entirely, dependent upon whether the Indian Government and perhaps other Governments pursue the policy of throwing silver upon the market whenever prices strengthen. If this policy were stopped, it seems highly probable that silver would ultimately recover. If it continues, it is impossible to predict the final outcome."

H. H. Stevens, former Secretary of the Treasury of the Dominion of Canada, in an address to the Canadian Legislature:

"One billion people in the Orient, in China, in India, in the Malay States, and in Mexico are deprived of two-thirds of their purchasing power by the action of the nations. There is one reason for the agricultural and commercial depression which exists to-day all over the world. One-half of the human race is living below the margin of decent living. In fact, millions upon millions in China during the present year have died largely because of the inadequacy of their purchasing power."

Mark Sullivan, writing from Washington in June:

"The purchasing power of all Asia is reduced by the fall in the price of silver. This in turn diminishes the purchasing power of Europe. The final net is reduced volume of international trade, including American exports. The same cause accounts, in part certainly, within Asia, for domestic disturbances, which in the case of China are described in terms of communism and India in terms of salt."

Wall Street Journal in a survey of business conditions:

"The trade with China is of vast importance to the commercial nations of the world.

"With the United States alone it amounts to over $300,000,000 a year. Indirectly, its trade with the United States is much more. One instance is that of cotton. It is one of England's greatest customers for cotton goods, which England makes from American cotton. The drop in silver means that Chinese exchange must decline. The purchasing power of silver therefore reacts on all countries with merchandise to sell. China is not only a purchaser of goods but a borrower in the money markets of the world."

The Vancouver Sun publishes an address by R. J. Crome, its publisher, before the National Foreign Trade Council, in which he said:

"China is the greatest potential trader in the world to-day. Its 4,000,000 square miles of territory support a population of 425,000,000. Close up, it may appear that China is hopelessly enmeshed in political squabbling, sectional wars, an economic chaos, but hold China off at a distance and it is apparent that it is unifying politically, economically, and socially. * * * Lump the Asiatic countries together and lump the billion people who live in them into a single trade unit and one has a picture of the world's new market."

Mr. S. U. Zau, director of commercial relations for the Nanking Government is quoted in the China press, as follows, in connection with the trade of China as affected by the British silver policy in India:

"It is the British policy, again, in India which has added so materially to the decline in the value of silver—another reason, it seems to me, why Great Britain should take the initiative in making at least an endeavor to reach some sort of international understanding for reestablishing silver as a standard basis of credit.

"Almost everywhere in Europe hundreds of factories are idle or working short-time, and millions of men and women are without work. Why are they unemployed? Because markets can not be found for their products. And the reason those markets can not be found in many parts of the world is, not that the people who usually buy the products of European and American factories have too many of those goods already stored in their family cupboards, but because they can not afford to pay the prices asked for them.

"This is particularly the case with us here in China. Owing to the terrific slump in the value of silver, we can scarcely buy from nor sell to foreign countries, and this paralysis of China's trade has its reactions far beyond the frontiers of this Republic. The price of an article manufactured in Manchester or Sheffield for sale in China becomes doubled simply because exchange compels us now to pay a dollar for what we used to get for 50 cents. * * *

"If only it were possible to get concerted action taken for the stabilization of the silver market, it would be soon possible to get the trade which is now paralyzed into movement again, and this would be to the benefit not only of China but of all the countries which have commercial dealings with us."

Rene Leon, noted American authority on commerce and finance, in a statement issued September 19, 1930:

"Available records running back well upwards of a century fail to reveal so low a quotation for the white metal as that which obtained in mid-June, 1930, and the improvement since that date has been purely negligible. The effect of this disastrous state of affairs on the psychology of the orientals may well be left to the imagination. Suffice to say that mass poverty breeds dispair and engenders social and political evils. India and China are in the throes of just such conditions."

Dr. Julius Klein, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, in a statement to subcommittee made on June 26, 1930:

"In explanation of the considerable loss in both our import and export trade with China three principal factors may be emphasized: (1) The renewal of extensive and energetic military activities in north central China and the Yangtze Valley throughout the first half of 1930; (2) the lower prices obtaining

in world markets for many commodities, and particularly those which figure most important in China's exports; and (3) the low price of silver. These three factors, as well as minor contributing ones, all blend into the one general cause for the reduction in China's trade, i. e., the reduction in China's purchasing power brought about by them."

And again:

"China, being on a silver basis, receives all of her income in China in silver, and all she receives from abroad must be paid for in silver, but upon a gold valuation. From our Table II we note that the average dollar value of the Shanghai tael in 1928 was 64.30 gold cents; in 1929, 58.42 cents; in May, 1930, 44.69 cents; and July 22, 1930, 36.74 cents. A simple way to state the problem is the obvious one that, other things being equal, China can not buy as much goods from abroad for 36 cents as it could for 64 cents."

Grover Clark, consultant on far eastern affairs, in a statement issued January 13, 1931:

"Millions in China, made destitute by famine and civil war, now must loot to live. These are the raw material out of which the communist bands are organized and from which the huge armies are recruited. Until these people can get an opportunity to earn a modest living, peace in China will have no secure foundation, the buying power of the people will remain low, and, consequently, China will continue to be very much less of a market for American goods than it will become when peace and better economic conditions are achieved."

The Irving Trust Co. of New York, in the Mid-Month Review of Business for December, 1930:

"Inasmuch as China is on a silver basis, her purchasing power in terms of imports has been melting away, and thus American sales have woefully declined. In addition, the Chinese are suffering from a world-wide decline in the gold prices of the commodities which they export. It seems safe to infer that the silver catastrophe has been a major factor in the unrest in India and economic crisis in China. If so, the full effects of the situation have not yet been witnessed."

Department of Commerce Reports of February 4, 1931:

"The silver situation continues to be the all-absorbing topic of interest in Shanghai business circles. * * * The outlook is thus uncertain and, combined with continued instability, is reflecting unfavorably upon both the import and export trade."

John Brisben Walker, writing in the New York Times, says:

"The effect on India and China will never be known in its fullest horror. The immediate depreciation of the only stock of money—silver—stopped trade and starved whole Provinces. It caused millions of deaths."

J. F. Darling, director of the Midland Bank, of London, in an address before the Royal Empire Society, of London:

"Gold has been accorded a value more than sixty times that of silver to-day. Despite the fact that the relative production of the two metals has been what it now is for the last four or five centuries. Over that long period only 14 ounces of silver have been produced for each ounce of gold. That proportion has shown no change for the last five years, but in the same length of time the price of silver has fallen from 64 to 28 cents an ounce.

"This has been terrific in its effect on the purchasing power of a billion people in the world, which in turn reacts against another billion. * * * We are fools to put up with it. Common justice, common humanity, and common sense urgently demand that the British Empire take the lead in restoring the equilibrium of gold and silver, on which the economic structure of the world rests."

E. Kann, international authority on the currencies and finances of China:

"The sale by governments had a doubly harmful consequence: First, because extra quantities of silver were thrown on the market, irrespective of whether, when, or where these were wanted; and, second, the baneful psychological effect caused by the uncertainty, or rather the certainty, of more coming in the near future. This has been a huge black cloud overshadowing the silver market like the Angel of Death."

STATEMENT FROM INDIA

Mr. Chunilal Mehta, of India, addressing the annual meeting of the Bombay Bullion Exchange in January, 1931, said:

"But more important than the Rex scheme for the rehabilitation for silver is the giving up by the Government of India of their policy of silver sales. * * * The Government of India has sold until now approximately 87,000,000 ounces of silver * * * and it seems that the Government policy is not yet revised. These sales of silver by the Government of India and the world knowledge that a further large amount is for sale have depressed the world market to the present low level."

The Business Week, as reported in the Literary Digest, describing the decline in silver:

"One of the major economic curiosities of the age."

Dispatch from China, as reported by Boston News Bureau, states that the Chinese Government—

"Faces commercial ruin from the tobogganing of silver prices."

Federal Reserve Board bulletin of January, 1931, states:

"The decline in the price of silver has affected the trade of the silver-using countries of the Far East."

DECLINE IN TRADE WITH CHINA

As shown in statistics prepared by the Department of Commerce for chief commodities during 11-month period of 1930 compared with previous years.

United States trade with the whole of China for the first 11 months of 1928, 1929, and 1930

(In thousands; 000 omitted)

	1928	1929	1930
Exports to China	$150,466	$142,326	$103,755
Per cent of increase or decrease	+5	−5.4	−27
Imports from China	$146,708	$169,442	$108,547
Per cent of increase or decrease	−7	+15.5	−36

All 1930 statistics subject to correction.

United States trade with China for the first 11 months of 1928, 1929, and 1930

(In thousands; 000 omitted)

		For 11 months of—					
		1928		1929		1930	
		Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
EXPORTS TO CHINA							
Petroleum products			$34,376		$25,600		$18,700
Paraffin wax	pounds	34,542	1,861	31,594	1,580	24,238	1,034
Gasoline	barrels	236	1,906	470	2,599	617	3,061
Kerosene	do	4,562	27,100	3,812	17,801	3,026	11,912
Gas and fuel oil	do	1,034	1,071	831	837	756	666
Lubricating oil	do	261	2,438	255	2,681	194	1,837
Tobacco, leaf	pounds	143,076	26,265	85,885	11,803	94,882	11,962
Cigarettes	number	7,815,397	13,543	4,519,766	7,967	1,359,100	2,107
Cotton, raw	bales	140	14,635	202	20,248	290	20,116
Flour	barrels	1,754	9,547	2,584	13,782	2,070	9,227
Iron and steel			7,728		7,235		6,650
Machinery and electrical equipment			5,900		8,978		7,928
Douglas fir	feet	165,089	3,013	301,890	5,226	209,000	3,270
Dyes, aniline	pounds	17,270	2,500	19,980	3,012	13,089	1,740
Automotive products			2,334		3,400		2,993
Milk, canned	pounds	12,334	1,829	8,688	1,339	6,122	1,030
Leather			1,140		750		240
Copper, refined	pounds	6,708	958	5,285	913	6,984	875
IMPORTS FROM CHINA							
Raw silk	pounds	9,898	43,413	13,603	56,350	9,270	27,944
Wood oil	do	98,192	12,038	112,344	14,057	125,507	12,427
Carpet wool	do	50,521	10,947	47,537	11,400	29,009	5,752
Bristles	do	3,196	3,741	4,500	5,400	2,871	3,875
Furs			15,630		14,093		6,000
Hides and skins			6,730		7,279		5,405
Raw cotton	pounds	27,370	4,905	27,271	3,461	24,143	2,548

Compiled Jan. 23, 1931.

Financial statistics for foreign countries—Gold holdings of central banks and governments

[In millions of dollars. Figures for end of month or latest available preceding date; see Bulletin for June, 1929, p. 396, and for June, 1930, p. 372]

(Gold holdings as shown by statistics of Federal Reserve Board Bulletin of January, 1931)

Month	Total (45 countries)	United States	Argentina	Australia	Belgium	Brazil	Canada	England	France	Germany	India	Italy	Japan	Netherlands	Spain	Switzerland	U. S. S. R.	29 other countries
1929—November	10,304	4,003	451	97	151	151	78	659	1,600	534	128	273	542	180	495	105	142	714
December	10,297	3,900	434	89	163	150	78	711	1,633	544	128	273	542	180	495	115	147	714
1930—January	10,362	3,921	445	88	164	139	78	732	1,683	547	128	273	520	177	495	108	147	717
February	10,434	3,988	448	124	164	127	78	740	1,680	582	128	273	477	176	476	108	150	715
March	10,505	4,061	445	126	164	127	79	759	1,668	595	128	274	453	174	476	108	156	713
April	10,568	4,131	442	109	164	90	79	795	1,659	611	128	274	443	174	477	112	167	712
May	10,613	4,159	441	91	167	90	80	765	1,717	617	128	274	434	174	477	112	177	710
June	10,673	4,178	440	97	167	89	81	768	1,727	624	128	274	434	174	477	112	203	701
July	10,709	4,160	436	97	167	80	94	746	1,775	624	128	274	440	157	477	118	233	701
August	10,791	4,148	434	97	168	69	100	759	1,852	624	128	275	433	157	477	123	249	698
September	10,828	4,159	434	98	173	65	110	766	1,899	590	128	278	431	157	478	123	239	688
October	[1] 10,868	4,184	[1] 429	79	180	[1] 43	122	782	1,992	519	128	278	414	171	478	128	249	[1] 691
November	[1] 10,909	4,220	[1] 417	75	181	[1] 29	[1] 130	767	2,037	519	128	[1] 279	409	171	474	130	249	[1] 693
December	-------	[1] 4,224	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	724	[1] 2,100	[1] 528	[1] 128	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	249	-------

[1] Preliminary, based on latest available figures.

NOTE.—Table covers all countries for which satisfactory figures are available; see Bulletin for April, 1930, where separate figures for 44 countries are given by years back to 1913. For the 16 countries here shown separately—all of which have held gold in recent years to the amount of $90,000,000 or more—the figures are for central banks only except as follows: United States—Treasury and Federal reserve banks; Argentina—Government conversion fund and Bank of the Nation; Brazil—Bank of Brazil and Government stabilization fund; Canada—Government reserve against Dominion and notes savings-bank deposits, and gold deposits of chartered banks in the central reserve; India—currency and gold standard reserves of Government; Japan—domestic holdings of Bank of Japan and Government.

Monthly China trade for 1930 as shown by figures of the Department of Commerce:

United States trade with China for 11 months of 1929 and 1930

[In thousands; 000 omitted]

	Exports		Imports	
	1929	1930	1929	1930
January	$14,749	$13,200	$15,767	$12,188
February	13,629	9,209	14,128	9,773
March	13,426	9,270	15,642	12,723
April	13,447	10,955	15,758	13,118
May	11,463	7,209	21,121	12,106
June	11,925	8,455	16,674	10,102
July	10,579	7,812	18,859	10,300
August	14,049	7,352	16,049	9,720
September	12,547	7,670	11,446	7,250
October	15,250	12,613	14,034	5,962
November	11,262	10,010	9,964	5,315

Compiled in Far Eastern Section, January 24, 1931.

Trade with silver-using countries, as shown in the figures of the Department of Commerce, dropped materially in 1930.

Total values of exports and imports of merchandise of United States with silver-using countries

[In thousands of dollars]

	Twelve months ended December—	
	1929	1930
Exports to—		
Central America	90,756	68,262
Mexico	133,863	116,214
Argentina	210,288	129,829
Brazil	108,788	53,805
Chile	55,776	46,409
Colombia	48,983	25,130
Ecuador	6,069	4,865
Peru	26,176	15,722
Uruguay	28,245	21,432
Venezuela	45,325	32,969
Total	754,269	514,637
Imports from—		
Central America	44,770	38,627
Mexico	117,738	80,293
Argentina	117,581	71,890
Brazil	207,686	130,854
Chile	102,025	54,785
Colombia	103,525	97,139
Ecuador	5,830	5,554
Peru	30,167	21,284
Uruguay	18,677	12,354
Venezuela	51,224	36,868
Total	799,223	549,648

Annual highest, lowest, and average price of silver since 1923

[From the report of the United States Bureau of the Mint]

	Highest	Lowest	Average
1923	$0.69000	$0.62875	$0.65239
1924	.72375	.63000	.67111
1925	.73187	.66812	.69406
1926	.68937	.51812	.62428
1927	.60312	.54187	.56680
1928	.63937	.56812	.58488
1929	.57812	.46812	.53306
1930	.45331	.32945	.38466

Price of silver February 9, 1931, $0.265.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14675) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Fletcher	McGill	Shortridge
Barkley	Frazier	McKellar	Smith
Bingham	George	McMaster	Smoot
Black	Gillett	McNary	Steck
Blaine	Glass	Metcalf	Steiwer
Blease	Goff	Morrison	Stephens
Borah	Goldsborough	Morrow	Swanson
Bratton	Gould	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Brock	Hale	Norbeck	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Harris	Norris	Townsend
Bulkley	Harrison	Nye	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
Dale	Jones	Reed	Watson
Davis	Kean	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Deneen	Kendrick	Schall	Williamson
Dill	King	Sheppard	
Fess	La Follette	Shipstead	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma obtained the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I send to the desk and ask to have read by the clerk an editorial appearing in the New Republic of February 11, 1931.

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

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

THE WEEK

President Hoover is engaged in a desperate gamble with death in his refusal to accept money from the Public Treasury for the victims of the drought. He is assuming that the Red Cross has or can obtain sufficient funds to carry all the victims through the period, which will be several months at the least, until they can again help themselves. The Red Cross is now seeking to raise $10,000,000 and is encountering difficulties in doing so. It would have been reasonable to suppose, in view of the appalling nature of the emergency, that it would have had the entire amount in hand by February 1, yet on that date it had raised less than one-half the total. It has some other money available; nobody knows how much; and Judge Payne refuses to be candid in his public statements on the subject, although the Red Cross is a quasi-official agency. It is also keeping secret the facts about the size of the emergency and the probable total expenditure which will be required. We know, however, that 750,000 persons are now wholly destitute, three times as many as were being helped one month ago; that the number is increasing "ten or twenty thousand a day"; that nearly half the States in the Union are affected in greater or less degree; that at least 40 per cent of the rural population in Kentucky must be aided; that conditions are still worse in Arkansas. Forty per cent of the rural population of Kentucky, which is our seventeenth State in size of population, means 400,000 persons. If the same ratio were maintained in Arkansas—it may prove to be much higher—300,000 more must be added; and there are 20 other States in distress.

The Red Cross has been conducted in such a way as to cause grave loss of confidence in the competency of its leaders; and President Hoover is so habitually wrong in his statistical statements, and, above all, in his forecasts of the future, that it is hard to put much reliance on his belief that the funds now in sight are sufficient to meet the emergency. The alternative is tragic, and we hope with all our hearts that he is right. Yet we can not help thinking of the ironic contrast between the Hoover of to-day and the Hoover who was the rescuer of babies in Europe a decade ago. Then he did not hesitate to use Government funds for food; millions of dollars were so expended under his direction. Long after the conflict was over he spent huge sums from the United States Treasury to feed the victitms of war and famine abroad. If the victims of drought in Arkansas or Kentucky could transport themselves half around the world and move backward 10 years in time his scruples would not exist. As it is, he is willing to have the Government buy them grain and farm machinery—provided they can live to sow the seed and reap the harvest, he will feed their livestock for them; but when it comes to food, clothing, and shelter for themselves and their families, he can only say, "Judge Payne hopes to raise enough money by private charity, even in these hard times, to keep you alive; and, on the chance that he will be able to do so, the door of the United States Treasury must be locked against you, lest the Budget be unbalanced and the taxes on the wealthier elements in the community be increased." There must be millions of Americans who are rubbing their eyes and saying, "Is this the Hoover we saw at work in Belgium?"

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, it is now almost 5 o'clock. I do not desire at this time to speak. The fact is, I never take the floor unless I feel it is my duty so to do. What I shall have to say upon this report in the main will be in relation to the method and manner in which the Indian citizens of the United States are being treated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

However, I will refer briefly to the relief item before proceeding to the second phase of my objections.

I made a statement on a former occasion that there was not a mouthful of food in this entire $20,000,000. The developments in the past 24 hours have demonstrated the soundness of that position.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a copy of Senate Resolution 446, known as the Borah resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be requested to advise the Senate as soon as practicable:

First. Whether he understands that the second paragraph or subdivision of the amendment to the Interior Department appropriation conference report relating to drought relief included in its terms food, clothes, and medicines.

Second. Whether he understands that a fair and sympathetic interpretation of said amendment would cover food, clothes, and medicines.

Third. Is there any prohibition therein which precludes the use of money secured by loans thereunder being used for the purchase of food, clothes, and medicines?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask that immediately following the Borah resolution there be inserted in the RECORD a copy of what may be termed the Hyde reply.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

[Telegram]

LOUISVILLE, KY., *February 12, 1931.*

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Capitol:

My attention has been called to the resolution of inquiry directed to me regarding the proposed amendment to joint resolution No. 211, for relief of farmers in the drought-stricken areas approved December 20. As I have already indicated, it is not my understanding that the reason for this legislation is to provide loans for food but for purposes beyond those already made by the joint resolution referred to which may be necessary to secure a crop and where the emergency for such assistance exists. The provision of food, medicine, and clothes by gift is the major purpose of the Red Cross, who are now generously meeting this need and are able to do so. Their services are particularly necessary to the great numbers of tenants and others who have no security to offer for loans and to whom the creation of a debt for food would be a hopeless burden. On the other hand, it is my understanding that the major purpose of this additional legislation is in effect to restore the weakened credit situation and that when loans under any part of the amendment are made to those who have the securities indicated for that purpose and for making the next crop and for rehabilitation from drought, there could be no prohibition against the proceeds of such loans being used for food or other supplies if they were necessary to effect the purpose. I am confident that the organization and relief by the combined agencies will adequately care for the drought sufferers. Fair and sympathetic interpretation of authority granted to the Department of Agriculture would be only natural in view of its close contacts and particular interest in those affected. The department will certainly give such administration.

ARTHUR M. HYDE,
Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I will not ask that these be read, but I will ask that I may have the privilege of inserting in the RECORD some telegrams and letters and data without their being read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I also ask unanimous consent that such data as requested may be read at the desk by the reading clerk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator desire to have them read now?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. From time to time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read from time to time, as requested.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, it is now 4.55 o'clock. I ask that the reporter be requested to prepare a copy of the unanimous-consent request and lay it upon my desk forthwith.

I would not take the floor at this time——

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What is the unanimous-consent request to which the Senator refers?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I now have unanimous consent to have read at the desk such data as I may present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That order has been entered.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I did not understand what the request was.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood the Senator from Oklahoma to say that in the course of the remarks he was about to make there would be certain data affecting the subject which he was discussing, and that he would ask from time to time that they be read from the desk; and, without objection, that order was entered.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not so understand the request, Mr. President. I understood that the Senator had sent to the

desk something to be read. I certainly can not consent to having the time of the Senate taken up here all day to-morrow by the reading of articles sent to the desk. If the Senator wants to take the time——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am not yielding for any suggestion from the Senator from Utah.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio will state it.

Mr. FESS. I listened to the request made by the Senator from Oklahoma that from time to time he would send matters to the desk to be read by the clerk. Did I understand the decision of the Chair to be that an objection could not be made at the time when an article was sent up to be read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood the Senator from Oklahoma to make his unanimous-consent request in this form of words, that from time to time as he proceeded with his discussion of the question there would be data affecting questions he was discussing, and that he asked unanimous consent that such data from time to time should be read from the desk. The Chair asked if there was objection, and none was entered.

Mr. FESS. None having been entered, then the Senator from Oklahoma could send up a book to-morrow and have it read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the present occupant of the chair is in the chair at such time, I do not think the Senator from Ohio need be under any apprehension that that will be done, because under the other rule, if objection is made to the reading of a paper, the Chair will entertain it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I was about to say that I would not take the floor if it did not now appear that hundreds, that thousands, yes, even millions of our fellow citizens are not to be taken care of in this emergency. I presume now to speak for those who can not speak for themselves, for those who can not help themselves.

No relief has been provided in the Interior Department appropriation bill for the unemployed, or in any bill that has been passed or is pending with prospects for consideration at this session of the Congress. No relief measure has been passed by this Congress, or is now proposed, to take care of the hungry, those who may be cold, those who are sick, those who may be afflicted, or the widows and the orphans.

No other proposition with prospects of passage is pending before Congress save this now before us. The other body has made that clear. It was stated in the other body on Saturday that this was an omnibus proposition, that everything is merged herein.

We shall hear no more of the Capper bill—the bill to make available 20,000,000 bushels of wheat, now owned by the Government, for those who may be hungry. That bill, along with others, is merged in this item in the report now pending before us.

Mr. President, on a former occasion in the Senate by unanimous vote there was placed in this bill a provision to give the Red Cross $25,000,000 to use to help the particular class I have just enumerated. But now that class has been forgotten, and when the conferees came back with their report, what did we find? We found the report omitting the unemployed in the country and in the city, forgetting the hungry, forgetting those who may be cold, those who may be sick, those who may be afflicted, even forgetting the widows and the orphans.

Mr. President, the Senate on various occasions has gone on record in favor of helping those classes of our people. No longer ago than yesterday a resolution was passed through this body asking the Secretary of Agriculture whether or not this bill, if passed, would permit him to loan money for the purpose of purchasing food and clothes and medicine. I desire at this time briefly to analyze his reply.

What I stated on a former occasion is the interpretation given by the Secretary of Agriculture. It is the interpretation given by the House of Representatives. It is the interpretation of the administration. Others may be in doubt, but no doubt exists in my mind as to what the compromise means. Here is what it means, as Mr. Hyde says:

> It is not my understanding that the reason for this legislation is to provide loans for food.

The permission is not in this bill, so says Mr. Hyde, to make loans for food or to provide money with which to purchase food. There being no purpose, there being no intent, there being no reason, of course the money will not be loaned for the purpose of buying food or clothes or medicine. That being true, my statement made a day or two ago that there is not a single meal nor a single mouthful of food in this entire $20,000,000 stands unchallenged and unanswered.

Further, said Mr. Hyde:

> The provision of food, medicine, and clothes by gift is the major purpose of the Red Cross.

Reason No. 2: There is no food or clothes or medicine in the bill. Further, said Mr. Hyde, speaking of the Red Cross:

> Their services are particularly necessary to the great numbers of tenants and others who have no security to offer for loans.

What does Mr. Hyde say? He says "tenants." What is a tenant? It was suggested this afternoon that tenants perhaps were synonymous with peasants and live in some of the Southern States. The Senator, representing a great Southern State, denied that he had peasants among his constituency. In some places they are called "share croppers." A tenant is a man who lives in or on some other man's property. In the Hyde reply the term refers to "share croppers," men who rent some other man's land and farm it on the shares—so much of the wheat for rent, so much of the cotton for rent, and so much of the other crops for rent. So under this bill the tenant farmers are not included and they are not protected.

Others who have no security for loans are not protected. What does the amendment cover? Mr. Hyde tells us that the $20,000,000 is for but two purposes: First, it is "to restore the weakened credit situation, and that when loans under any part of the amendment are made to those who have the securities." Instead of giving this money to the Red Cross as we intended, to help the unemployed, to help the hungry, to help those who are cold, to help the sick and the afflicted, and the widow and the orphan, the purpose is entirely reversed, and now we are to help the weakened credit situation and this money is to be loaned to those who have security.

Let me call attention to the next to the last sentence in this remarkable document. I read:

> Fair and sympathetic interpretation of authority granted to the Department of Agriculture would be only natural in view of its close contacts and particular interest in those affected.

That is a peculiar statement. Mr. Hyde says that "fair and sympathetic interpretation of authority granted to the Department of Agriculture would be only natural." He there casts a doubt upon his own fairness to interpret and administer this legislation. Then he proceeds to argue in favor of his fairness. He says: "I will consider this legislation fairly because of my close contacts and particular interest in those affected." Who are "those affected"? Not the unemployed, not the tenant farmer, not those who may be hungry, not those who may be sick; but those affected, which means the credit corporations, the stockholders in such credit corporations who have stock to hypothecate with which to secure loans, and, perhaps, as has been suggested, the plantation owners.

Mr. President, the issue is narrowed, cleared, and well defined. The administration has definitely decided in this proposal to help one class, and that is the class that does not need help. The class that needs help—the unemployed in the cities and those who have no security in the country—are to get no relief.

Mr. President, who among our people have had help at the hands of the Congress since this depression started? Let me call attention to the record already made. Immediately after the stock-market crash something over a year ago, when Wall Street was in a frenzy, when the stock-market operators in that area were demoralized, what happened? Presumably a committee came to Washington, because in a few days thereafter there was sent a recommen-

dation to the Congress and immediately thereafter a bill was introduced proposing relief for Wall Street and those who were operating in its stocks. No sooner had that bill been presented when everything was swept aside and the bill was rushed hurriedly through the Congress giving to Wall Street and the stock-market manipulators relief to the extent of $160,000,000. That was relief for Wall Street.

What else? A bill passed recently appropriating $45,000,000; for whom? For those who have credit, and to this good hour not a single penny has been appropriated for those who may be in the direst of distress.

Then we have in this appropriation bill an item of $20,000,000 to be loaned to credit corporations, to be loaned to those who have stock in such credit corporations, and to be loaned to planters. I doubt, if this bill should pass, whether or not many planters would or could avail themselves of the opportunity of securing loans from the $20,000,000. However, that remains to be seen.

Mr. President, the Senate has passed upon this question repeatedly in a way indicating that we desire to help the class that now has no help in sight, the classes I have enumerated—the unemployed, the hungry, the cold, the sick, and the widows and orphans.

Mr. President, what is government for? I hold that one of the supreme functions of government is to help those who can not help themselves. Acting on this, with me, established policy, I now ask unanimous consent that the conference report on this bill (H. R. 14675) be rejected and that the House of Representatives be requested to grant a further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on said bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this session of Congress is about over. At 12 o'clock noon on March 4 this session ends. Instead of the economic, drought, and human conditions getting better they are getting worse.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. For what purpose?

Mr. SMOOT. I simply want to state to the Senator that if he does not feel like proceeding further to-night I am perfectly willing to ask for a recess at this time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am willing to yield for that purpose, upon the condition that I shall be recognized at the beginning of the next session of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no question about that, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Very well.

RECESS

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 a. m. to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, February 13, 1931, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 12 (legislative day of January 26), 1931

DISTRICT JUDGE, DIVISION NO. 3, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

E. Coke Hill, of Alaska, to be district judge, Division No. 3, District of Alaska. (He is now serving in this position under an appointment which expires February 14, 1931.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Harry M. Reed, of Iowa, to be United States attorney, northern district of Iowa, to succeed Bennett E. Rhinehart, whose term expires February 28, 1931.

Frederick H. Tarr, of Massachusetts, to be United States attorney, district of Massachusetts. (He is now serving in this position under an appointment which expired December 21, 1930.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

To be colonel

Lieut. Col. Sydney Smith, Infantry, from February 6, 1931.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Walter Raymond Wheeler, Infantry, from February 6, 1931.

To be major

Capt. Frederick LeRoy Black, Quartermaster Corps, from February 6, 1931.

To be captain

First Lieut. Harold Lyman Clark, Air Corps, from February 6, 1931.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. Hubert Whitney Ketchum, jr., Cavalry, from February 6, 1931.

Second Lieut. Marcel Gustave Crombez, Infantry, from February 7, 1931.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Henry Poindexter Carter, Medical Corps, from February 11, 1931.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Second Lieut. Wilburt S. Brown to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of June, 1930.

Second Lieut. Theodore B. Millard to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of June, 1930.

Second Lieut. Albert L. Gardner to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July, 1930.

Second Lieut. Samuel S. Ballentine to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 9th day of July, 1930.

Second Lieut. James P. S. Devereux to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of August, 1930.

Second Lieut. David K. Claude to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of August, 1930.

Second Lieut. Edward J. Trumble to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September, 1930.

Second Lieut. Harold D. Harris to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September, 1930.

Second Lieut. Martin S. Rahiser to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of September, 1930.

Second Lieut. Frank J. Uhlig to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 16th day of September, 1930.

Second Lieut. Adolph Zuber to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of September, 1930.

Second Lieut. Robert E. Hogaboom to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October, 1930.

Second Lieut. Francis H. Brink to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October, 1930.

Second Lieut. James Snedeker to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 12th day of October, 1930.

Second Lieut. John D. Blanchard to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November, 1930.

The following-named noncommissioned officers of the Marine Corps to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, probationary for two years, from the 10th day of February, 1931:

Corpl. Marcellus J. Howard. Sergt. Norman Hussa.
Corpl. August Larson. Corpl. Henry T. Elrod.

The following-named noncommissioned officers of the Marine Corps to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, probationary for two years, from the 10th day of February, 1931:

Corpl. Donovan D. Sult.
Sergt. Robert L. McKee.
Corpl. Edward B. Carney.

Quartermaster Clerk Robert M. O'Toole to be a chief quartermaster clerk in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenant, from the 26th day of December, 1930.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1931

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, our Heavenly Father, the One who comes with the rising morn and the One who stays when the sun goes down, hear our prayer in the name of Him who taught us all to pray. While our lives are rooted in occupation and industry, O let us remember that the flowers take their beauty and fragrance from the heavens above. In the immortal name of the rugged son of the West, call us to surrender our wills to the one supreme allegiance to Columbia, our dear homeland. Thus reminded, may we be deeply thankful for the conspicuous sons of our Nation's past. They are the heritage of the Republic. They have made a cathedral aisle out of our history, and its walls are crowded with the splendid tablets and memorials commemorating their contribution to our civilization. May they live in the throbbing heart of the present, urging us on to greater issues and vaster deeds. O Lord God, as they sleep, pillowed in the bosom of kindly mother earth, where the call of duty shall no more summon them, may we, the living, be loyal and true to our country and hope, work, and pray for its highest good. 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. 8583. An act for the relief of the State of Maine and the city of Portsmouth, N. H.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the following titles:

H. R. 8159. An act to authorize appropriation for construction at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.; Fort Lewis, Wash.; Fort Benning, Ga.; and for other purposes; and

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.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may sit during the sessions of the House for the remainder of this session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, may I suggest to the gentleman that he amend that request by making it the balance of this week, and then we can determine whether it is further necessary.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request to this extent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut as modified?

There was no objection.

WILL ROGERS AND DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mrs. WINGO, may insert in the RECORD, with her own remarks, a resolution passed by the American Legion at Fort Smith, Ark., indorsing Will Rogers for his work in the Red Cross relief.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a resolution passed by Voiture 1082, Forty and Eight, in connection with the American Legion of Fort Smith, Ark., praising the great work of Mr. Will Rogers for the stricken people of the drought section. The people of Arkansas deeply appreciate all that Mr. Rogers has done to bring hope and relief to a distressed humanity.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolution

Whereas the person who serves his country in times of peace by extraordinary self-sacrifice is as much a patriot and hero as the person who serves in times of war; and

Whereas the motive of the person in time of peace is not inflamed by the tension of martial feeling, but is a quiet understanding of the principles of mercy, charity, and patriotism; and

Whereas the United States of America recognizes the high degree of patriotism exhibited in war by the issuance of three medals called the congressional medal of honor, given to the warrior who performs valorous deeds out of the line of his ordinary duty; the distinguished-service cross, for the person who performs valorous deeds in line of duty; and the distinguished-service medal for the civilians who perform valorous services in times of war; and

Whereas the United States of America is now in a financial crisis due to the vagaries of nature, and untold sufferings and misery and want prevail and are weakening the fibers of the structure of patriotism and making it a prey for forces seeking to disintegrate the fundamentals of our Constitution; and

Whereas among all agencies tending to alleviate the desperate conditions existing, the most outstanding personal agency is Will Rogers, who, inspired with love of country and a sympathetic feeling for suffering humanity, is making a sacrifice of his time, his money, and is making use of his unusual talents to awaken the people of America to the problems confronting them by giving lectures in the country and letting the proceeds be used for relief work; and

Whereas he not only procures moneys, food, clothing, and material by this method but he also by his wit and wisdom and good cheer strengthens the morale of the citizenship at large, thereby combating the insidious and hidden force of evil; and

Whereas, we, Voiture 1082 of the Forty and Eight connected with the Victor Ellig Post of the American Legion, of Fort Smith, Ark., do hereby believe that such patriotism as exhibited by Will Rogers, even though not in time of war, should be regarded by the entire Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the voiture in regular meeting assembled call upon the Government of the United States to bestow upon Mr. Will Rogers the distinguished-service medal or to commemorate his relief work by having a special medal struck and presented to him; and be it further

Resolved, That the Fort Smith Voiture call upon all voitures in the country, all Legion posts, the citizens of Arkansas, the legislative assembly of Arkansas, the national representatives of our State and the entire Nation, for assistance in rendering to Mr. Will Rogers this just honor for his performance of humanitarian service.

Adopted: Fort Smith Voiture 1082, Forty and Eight.

WILL D. O'SHEA, *Chef de Gare.*

EDWARD H. SMITH, *Correspondent.*

Presented by JAMES K. JORDAN, *Voyageur.*

SOVIET DUMPING AND COMMUNISTIC ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an extension of my remarks and include quotations from the New York Times and other publications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I present for printing in the RECORD extracts from a statement entitled "Trade with the Soviets," and from a memorandum entitled "Bolshevism, One of the Agents of the Economic Crisis," both dated January, 1931.

From sources entitled to consideration, these documents come to me as a Member of the House and of its Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, dealing with immigration and deportation questions. The statements are pertinent to questions now being considered by the Ways and Means Committee and to the present acute economical situation in the United States.

My own information as to alleged facts presented is too restricted to permit me to vouch for the accuracy of these statements or the correctness of conclusions reached. Nevertheless, the channels through which these statements come to me, and the character and importance of the facts stated, prompt me to place these extracts where they can be read and considered by those who are interested in the situ-

ation with which they deal. The importance of that situation makes it and every fact related to it worthy of careful consideration.

THE FORCED LABOR OF THE WORKERS

For its part, the central council of the Communist Party decided on October 20, 1930: "The commissariats of labor of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and the federated states are authorized to transfer trained workers, mechanics, and engineers already in work to another occupation in an enterprise of another kind or in a similar enterprise situated in another region. * * * Any worker who refuses the work offered—even if this work is not his specialty and if the acceptance of this work entails removal to another part of the country—will be immediately struck off the registers of the labor exchanges. * * * No other motive for refusal will be accepted than illness duly certified by a medical board of control.

"All workers leaving an undertaking, whether of their own free will or owing to dismissal for infractions of labor discipline, will be regarded as deserters. * * * During the six months following their dismissal from the undertaking they will have no right to any employment in the industry. * * *

"Workers who seek only their own personal interest, without consideration for the needs of the national economy, and the realization of the 5-year plan, may be struck off the registers of the labor exchanges." The texts were published more fully on November 10, 1930, by the international labor office.

We extract from the Pravda of October 22, 1930, the following communication, addressed to the trade-unions and the young communists (we abbreviate in certain places):

"To be able to assure to our mines, our building yards, and our forestal exploitations a sufficient staff, the communists and the trade-unions have given the labor organs the task of completing the recruiting of 103,000 agricultural workers to transfer them before the 15th of October to the coal mines, to supply immediately 150,000 workers for the most important building yards, to make up the deficit in the personnel employed in transporting timber by waterway, and to assure for all the 'shock quarter' (October-December, 1930) an uninterrupted supply of labor to the forestal exploitations; that is to say, 964,000 woodcutters and 1,109,000 workers with horses for transport.

"The bureaucracy working too slowly; organize yourselves in the industrial and agricultural undertakings; special brigades to recruit this personnel and send them to the mines, to the lumber camps, and the building yards.

"(Signed) ZIKHON,
"*The Commissar of Labor.*
"VEINBERG,
"*The Secretary of the Pan-Russian Council of Trade-Unions.*
"SALTANOV,
"*The Secretary of the C. C. of Young Communists.*"

These measures instituting forced labor throughout Russia have occasioned a serious effervescence even among the communists of Moscow, but they have not been abrogated.

THE CONVICTS

So far we have only examined the conditions of life of the privileged working class. Without speaking of the last bourgeois, deprived of food cards, who are ending by dying of hunger, without mentioning either the hordes of deserted children, who subsist solely by theft and prostitution, we can not remain silent concerning the immense army of convicts, condemned to a slavery worse than that of the negroes of other days, for their work plays a great rôle in soviet's dumping.

Alongside the malefactors of common law, there were at first the supposed adversaries of the present régime; the religious persecutions added many priests and believers. In the spring of 1929 there were more than 30,000 at Solovetsk alone. Since then innumerable koulaks, opposed to the confiscation of their land, have been condemned to forced labor. It has been necessary to construct new camps in the extreme north of Russia and of Siberia, where these unfortunates are employed in the lumber camps. The G. P. U. hires out for its own profit troops of these for the fisheries, and to certain mines and industries where they are exploited like beasts.

"To command so many workers the police are insufficient. They have had recourse to the method employed formerly by the slave drivers; they recruit the worst elements among the convicts, make them overseers and stimulate their zeal by more abundant food and the threat of putting them back to work like the others. The results thus obtained are, according to the chekists, "excellent." Blows rain down, and the workers are broken by overstrain, for the maximum of profit has to be got out of them. If they succumb, what matter? New supplies are always arriving.

Despite the atrocious climate, these convicts are in rags, the G. P. U. economizing clothing for its own profit and only distributing it as recompense to further increase the output of labor.

The want of food and warm clothing and the ill treatment cause many of the prisoners to do themselves intentional bodily harm to try to escape work, but those who do this are pitilessly executed. ("Dni" extracts from Nos. 97 and 99, 1930.) (Trade with the Soviets, pp. 8–10.)

SOVIET DUMPING

The soviets claim that they do no dumping, because the goods they sell at low prices cost them still less. Seeing the immoral manner in which they procure them, this is quite possible. But the expression soviet dumping has entered into common parlance, and we shall continue to use it for want of better. It fits, moreover, from the fact that these goods are sold abroad much below the prices demanded in Russia itself, although the better products are reserved for export. Here are the principal goods which serve for dumping, and they are being continually added to:

Petrol was already exported before the war, but as it is wanted everywhere, the soviets have forced their sales by an intensive exploitation of the oil beds at the risk of rapidly exhausting them. They have also restricted internal consumption and raised the price to the home consumer. Having confiscated the oil wells at their best (belonging largely to foreigners) and paying their workers miserably, the soviets are in a position to sell this product and its derivatives at far below world prices.

Timber

Pre-war Russia was already the largest supplier of timber in Europe. We have seen how the soviets have set about the intensive exploitation of the immense forests in the north of Russia and Siberia by means of forced labor. They can, therefore, export large quantities of timber at prices defying all competition.

The other producing countries are in this way subjected to catastrophic underselling.

It may be remarked that all the forestal concessions accorded by the soviets themselves to foreign capitalists have had to be liquidated after suffering heavy losses.

In Russia, where there is so much need of wood for building and heating, consumption is severely rationed and the prices high.

Coal and anthracite

Before the war Russia was an importer. Having forced the production in the Donetz Basin to the extreme and reduced internal consumption, the soviets have succeeded in exporting largely, even to the producing countries.

The inhuman labor which they demand of the workers enables them to sell, even in the United States, at half the normal price.

Ore and manganese

The output of the former exploitations has been forced, and the soviets have entered into disastrous competition with other producers. Many foreign mines have had to close down; all the rest will have to do so unless soviet dumping can be stopped.

Furs

The export is six or seven times that of 1913, mainly because the Russian population has no longer the means to clothe itself warmly as formerly.

To be able to sell still more, the animals with valuable furs, such as the blue fox and the zibeline, have been almost exterminated. The quality has fallen to such a point that the American firm of Attington refused last autumn to renew its contract with the soviets. To force their hands, these latter imprisoned the representative of the firm and threatened him with execution.

This crying abuse of power shows once more how abnormal trade with the soviets is. (La Liberté of the 30th April, 1930.)

Linen

Before the war Russia exported largely. Since agriculture has worked under the communist régime production has greatly fallen off. But despite reduced exports the soviets have, by underselling, succeeded in disorganizing the linen production of Belgium and France, for example, where defense measures have had to be taken.

Cotton cloth

Pre-war Russia only exported to the Near and Far East. The soviets have started to export to England, where they are selling good qualities at low prices to ruin the English industry, already severely hit by the lack of sales in India as a result of the boycott.

Nevertheless, the Russian people are very short of these goods, of which they can only obtain little and of bad quality.

Matches

The export of matches has largely increased, although the soviet press reports a lack of these goods in various parts of the Union of Social Soviet Republics.

Abroad, these matches are sold very much below normal prices to disorganize the industry. A certain number of countries have begun to defend themselves by introducing a match monopoly or by largely increasing customs duties.

Chemical products

The soviets have managed to create various chemical products capable of competing with those of the principal industrial countries, at all events by their prices, which are much below normal.

Opium

Whilst the League of Nations is doing its best to combat opium and its derivatives, the countries bordering Russia observe that the U. S. S. R. is secretly exporting large quantities of these products.

Foodstuffs

Soviet dumping is specially immoral when it concerns foodstuffs taken from the population, despite the increasing famine.

According to a recent press report, it seems that the Soviet Government, frightened by movements of revolt brewing in the red army, intends to suspend provisionally further exports of wheat. (Trade With the Soviets, pp. 13 to 15.)

During recent years Russia has been buying from the United States a worth-while amount of raw cotton. Cotton

growers have been suffering for a lack of a market for their cotton. Late reports, for the correctness of which I can not vouch, indicate that Russia is now developing a sufficient supply of cotton for her own use produced in southern Russia, and may soon be exporting a considerable surplus of that commodity. For whatever it is worth as information bearing upon Russia's domestic supply, and the probability of her future exportation of cotton, I insert the following from the New York Times of February 11, 1931:

Moscow, February 10.—The soviet's exportation of oil, grain, and lumber, not to mention manganese and coal, which has already caused an outcry in the United States and elsewhere, may be followed soon by more protests, this time over cotton.

The soviet contends that last year's crop of 400,000 metric tons (a metric ton is 2,204.6 pounds) of staple cotton—compared with 270,000 in 1929—was almost adequate for the demands of the home textile industry. The problem of acclimatizing Egyptian cotton has been now solved, it is declared, and this year it is expected to produce about 35,000 metric tons.

The total estimated crop for the current year is 650,000 metric tons of staple cotton, which leads an official bulletin to declare: "This will not only suffice for the expanding demands of our textile industry, but will probably raise the question of exporting the surplus warp cotton harvested this year. Small cargoes of warp cotton have already been shipped abroad in exchange for woof cotton."

In less technical terms this means that 1930 provided cotton to meet the needs of the home industry and exports enough to pay for the longer staple cotton bought abroad.

BOLSHEVISM, ONE OF THE AGENTS OF THE ECONOMIC CRISIS

The acuteness and duration of the present economic crisis are due to industrial overproduction; that is to say, to the insufficiency of markets and to lack of confidence in the future. New outlets are sought and are not found; several former markets are closed. This state of affairs results largely from the action of the Soviet Government and of the Third Internationale. As a matter of fact:

Russia, in Europe and Asia, that immense empire where everything needs to be reconstructed, is hermetically sealed against imports, with the exception of those destined for the execution of the 5-year plan, the carrying out of which will result in the final closing of the Russian market. Moreover, the purchasing power of the Soviet Government abroad is greatly inferior to the purchasing power of the former empire.

In China the chaos, favored and maintained by Moscow, reduces the volume of business and excludes the possibility of creating new.

In the Asiatic and African possessions the spirit of revolt is maintained and excited by Moscow.

Throughout the world social insecurity and economic difficulties are maintained by the immense network of organizations and agents of the Third Internationale and by the Soviet embassies and commercial missions.

THE WORKERS ARE, AND WILL BECOME MORE AND MORE, THE VICTIMS

The first victim of this bolshevist action is the worker. If this world factor of trouble and disorder and destruction which the bolshevist power represents were suppressed it would be possible to give work to millions of unemployed. Unemployment, which constitutes such a serious menace from the social as well as from the economic point of view, is preparing what the bolsheviks call the "revolutionary situation." The sixth congress of the Third Internationale which met at Moscow in the summer of 1928, formulated this menace: "It is necessary that the situation of the masses shall have become more than ordinarily painful."

We see now its execution. (Bolshevism, One of the Agents of the Economic Crisis, p. 4.)

As a disclosure of an instance in which one of the foreign-language newspapers sympathizes with and seeks to promote the purposes of the Third Internationale, I quote what is furnished me from a reliable source as a translation of an article entitled "Stream or Waterfall," by M. Olgin, editor of the Freiheit Yiddish Daily of January 28, 1931.

STREAM OR WATERFALL

The American workers like a good fight and are not afraid to hit and be hit. The American workers have no respect for direct skirmish with force against force. They have not made use of it enough yet in the skirmish of one class against the other, but the ideals, the transformation from one point of view to another, is a very quick process. It might happen in half a day; it will come. The breadlines will force themselves in the stores, into the restaurants and into the department stores. The homeless will take possession of the Commodore, the McAlpin, the Pennsylvania, the Ritz-Carlton, and the Roosevelt Hotels. The naked ones will find the warehouses where the garments and shoes are stored. They will wipe everything out of their way as they approach. As far as the laws are concerned, we must at least for that be thankful to capitalism. Capitalism itself has injected into the masses a deep disrespect for the laws. The American laws are a stinking dirt.

I am not yet ready to charge present conditions in America to the Third Internationale or to the present régime in Russia. My judgment is that present conditions are, in the main, results of causes recited by me in a speech in this House on the 9th instant, and kindred causes. But I recognize, first, that those who are seeking to forment disorder and communistic revolution here, find their readiest material in elements, a large portion of which, read only foreign language newspapers, and kindred alien elements, and second, that unfortunate conditions such as now prevail in America, tend to create a state of mind making the victims of such conditions more inclined to tolerate such ideas as those suggested in the last quoted statement.

The dumping of products of convicts and nonfree labor upon America, with the prospect of an increase of the volume of such dumping, presents a serious threat to labor and business here.

The other elements indicated by these statements remind us of the necessity of more restrictive immigration laws, and the better enforcement of both immigration and deportation laws already enacted.

BRYCE CANYON NATIONAL PARK, UTAH

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 16116, "An act to adjust the boundaries and for the addition of certain lands to the Bryce Canyon National Park, Utah, and for other purposes," and agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill and amendments.

The Clerk reported the following Senate amendments:

Page 2, line 10, after "quarter," where it appears the first time, insert ", north half south half southeast quarter northwest quarter and."

Page 2, line 13, after "half," insert "and."

Page 2, line 19, after "half" where it appears the second time, insert "and."

Page 2, line 21, strike out "northwest quarter" and insert "west half."

Page 2, lines 21 and 22, strike out "1 and 2" and insert "1, 2, 3, and 4."

Page 2, line 22, strike out "northeast quarter."

Page 2, line 22, after "4," insert "and lots 1 and 2 and south half east half section 5,".

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if this is agreeable to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS]?

Mr. COLTON. It is; I have conferred with him.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS WITHIN THE CHACO CANYON NATIONAL MONUMENT, N. MEX.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 10576, "An act to authorize exchange of lands with owners of private-land holdings within the Chaco Canyon National Monument, N. Mex., and for other purposes" and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the following Senate amendment:

Page 3, line 20, strike out "and" and insert "the."

Mr. GARNER. This, I understand, is satisfactory to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. COLTON. It is.

The amendment was agreed to.

OMNIBUS PENSION BILL

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the bill (H. R. 13518) 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, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. BUSBY. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question. How many persons are involved in the bill you are presenting?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER].

Mr. LOZIER. I will say that the pending bill comprises 667 House bills and 85 Senate bills. The total is 752 private bills. It carries an expenditure of $129,750, assuming that they will continue to live, but they are dying very rapidly.

Mr. BUSBY. In other words, this is an increase in pension expenditures of $129,000 annually in round numbers, if they continue to live?

Mr. LOZIER. Yes.

Mr. BUSBY. To what class of pensions does this bill relate?

Mr. LOZIER. This bill largely covers increases in widows' pensions from $20 to $40 a month, and in some cases from $40 to $50 a month, where the widows have reached the age of 75, 80, or 85 years, and where their condition, financially and physically, is such as to render them practically helpless.

Mr. BUSBY. What war period does it cover?

Mr. LOZIER. Only the Civil War period.

Mr. BUSBY. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 29, strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive.
Page 50, strike out lines 13 to 17, inclusive.
Page 51, strike out lines 5 to 9, inclusive.
Page 52, strike out lines 10 to 13, inclusive.
Page 56, strike out lines 21 to 24, inclusive.
Page 80, strike out lines 12 to 16, inclusive.
Page 92, strike out lines 10 to 14, inclusive.
Page 94, strike out lines 13 to 17, inclusive.
Page 104, strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive.
Page 121, after line 22, insert:

The name of Bertha Hart, helpless child of Absolom Hart, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary Lester, widow of Charles Lester, late of Company A, Seventieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Franklin D. Pierce, late of Capt. Walter P. Ingram's Company D, Halls Gap Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Preston, widow of Aaron Preston, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan S. Tidball, widow of David A. Tidball, late of Troop H, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Phebe A. Ingles, widow of Andrew Ingles, late of Company E, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteen Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Matilda E. Houlette, helpless child of Francis D. Houlette, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Nannie Young, widow of Richard Young, late of Company D, One hundred and ninth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Agnes C. DeGroot, widow of Horace W. DeGroot, late of Troop I, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella Van Alstine, widow of Lovant Van Alstine, late of Company G, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Parmelia A. Holman, widow of Squire A. Holman, late of Company A, One hundred and thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Minnie A. Hamm, former widow of James M. Sowers, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nannie Hall, widow of Benjamin F. Hall, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Hawkins, widow of Albert A. Hawkins, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Blanchard, widow of Henry M. Blanchard, late of Troop K, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha M. Green, widow of William A. Green, late of Company B, Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Melinda A. Smiley, widow of Sylvanus C. Smiley, late of Company A, Thirty-third Regiment Massachusetts Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella Jackson, former widow of Eugene H. Porter, late of the Fourth Independent Company, Ohio Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Westfall, widow of Job Westfall, late of Company D, Sixty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lizzie Antrim, widow of John Antrim, late of Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Estelle W. Wilson, widow of John R. Wilson, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Tryon, widow of Noah W. Tryon, late of Seventh Battalion, Indiana Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Adeline Barrows, widow of Dustin Barrows, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Adelaide S. Smith, former widow of Benjamin S. Smith, late of Company B, Fifty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucy Grimsley, widow of George T. Grimsley, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Myrtle Josephine Cogley, widow of Thomas S. Cogley, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Louvinah J. Price, widow of James H. Price, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Marinda DePuy, widow of Lyman M. DePuy, late of Battery I, Second Illinois Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara V. Brown, widow of John J. Brown, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Underhill, widow of Isaac Underhill, late of Company F, Ninety-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Jane Brown, widow of William R. Brown, late of Company B, Sixty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cora Shank, widow of Jesse L. Shank, late of Troop C, Eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria J. Carl, widow of Rollin M. Carl, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amelia Clapper, widow of Joseph Clapper, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Almeda Hilton, widow of Walton J. Hilton, late of Company G, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellen M. Holcomb, former widow of Martin L. Holcomb, late of Company K, Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Josephine Cook, former widow of Valentine Seigert, late of Company B, Thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Burnette, widow of Eliphez Burnette, late of Troop L, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Gordon, widow of Frederick M. Gordon, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella F. Rand, widow of James Hovey Rand, late of Captain Cootey's Independent Company Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nancy C. Jones, widow of Albert G. Jones, late of Troop E, Tenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Caroline Norris, widow of William H. Norris, late of Troop E, Fourth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frances E. Johnson, widow of Lewis Johnson, late of Troop G, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nancy Jane Harrell, widow of Henry D. Harrell, late of Twentieth Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cora Conzet, widow of John Conzet, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month, and $30 per month when she has attained the age of 60 years.

The name of Lydia M. Higgins, widow of John W. Higgins, late of Company E, Fortieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Grace Barry, widow of Milton F. Barry, late of Battery H, First Regiment New York Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Horn, widow of Henry H. Horn, late of Company A, Forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Flora J. Thrapp, former widow of John Stevens, late of Battery M, Second Regiment Illinois Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Caroline Houzelot, widow of Edward Houzelot, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda C. Wolf, widow of George Wolf, late of Troop F, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emily G. Emanuel, widow of Jonathan M. Emanuel, late of United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Simmers, widow of Andrew Simmers, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sara E. Shumard, widow of Thomas M. Shumard, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ida A. Bower, widow of Joseph M. Bower, late of Company D, One hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rhoda A. Larimer, widow of James E. Larimer, late of Company A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Vincent, widow of Robert W. Vincent, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa Mutchie, former widow of John Moog, late of Company A, One hundred and ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Georgie A. Jamison, widow of William Jamison, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Malinda Betsall, widow of Frederick Betsall, late of Company L, Sixth Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie E. Rogers, widow of Frederick E. Rogers, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary O. Stevens, widow of David S. Stevens, late of Company H, Third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara Taylor, widow of Horace Taylor, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Josie W. Witham, widow of Nathaniel R. Witham, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna F. Whiteside, widow of George Whiteside, late of Fourteenth Battery Indiana Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Smith, widow of Isam Smith, late of Company D, Eighty-third Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria S. Bird, widow of Roseberry Bird, late of Company K, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarepta Rhodes, widow of Beachum Rhodes, late of Seventh Battery Indiana Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Welch, widow of William H. Welch, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elida J. West, widow of John S. West, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mattie Riess, widow of Elias Riess, late of Company D, Sixty-first Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Clyde A. Grippin, helpless child of Henry V. Grippin, late of Company B, Thirty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Lucinda Ragsdale, widow of James E. Ragsdale, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Lewis, widow of David Lewis, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret C. Pyles, former widow of Michael Hockersmith, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Porter, widow of John C. Porter, late of Company D, Eightieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Jewell, widow of Trueworthy Jewell, late of Company A, Forty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Adelia A. Deforge, widow of Alfred Deforge, late of unassigned company, First Regiment Vermont Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha B. Wheeler, widow of Artemas H. Wheeler, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Matten, widow of Alfred Matten, late of Company B, Twenty-eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna S. Bergeson, widow of Lars V. Bergeson, late of Company I, Thirty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca S. Kerlee, widow of William H. Kerlee, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary W. Ferrin, widow of Eaton Ferrin, late of Company C, Twenty-eighth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucie B. White, widow of Henry W. White, late of Troop C, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lydia Deming, widow of Orin H. Deming, late of Troop H, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 15930) 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, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H. R. 15930, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 61, after line 21, insert:

The name of Annie L. Haynes, widow of John R. Haynes, late of Company B, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month, and $30 per month when it is shown that she has attained the age of 60 years.

The name of Harriet Norris, widow of Jeremiah Norris, late of Captain Hilbourn's company, Fourth Regiment Unattached Massa-

chusetts Military Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and $30 per month when it is shown that she has attained the age of 60 years.

The name of Elizabeth Ware, widow of Rice Ware, late of Troop M, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary C. Bliss, widow of Lyman W. Bliss, late surgeon, Fifty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Belle A. Clark, widow of William H. Clark, late of Company E, Forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Catherine Tully, widow of Edward G. Tully, alias Edward Atherton, late of Company C, Ninety-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Franklin D. Pierce, late of Capt. Walter P. Ingram's Company B, Hall's Gap Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Ruth T. Guffin, widow of Oren Guffin, late of Battery C, Fifth Regiment New York Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna E. Vetter, widow of Charles Vetter, late of Company A, Two hundred and fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Katherine G. Sexton, helpless child of Bartholomew Sexton, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Louise Claussen, widow of William Claussen, late of Troop C, First Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna Miller, widow of Lewis Miller, late of Company A, Sixty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lulu Anderson, widow of Peter Anderson, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jennie Ball, widow of Henry A. Ball, late of Battery D, Seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John B. Wardell, helpless child of Samuel B. Wardell, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Flora May Wardell, helpless child of Samuel B. Wardell, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Margaret Goodner, widow of Thomas J. Goodner, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarra Elizabeth Harrell, widow of Garrett Harrell, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Adam Ulrich, helpless child of Joseph Ulrich, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Martha A. Brand, widow of John F. Brand, late of Troop D, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucinda C. Muncey, former widow of Reuben Muncey, late of Company B, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Emory, widow of Charles Emory, late of Company H, One hundredth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hannah F. Mundell, widow of Joseph Mundell, late of Troop C, Ninth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catharine Vernum, widow of Samuel Vernum, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jane A. Johnson, widow of Reuben W. Johnson, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie Baxter, widow of Allen F. Baxter, late of Signal Corps, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie S. Sweetland, widow of Edward Sweetland, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Almira M. Stone, widow of Almanzo Scott Stone, late of Battery B, First Regiment Rhode Island Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Steere, widow of Alphonso Steere, late of Battery B, Second Regiment Massachusetts Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Mann, widow of Gilbert Mann, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza A. McCausland, widow of Norman L. McCausland, late of Battery B, First Regiment Rhode Island Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha L. Shepperd, widow of Thomas C. Shepperd, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Moncrief, widow of John C. Moncrief, late of Company I, Sixty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Edna M. W. Fales, widow of William E. Fales, late of Troop F, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jane Yates, widow of Rufus Yates, late of Company F, One hundred and nineteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Van Guilder, widow of Burnam E. Van Guilder, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cordelia Vilmire, widow of Peter Vilmire, late of First Battery, Vermont Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of May S. King, widow of David W. King, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles S. Follett, helpless child of Benjamin Follett, late of Company K, Twenty-fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Kate Neafus, widow of David B. Neafus, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Phoebe Peak, widow of Joab Peak, late of Company E, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucinda Hoskins, widow of James C. Hoskins, late of Company C, Thirty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Laura F. Carr, widow of Lemuel N. Carr, late of Company C, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cora E. Nolan, former widow of Henry D. Burlingame, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Effie Compton, widow of William D. Compton, late of Company A, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month, and $30 per month when it is shown that she has attained the age of 60 years.

The name of Emma C. Campbell, widow of Samuel Campbell, late of Company H, One hundred and third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma E. Hudelson, widow of Robert D. Hudelson, late of Company K, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Runnion, widow of Hiram E. Runnion, late of Company F, Second Regiment North Carolina Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month, and $30 per month when it is shown that she has attained the age of 60 years.

The name of Annie M. Logan, widow of Herman N. Logan, late of Company B, Thirty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet E. Delay, widow of William Warren Delay, late of Troop E, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Bell Hoggins, widow of Robert C. Hoggins, late of Company C, Twenty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jane Graham, widow of Edward J. Graham, late of Troop E, Seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha E. McPherson, widow of Nimrod B. McPherson, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Katharine Mertz, widow of Gottfried Mertz, late of Battery I, First Regiment New York Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nancy Copen, widow of William Copen, late of Company K, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma E. Bennett, former widow of Isaac D. Worster, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa A. Cleveland, widow of Charles Alonzo Cleveland, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Fannie A. Knowles, widow of Harford B. Knowles, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah S. Ward, widow of William M. Ward, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nora Ernst, widow of John Ernst, late of Company I, Two hundred and thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth May, widow of Thomas J. May, late of Company A, Fifty-eighth Regiment New York National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Woodworth, former widow of James S. Richardson, late of Troop D, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Tilford, widow of John W. Tilford, late of Troop A, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Frieda Gilliland, widow of William F. Gilliland, late of Company E, Eighty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lizzie Berry, widow of Wakefield Berry, late of Company D, Sixty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mollie A. Bellomy, widow of Robert Bellomy, late of Troop K, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month, and $30 per month when it is shown that she has attained the age of 60 years.

The name of Mary Jane Simms, widow of Theodore Simms, late of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mollie T. Graham, widow of Finley Graham, late of Company F, Thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Francis Marion Loughead, helpless child of John Loughead, late of Company E, Forty-second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Minnie T. Harris, widow of William H. Harris, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Kinnear, widow of Thomas J. Kinnear, late of Company L, Fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caroline Voit, widow of Julius Voit, late of Company A, Nineteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of India V. Krch, widow of Francis A. Krch, late of Company B, First Battalion Thirteenth United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Augusta Freeman, helpless child of Thomas B. Freeman, late of Company K. Twenty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sarah Catherine Campbell, widow of James S. Campbell, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret A. Looney, widow of William Looney, late of Troop C, Fifteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna Kath, widow of Christian D. Kath, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ann Lee, widow of Crawford Lee, late of Company I, Sixty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan T. Clark, widow of Robert H. Clark, late of Battery B, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Candalaria S. De Chavez, widow of Blas Chavez, late of Troop D, First Regiment New Mexico Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Williams, widow of Oliver J. Williams, late of Troop B, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Guptill, widow of Albert Guptill, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Bridget Hagerty, widow of John Hagerty, late of Troop C, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Salina E. Miller, widow of Charles C. Miller, late of Troop A, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alta Kimble, helpless child of Francis Kimble, late of Company K, Forty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Clementine Ferris, widow of Simeon L. A. Ferris, late of Troop L, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Sweeney, widow of Robert E. Sweeney, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elenor Eustis, widow of Lyman S. Eustis, late of Company A, Sixty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy E. Kerrihard, widow of Henry C. Kerrihard, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia C. Benner, widow of Daniel Benner, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Watson, former widow of John Wanless, late lieutenant colonel, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nettie Jerome, widow of John Jerome, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellen R. Copeland, widow of Exum Copeland, late of Company D, Thirty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Farrow, widow of Robert T. Farrow, late of Company K, Eighty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth M. Clark, widow of Henry Clark, late of Company K, Twenty-fifth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Libie Seals, widow of Isaac M. Seals, late of Company, A, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Davis, widow of James Davis, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy C. Kays, widow of John Kays, late of Company I, Nineteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Samuel E. Brown, helpless child of Samuel E. Brown, late of Company K, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Nancy J. Hash, widow of Hugh Hash, late of Company C, Ninety-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa Livingston, widow of Samuel Livingston, late of Company C, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Reed, widow of John W. Reed, late of Nineteenth Battery Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rose M. Schaeffer, widow of Edward M. Schaeffer, late hospital steward, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susie M. Gilbert, widow of Franklin T. Gilbert, late lieutenant colonel Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine A. Tipson, former widow of Marcus M. Holmes, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Louise M. Barlow, former widow of Nathaniel A. Tuttle, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mariam Hill, widow of William Hill, late of Company H, Fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emily M. Ryan, widow of Torrence E. Ryan, late of Company B, One hundred and forty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca Jane Day, widow of Peter A. Day, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Hunt, former widow of James Crowley, late of Twenty-first Company unattached Massachusetts Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hellanah Jane Fellows, widow of Peter Fellows, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henrietta Steele, widow of Jonathan M. Steele, late of Company I, Fortieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Adolia Bottsford, widow of John Bottsford, late of Troop G, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Levenia E. Irwin, widow of William M. Irwin, late of Company H, Second Independent Battalion Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary H. Rodgers, widow of James Rodgers, late of Company C, One hundred and fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Cole, widow of Bennett Cole, late of Battery M, Fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Robert Page, helpless child of Reuben Page, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Provisional Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mildred A. Clough, widow of Charles F. Clough, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amy E. Edwards, widow of George W. Edwards, late of Company A, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria L. Wood, widow of Francis Marion Wood, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Madora C. Brooks, widow of Benjamin J. Brooks, late of Company K, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Watson, widow of David M. Watson, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah L. Wilkinson, widow of Alfred G. Wilkinson, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lizzie A. Foote, widow of George F. Foote, late of Company E, Forty-eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Bradley, widow of Jacob P. Bradley, late of Company F, Seventy-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha A. Odell, widow of Leonard Odell, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George Ann Yankee, widow of David Yankee, late of Troop F, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. What procedure does the gentleman's committee take in passing on the various Senate amendments that have been added to the House bill?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. The committee, of course, has to be very careful, and so we adopted the procedure this year, and had it in part last year, of first having our experts and examiners assigned from the Bureau of Pensions pass on all bills to find whether they were strictly within the rules. I might add that I have said to each clerk or examiner that anyone that violated the rules would be discharged from the committee. The clerk rechecks all bills.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am directing my inquiry as to the Senate amendments, which run to the hundreds, perhaps.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. I desire to give the House the whole procedure. First, an expert examiner prepares a report on the bill, another expert rechecks it, and then the clerk checks again. Then we invite the expert from the Senate with the clerk to come over and object to any of our approved bills, and if they object because a bill violates the rules we lay it aside. When the bill goes to the Senate, our experts and clerks go over there and check every proposed amendment, and if any are irregular under the rule they lay them aside. This is true except in two instances. The Senate put in two bills in which I thought the widows did not need the increase, but the prime cause of disagreement died a day or two after a pension for her was adopted by the Senate committee, and so I do not ask for disagreement on the account of the other amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Every Senate amendment meets with the rules as prescribed by the committee?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Yes; except as just stated.

Mr. STAFFORD. And further, your committee clerk has gone over the respective items, and the experts have gone over them before they pass and after they pass.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. BUSBY. Who makes these rules that bar some and allow others to obtain the favor that is given in the bill?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. There are no favors. There is no Member of the House who can say that he has been granted a favor. We hold them all strictly to the rules.

Mr. BUSBY. The gentleman does not get the point. Who adopts the rules that deny relief to some and give it to others when the time of the marriage of the individual to the soldier would not vary five days one from the other?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. The Committee on Invalid Pensions have adopted rules for their own guidance.

Mr. BUSBY. Is that a part of the law or merely the rules of the committee that administers the law?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. The committee have to pass on the pension cases and have to have rules to go by. They have agreed on rules, and we have to abide by them.

Mr. BUSBY. In my district there is an old lady, Missouri Leistner Clark, who is destitute, without relatives or anyone to care for her, who married a Union soldier and remained married to him and took care of him until he died, a year and some months later. I introduced a bill for her relief. She is qualified in every way except that he did not live long enough, something for which she is not responsible.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How old was the soldier when she married him?

Mr. BUSBY. He was up in years.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How old was she?

Mr. BUSBY. About 60 or 65. I go before the gentleman's committee and am told that she is short about seven or eight or nine months of time, when her marriage took place in 1909 and he died in 1910, and that the committee can not consider her case, although she is the widow of this Union soldier, and she is the only one that I have in my district, so far as I know. I have worked every way to get her just cause recognized, and I am turned down by the committee rules.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to answer the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. LOZIER. Just as the English system of equity jurisprudence was established to grant relief in numerous cases

where the law by reason of its universality was unable to afford a remedy, so there has grown up a system of granting pensions by special acts of Congress in cases which are especially meritorious, and where by reason of the inelasticity of the general pension laws no relief can be had thereunder. This practice has been followed for many years, and I believe, is founded on a sound public policy. In order that the Pension Committees might function efficiently, it was found necessary to adopt general rules which would circumscribe the activities of the committees, and particularly define the terms and conditions under which relief might be obtained by special bills. Therefore, the House Committee on Invalid Pensions and the Senate Committee on Pensions, after careful thought and full consideration, adopted rules prescribing the character of cases that would be favorably considered. Without a set of rules to determine what character of cases the committee will favorably consider, chaos would inevitably result and grave abuses would creep into the administration of this otherwise benevolent system.

It is the policy of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to scrupulously observe these rules and grant relief in all cases that come within the purview of these rules, and to reject all claims that clearly fall outside of the rules.

These rules are applied fairly and impartially, without regard to what member introduced the bill; and the rules are vigorously enforced against each and every member of the committee who presents a bill that does not measure up to the standard prescribed by our rules.

I will also add that the rules under which our committee functions are reasonable, just and generous. I do not mean that they are perfect, but they are the result of many years of experience. There is a sound reason in support of each and every one of these rules.

A provision requiring a widow to show that she was legally married to the soldier two years before his death and lived with him continuously from the date of their marriage to the date of his death is not an unreasonable or arbitrary requirement. The lines must be drawn somewhere and it is the mature judgment of the committee that a widow should not be granted a pension by private act of Congress where the evidence shows that she was not the wife of the soldier for at least two years and did not live with him continuously from the date of their marriage to the date of his death.

Under the general pension laws a widow must show that she was married to the soldier prior to June 27, 1905, but this requirement has been liberalized by the rules of our committee, and special bills will be favorably considered where the marriage was prior to June 27, 1915, if the evidence in other respects brings the case within our rules.

Under the general pension laws, to entitle a soldier or his widow to a pension, it must be shown that the soldier had at least 90 days' actual service. Under our rules, in meritorious cases a pension will be recommended where the evidence shows 80 days' actual service. Fixing 80 days as the minimum service is no more unjust, harsh, or arbitrary than the provision under the general law which requires 90 days' actual service. In fact our rules in respect to service are much more liberal than the general pension laws. Otherwise there would be no occasion for special pension bills.

I repeat, therefore, that the rules under which the Committee on Invalid Pensions functions are reasonable, just, and generous, and they have remedied the inelasticity of our general pension laws and materially liberalized our pension policy, as well befits a just and generous Nation.

Mr. BUSBY. Why result, if the committee is a committee that is rendering equity in all cases? What have we to do to get rid of those rules? That is what I want to know.

Mr. LOZIER. The two Committees can reform or amend their rules if it is shown that they are unreasonable.

Mr. BUSBY. Do they have any legislative authority for adopting arbitrary rules of procedure which cut off a meritorious case? That is what I am asking about.

Mr. LOZIER. Of course, these rules are not based on any legislative mandate, but the committee, charged with the responsibility of passing on more bills than all other committees of the House combined, have found it necessary to adopt certain rules and regulations in order that justice may be done, and this pension policy administered in an orderly manner.

Mr. BUSBY. Is it not a fact that the two bodies have agreed on a set of rules, and each one chides the other if he transgresses those rules; that they have arbitrarily formulated among themselves, and they have left the membership of the House out of consideration and there is no legal warrant for the rules which have been adopted, to deny some cases and approve other cases?

Mr. LOZIER. May I say in conclusion to the gentleman that chaos would result if the Senate Committee on Pensions and the House Committee on Invalid Pensions and the House Committee on Pensions did not circumscribe their activities by certain rules which they think are just and generous.

Mr. BUSBY. As equitable bodies, do you not think equity ought to be administered instead of hard and fast, cut and dried rules adopted by the committees jointly, without any warrant of law?

Mr. LOZIER. It is not always easy to determine what is equity and what should be done under a given state of facts. There must be some self-imposed limitation on the action of the committee and the Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman a question. Is it not a fact that the rules and regulations which the committees have promulgated for their own guidance are general in their character, and that all cases that come within that particular class are allowed and the cases that do not come within a particular class are disallowed? So therefore it is just to all Members of Congress. Is not that the fact?

Mr. LOZIER. That is true.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. How would the experts on our committee know what to do? They have no equity jurisdiction. If they did not have rules to guide them, they could not examine these bills.

Mr. BUSBY. One further question and I am through. In other words the rules of the gentleman's committee provide that if a widow has been married to a Union soldier 1 year 11 months and 29 days she is denied relief, but if another widow has been married 2 years and 1 day, she is within your rule and is granted relief? The widow I speak of, Missouri Leistner Clark, of Kosciusko, Miss., the only one in my district, happens to be in the first class, and you can not consider her?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this is interesting to the membership. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BUSBY] has been very energetic in pressing his bill. The committee invited the gentleman to come before the committee and be heard. It is true the rules prohibit an allowance in such a case, because they had not cohabited for two years. If we start to violate the rule in one case, we will be absolutely swamped with cases behind it. A bad precedent invites abuse.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS TO CERTAIN SOLDIERS AND SAILORS OF CIVIL WAR, ETC.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speakers table 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, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 7, strike out lines 9 to 13, inclusive.

Page 58, after line 16, insert:

The name of Flora Irish, widow of George H. Irish, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Helen F. Wilcox, widow of Thaddeus H. Wilcox, late unassigned, Fifteenth Regiment New York Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lizzie C. Snow, widow of James H. Snow, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of May E. Carsten, widow of Frederick W. Carsten, late of Troop L, Sixth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Caroline Richards, widow of Henry H. Richards, late of Troop K, Third Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Agnes Messenger, helpless child of James Messenger, late of Troop K, Fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Susan Hickenlooper, widow of Thomas B. Hickenlooper, late of Company D, Twenty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Harriett E. Mitchell, widow of A. Bartley Mitchell, late of Sixteenth Independent Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Simpkins, widow of George W. Simpkins, late of Company G, Eighty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary C. Starbuck, widow of John M. Starbuck, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Kent, widow of Thomas J. Kent, late of Company B, Ninety-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Boyd, widow of Horatio N. Boyd, late of Troop L, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda J. Brooke, widow of Thomas H. Brooke, late of Military Telegraph Corps, United States Army, during Civil War, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Louisa S. Richmond, widow of William H. Richmond, late acting master's mate, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Auriela R. Johnson, widow of John Johnson, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Crippin, helpless child of John F. Crippin, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sarah F. Lambing, widow of George W. Lambing, late of Company H, One hundred and ninety-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cordelia Bodoin, widow of James Bodoin, late of Troop K, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caroline V. McCullough, widow of George A. McCullough, late of Battery F, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Pangburn, widow of Samuel V. Pangburn, late of Company A, Forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jemima McClure, widow of James McClure, late of Battery L, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elmer E. Hickman, helpless child of Charles A. Hickman, late of Company A, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Louisa J. Lewis, widow of Charles V. Lewis, late of Troop D, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Carrie M. Bearse, former widow of Samuel B. Stuart, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha V. Emery, widow of Charles A. Emery, late of Troop H, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month, and $20 per month for helpless child, Amos E., in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Amos E., helpless and dependent child of said soldier, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Martha V. Emery the name of said Amos E. Emery shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Martha V. Emery.

The name of Lee Dan McMonigle, helpless child of Henry McMonigle, late of Troop H, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Minerva C. Smith, widow of Leander Smith, late unassigned, Indiana Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Tom Kinney, helpless child of William Kinney, late of Company B, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Marie E. Combe, widow of Adrien Combe, late of Company E, Twenty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Pickard, former widow of Benjamin Smith, late of Company F, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah F. Stewart, widow of William N. Stewart, late of Company D, Sixty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month, and $20 per month for helpless child, Irma, in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Irma, helpless and dependent daughter of said soldier, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sarah F. Stewart, the name of said Irma Stewart shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Sarah F. Stewart.

The name of Minnie Pennington, widow of Dixon Pennington, late of Company C, Forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Allie M. Casad, widow of Orla S. Casad, late of Company B, Sixty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda M. I. Clark, widow of Firmin Clark, late of Company A, Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa S. Fee, widow of Nathan H. Fee, late of Troop I, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Bowers, widow of Joseph R. Bowers, late of Company F, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Bates, widow of John T. Bates, late of Fourth Battery Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Jane Williams, widow of Joseph Williams, late of Company B, Seventy-second Regiment Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rachel Patten Ricks, widow of William Ricks, late of Company G, One hundred and second Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Richards, widow of Frank Richards, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Celia Thurber, widow of Henry Thurber, late of Company F, Thirty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Walters, widow of George W. Walters, late of Company F, One hundred and eighty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Paul Manso, helpless child of James G. Manso, late of Company A, Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sarah C. Manso, widow of James G. Manso, late of Company A, Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eveline Bloodgood, widow of Augustus Bloodgood, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lena Elizabeth Wissmath, helpless child of Henry Wissmath, late of Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Hattie Carver, helpless child of Henry Carver, late of Company C, Twentieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Evelyne Qualls, widow of Nevel Qualls, late of Company C, Eighty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Greene, widow of Lester B. Greene, late of Company C, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary McLaughlin, widow of John McLaughlin, late of Company A, Two hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month, and $20 per month for helpless child, George, in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of George McLaughlin, helpless and dependent son of said Mary McLaughlin, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary McLaughlin, the name of said George McLaughlin shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions

and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary McLaughlin.

The name of Philip Gump, jr., helpless child of Philip Gump, late of Troop C, Eighteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary Martin, widow of William Martin, late of Company I, Forty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Williams, helpless child of Thomas T. Williams, late of Capt. Francis M. Vaughn's Company B, Three Forks Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, by authority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 462) to further provide for defraying the expenses of the International Water Commission, United States and Mexico, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 7 to 11, inclusive, and lines 1 to 5, inclusive, page 2, and insert: "continuing its study, in cooperation with representatives of Mexico, regarding the equitable use of the waters of the lower Rio Grande and lower Colorado Rivers and, with the concurrence of Mexico, of the Tia Juana River, for the purpose of securing information on which to base a treaty with the Government of Mexico relative to the use of the waters of these rivers, including salaries in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, fees for professional services at rates and in amounts to be determined by the Secretary of State; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses, including transportation of effects; subsistence or per diem in lieu of subsistence notwithstanding the provisions of any other act; printing and binding; subscriptions to foreign and domestic newspapers and periodicals; purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger and freight carrying vehicles; drilling and testing of dam sites by contract if deemed necessary without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); equipment, and such other miscellaneous expense as the Secretary of State may deem proper: *Provided*, That any moneys contributed by or received from the United Mexican States for the purpose of cooperating or assisting in this work shall be available for expenditure in connection with this appropriation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table 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, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WASON] asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 16415), with Senate amendments, and disagree to the same and ask for a conference.

The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman whether or not this request is agreeable to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

Mr. WASON. I think it is.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from New Hampshire if the Senate has inserted in the bill the amounts necessary for the step-ups within the grades under the classification act? Are those the amendments?

Mr. WASON. I do not know just what they are. I think they would refer to it. I have not checked them up.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Are those the only amendments?

Mr. WASON. No.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There are other amendments?

Mr. WASON. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman come back to the House if there is continued disagreement on these step-ups, according to the classification act?

Mr. WASON. I should expect we would have to come back.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman says that rather reluctantly.

Mr. WASON. I do not anticipate such a condition as the gentleman speaks of.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then I will move to concur with the Senate.

Mr. WASON. To concur with the Senate?

Mr. WOODRUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WASON. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], of course, knows there is a tentative understanding that whatever disposition is finally made on the Treasury-Post Office bill will be carried in all of these bills.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. So that the discussion is on the Treasury-Post Office bill at this time?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WASON]?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is an amendment affecting the disabled emergency officers' bill that was passed two years ago. Under the reservation of objection I ask unanimous consent to make a few observations on that amendment for about 10 minutes now before the bill goes to conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. What became of the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WASON]?

The SPEAKER. Under reservation of objection the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] asked unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, there is pending in the bill, which I trust will go to conference in the next few minutes, a provision repealing certain parts of the emergency officers' retirement bill that Congress passed over the veto of President Coolidge two years ago.

The House understands that I am one of those service men who fought the passage of that bill in the House and supported President Coolidge in his veto of it. However, it became a law and is now the law.

Charges have been made on the floor of the House and also on the floor of the Senate that certain discriminations and certain unjustified awards have been made under the provisions of that bill. I do not propose to discuss those charges. They could be reached, in my judgment, by proper committees of the House and Senate through investigations or by proper handling within the Veterans' Bureau itself.

In order to reach that situation there was put in the independent offices bill in the Senate this proviso:

Provided, however, That no person shall on and after July 1, 1931, be entitled to and/or paid retired pay under the disabled emergency officers' retirement act of May 24, 1928 (45 Stat. 735), for any period during which he is receiving a salary, pay, and/or compensation from the United States which exceeds $2,000 per annum; and said disabled emergency officers' retirement act of May 24, 1928, is hereby amended accordingly.

A number of the service men of the House who fought that bill fought it because it created a series of unjustified discriminations between America's men who fought during the late war.

I want to discuss this proviso with relation to the men whom Congress declared should be the beneficiaries of this act. I have not changed my views about the act one iota. I still believe it was wrong and should not be the law. However, in an attempt to correct specific instances of alleged unjust allowances a provision affecting all the dis-

abled service men who were emergency officers who are now in the Government service and who are receiving more than $2,000 a year is proposed.

The first bill set up a series of violent and unjust discriminations. I want to point out to you the discriminations which the Senate amendment now proposes to add to that bill.

We have encouraged the disabled service men to enter the Government service. We have given them a preference in civil-service examinations; we have given them 10 per cent in addition to their earned grades, and had them placed at the head of the civil-service eligibility lists. Now, when an emergency officer, in compliance with the declared policy of the Congress, has secured a Government position, which he has been held qualified to fill, it is proposed to penalize him while holding that position, after having encouraged him to take it. The first discrimination which the Senate proviso puts into the situation is a discrimination against the emergency officer who is serving the United States as compared with the emergency officer who is in private pursuits. What fundamental difference is there between the officer who is a civil-service employee of the State or a municipality and the Federal Government? The amendment affects only those working for the United States. It allows those working for other governmental agencies to continue to receive both payments. Now that, I take it, is wrong. Then the next discrimination is that we have in the Government service a number of disabled men who were enlisted men during the war. They are receiving compensation, and rightfully so. They are allowed to keep their compensation, and rightfully so; but this proviso would take compensation entirely away from the man who is qualified under the law to receive the compensation granted to a disabled emergency officer. That, I believe, is an unjustified discrimination between two groups of service men, both of whom work for the United States.

Another discrimination is set up if the Senate amendment should be accepted. Take for instance the case of two men in the Government service. Both of them were emergency officers and one of them, in the classified service, receives $160 a month or $1,920 a year; the other man in the classified service receives $170 a month or $2,060 a year. Both of them are disabled emergency officers; both of them receive an allowance of $150 a month under the disabled emergency officers' bill at the present time. Now, what would the Senate proposal do? It would penalize the most efficient of those two men. The salary difference would be $10 a month. The man receiving in the classified service $170 a month would be penalized $150 a month by having his retired pay withheld, but the man who draws the less competent salary of $160 a month would be allowed to keep his $150 a month disability pay. That is a discrimination which I feel is entirely unmerited. If we are going to act to correct this matter we should proceed in an entirely different way. I know nothing about the abuses which may have gone on in the Veterans' Bureau, if any, but I do know about the discriminations which the emergency officers' retirement bill created. However, that has been decided. Congress ought not to further discriminate against groups of service men in the Government service, and between groups of service men within and without the Federal establishment.

I am making these observations for what they may be worth to those on the conference committee in order that they may meet this problem with the Senate.

As I have always stated, I have no apologies whatever for the opposition I voiced on the floor of this House to the passage of the original bill, and were it before us now that opposition would be voiced again at this time as it was prior to the passage of the law. I have not changed my mind one bit about it.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DYER. From the gentleman's remarks I take it he feels that the proper thing to do, if we are going to act at all upon this matter, would be to attack the act itself and repeal it.

Mr. SIMMONS. You can not remove the discriminations of that act by setting up a series of other discriminations.

Mr. DYER. No, sir.

Mr. SIMMONS. And that is what the Senate amendment does.

Mr. DYER. In other words, we should go along probably with it as it is until the Congress decides whether or not it will repeal the act itself.

Mr. SIMMONS. There is only one way to meet the problem and remove existing discriminations, and that is by direct action on the question as to whether or not the bill shall be repealed. To meet the specific problem that has been raised on the floor of the House and Senate on this question there ought to be an investigation either by the Veterans' Bureau or by the committees of the Congress, if they see fit, with respect to the administration of the law. What I am objecting to now is the setting up of additional discriminations by law in an attempt to correct certain violations and wrongful allowances under the existing law.

Take the case of two men, one of them in the Government service whose case was properly allowed and whose retirement pay could not be questioned, he is affected by this amendment and his retirement pay taken away just as well as the man who may have received retirement pay when he was not entitled to it.

Mr. SWICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SWICK. Does the gentleman have any figures as to how many have been placed on these rolls during the past year of 1930?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; but it amounts to several thousand. The hearings probably will show that.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to know if there has been any assurance given on the part of the chairman of the committee as to whether or not the House will be given an opportunity to express itself on this amendment before any action to concur in the Senate amendment is taken.

Mr. SIMMONS. I take it the chairman of the committee could not give that assurance. I have taken this means of calling this matter to the attention of the House that you may consider it and be in a position to act upon the amendment itself if it comes back or act upon any substitute for the amendment that may be offered by the conferees.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point for the purpose of introducing into the RECORD specific instances to demonstrate the truth of the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS].

I have some information—I do not like to take the time of the House to recite it now—and I would like to place it in the RECORD here as a part of my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I add:

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] has presented most ably the matters I had in mind and others in addition. I hope his observations will be carefully noted and that Congress may later, and in a more appropriate manner, deal with these inequalities.

When this matter was first broached, in connection with consideration of the bill we have before us, by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] I was in full sympathy with his general purpose. I believe every Member of Congress has had individual experiences with claims and rating boards in regional offices of the bureau, and in the appeals groups in the central office, which has given rise to dissatisfaction, with these retirement facts and figures in mind.

I have battled for more than a year, I confess, with the temptation to pay my respects on the floor of this House to a certain doctor, now on this retired list, and to his method of administering justice to claimants whose claims

his board considered. But I have not done so; now, I am glad for this individual has since that time exhibited a more human attitude.

The day after adoption of this so-called Reed amendment in the Senate I received a telegram, signed jointly by 25 officers now drawing retirement pay under the emergency officers' retirement act. Of these only four will be affected by the amendment, if it is enacted. They state:

The undersigned earnestly urge that the Reed amendment to H. R. 16415 providing stoppage of retirement pay to Federal employees be not embodied in said House bill. We believe such legislation to be hasty and lacking proper consideration. To enact such legislation would result in punishing the many in an effort to correct few apparent questionable cases and would not result in any advantage to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, among the names affixed to this message I find that of J. H. Fraine. I want the House to know what manner of man he is. Born in 1861, he is now about 70 years old, yet is serving with distinction as our regional attorney in the Fort Snelling office of the Veterans' Bureau. Not only that but he is mentally alert and actively engaged in the trial of the many war-risk insurance cases filed in our State, in addition to supervising the affairs of nearly 1,600 mentally incompetent and lesser beneficiaries of the bureau. All this he does in a manner that places his office beyond criticism.

Continuously since 1885 he has seen active service in the National Guard or in the United States Army. His Army service includes service in the Spanish-American War, the Mexican border campaign, and the World War, concluding the latter with service in the expeditionary forces from December, 1917, to June, 1919, with the rank of colonel.

I shall want to see more concrete evidence of widespread abuse and dishonesty in connection with operation of the emergency retirement act before I can feel justified in supporting such an amendment as has been added to this appropriation bill. I can not feel that I should properly penalize a man of this caliber and with such a record of long and brilliant service in order to reach any individual or group who I am convinced have manipulated this law, or who I suspect of having abused the spirit of this law, or who I feel are being too generously treated.

I find another name attached to the telegram. It is that of Dr. Henry V. Hanson, a member of the surgical staff in the Fort Snelling Veterans' Hospital. He served with the Army in France during the last war, under fire again and again; and there is not a fair-minded man who would not admit that he eminently deserves recognition of his disabilities, all of which, I am told on good authority, are direct in their connection to his service. And there are others like the two I have described.

Indorsement of the purpose and scope, the rates and provisions of the act—that is quite another matter. But I do hold with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] that the House should give attention to considerations like these.

If that is done, I believe it will be agreed that remedial steps should come from another direction and in another manner than the one proposed in the amendment numbered 72 to the independent offices appropriation bill; or, if it is accepted, it may be in an amended form that will except men like these.

I believe, if each Member of the House will undertake to inquire into the affected personnel in the respective regional offices and elsewhere throughout the governmental offices—even this House—the truth of these statements can easily be established. I trust the conferees will insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WASON]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WASON, SUMMERS of Washington, and WOODRUM.

There was no objection.

REFUNDS TO CERTAIN RAILROADS

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 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, be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. There is some question as to whether this bill should go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or to the Claims Committee. The chairman of the Claims Committee is perfectly willing that the bill should go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CELLER. What bill is this?

Mr. PARKER. It is a refund bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

JOHN M. FLYNN

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3644) for compensation in behalf of John M. Flynn, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of John M. Flynn, who was injured May 4, 1921, while in the performance of his duties as an elevator operator in the Federal building at Springfield, Ill."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to the proposed Senate substitute if there is incorporated an amendment providing that no benefit shall accrue hereunder until after the enactment of this law.

A few weeks ago I took occasion to call to the attention of the House an inadvertent ruling connected with the consideration of these private bills, where we authorize the claimant to have the benefits of the compensation act, in that the Comptroller General ruled against the established policy of the Government from its organization, that benefits would accrue from the date of the injury and not from the passage of the act. This ruling was made in spite of the fact that when the conference report on that bill was under consideration in the House I interrogated the gentleman from Illinois as to whether it was the understanding that the benefits of that act should date from the passage of the act, to which he replied that it would, and yet the Comptroller General held that the benefits date from the time of the injury.

Now, it is not the purpose, and can not be the purpose, of the Congress to override the established practice which has been followed since the Government was established in recognizing ex post facto claims, but only pay the claims from the time the act is passed or some date subsequent thereto. If the gentleman is willing to agree to this amendment to carry out the intendment of Congress, then I shall have no objection to the consideration of the Senate substitute at this time.

Mr. IRWIN. This bill merely provides that the matter shall go to the compensation commission. It is purely within their discretion and it is up to that committee to set the time.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is my understanding that in many instances the date when the allowance begins is not under the control of the commission. I am unwilling to establish the precedent—and I will do everything within my power to prevent it—that the injured party shall have the right of reimbursement made from the time of the injury. It never has been done in pension cases nor in those of private claims.

Mr. IRWIN. Very well, Mr. Speaker, I will accept the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STAFFORD to the Senate amendment: Add at the end of the Senate amendment the following: "*Provided*, That no benefit shall accrue hereunder until after the enactment of this act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). The question is as to the amendment to the Senate amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

ANDREW J. BROWN

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 9872, "An act to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Andrew J. Brown, a former rural mail carrier at Erwin, Tenn.," and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Andrew J. Brown, a former rural mail carrier at Erwin, Tenn."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, this is a similar case to the one we have just disposed of. Will the gentleman accept a similar amendment?

Mr. IRWIN. I will accept the amendment under protest, because I want to get these bills through. I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think it is essential. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the Senate amendment insert the following:

"*Provided*, That no benefit shall accrue hereunder until after the enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

CONSIDERATION OF VARIOUS BILLS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I submit the following privileged report for printing in the RECORD under the rules.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 355

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the Committee on the Judiciary shall have one legislative day for the consideration under the general rules of the House of the following bills:

S. 3614, to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois.

S. 4425, to amend section 284 of the Judicial Code of the United States.

H. R. 11199, to amend sections 22 and 39, Title II, of the national prohibition act.

H. R. 14055, to make permanent certain temporary judgeships.

H. R. 12059, to provide for the appointment of an additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

H. R. 12032, to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the southern district of New York.

S. 3060, to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system, and for other purposes.

This rule not to interfere with privileged business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RESPECTING SESSIONS OF CONGRESS

Mr. SNELL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution for printing in the RECORD, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 356

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. J. Res. 292, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the House joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, the House joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the House joint resolution for amendment the committee shall rise and report the House joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the House joint resolution and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FEDERAL AND STATE COOPERATION IN RELATION TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on Senate bill 3060.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending before the House of Representatives a bill (S. 3060) which provides for a national system of employment exchanges. The object of this measure is to furnish the machinery for Federal and State cooperation in bringing men in different sections of the United States in contact with those sections where it is possible to find employment.

This bill provides for a national system of employment exchanges and makes use of public employment agencies in the various States and cities in the United States.

During the World War a system was inaugurated under the control of the Department of Labor whereby employment agencies were established in the United States, and the employment problems were handled during the war by the Department of Labor. At the close of the World War this system was discontinued, and S. 3060, in effect, reestablishes the methods adopted at that time.

Just recently a bill was enacted into law which provides for systematic planning of public works by the Federal Government. In other words, Congress has enacted legislation which provides that the Federal Government shall plan its public-building program so that the same shall be carried on during periods of unemployment.

If this principle of planning for public works to be carried on in times of unemployment is sound, it is also a principle that can be carried into the industrial world. If it is good for the Federal Government, it ought to work in the field of business.

There appear to be no valid arguments against S. 3060. It provides no new or untried principle of action. Its purpose is to assist the unemployed by placing them in contact with those sections of the country where workers are in demand.

It ought to pass at this session of Congress.

The question of relief and the question of unemployment are much discussed. The causes appear to be as numerous as the individual opinions of the persons interested in finding a solution for the unfortunate situation. The remedies are without number, and each individual has developed his own peculiar solution for this question.

It is not my purpose in these remarks to announce the cause of unemployment or to give the world a remedy. With the great amount of discussion as to the cause and the remedy of unemployment, a person may well hesitate to announce any one condition as the cause for unemployment and any one plan as a "cure-all" for this problem.

I am not supporting S. 3060 with any idea that it furnishes a solution. The enactment of this bill into law, however, has many advantages, and the measure is entitled to the serious and favorable consideration of this House of Representatives.

Whatever the causes of unemployment, that problem is with us in the United States; and, in my opinion, every step possible ought to be taken by Congress to relieve the distress that is occasioned thereby, to find the cause, and to assist, so far as is possible by legislation, in finding a solution to the problem.

It has been suggested that the economic forces and institutions can do much in attacking the cause and in finding a remedy for the world-wide condition now prevailing by "planning" a program for economic, industrial, and business activity. In other words, just as the Federal Government will "plan" its public works to be carried on when there is a surplus of labor, so the business and commercial world should "plan" with relation to the problems of pro-

duction and consumption of the products. In other words, production should be adjusted to market demands.

This bill (S. 3060) is an aid to that sort of program. It will enable the workers to be shifted to the places where they are needed. Unless and until there is some way by which the business forces and industries of the country can carry on with system and with plans worked out for the future there will be overproduction, the closing down of industrial plants, and the problem of unemployment.

It is trite but true that what takes place in one part of the world affects the industrial conditions in other parts of the world, and there should be some agency to study these changes and plan for the future in order that the dangers of unemployment may be minimized. This bill will help in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, on May 28, 1929, I placed some remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dealing with the unemployment problem. I discussed the changes in our economic, industrial, and business life, the consolidations, mergers, and combinations in industry.

I called attention to the fact that labor-saving machinery has consistently displaced the workers in industrial fields. We are all familiar with the fact that one machine can do the work of dozens or perhaps hundreds of men.

I discussed the modern tendency of throwing into discard middle-aged men, still in good health, and able to work.

At that time I called attention to the system of doles in England, and asked the very pointed question whether or not that system would have to be tried in America or whether some solution for the unemployment problem would be found to make it unnecessary.

Since May 28, 1929, this subject has become one of increasing importance. It has furnished the basis for editorial comment and newspaper and magazine articles. I quote from a very interesting and able editorial which appeared sometime ago, in connection with the unemployment discussion in the Duluth Weekly Advertiser, as follows:

UNEMPLOYMENT A BLOT ON CIVILIZATION

Unemployment is a blot on our civilization. It denotes not only want of judgment on the part of society as a whole, but also a woeful lack of consciousness on the part of the individual of his or her responsibilities toward fellow human beings.

As far as material development is concerned, there no longer is even a shadow of an excuse for any person being in want. Such a large portion of humanity has progressed to a point where they can make use of the earth's manifold resources that there is plenty of everything to provide for the comfort and welfare of all.

In times gone by want and suffering stared the race in the face almost constantly. Only through strenuous work, early and late, was it possible for the large majority of the people to eke out a precarious living. Measured by our standards to-day, the mass of humanity was merely existing then.

Science and invention have changed all this. Whereas in the past the problem was how to produce enough food and adequate shelter for all, our big trouble to-day seems to be to curtail production so there will not be a glut on the market.

Right here is where our economic system fails to function. The trouble is not that we are producing too much of anything, but the fact that we don't know how to distribute our commodities so that they get within the reach of all. As long as we have millions of consumers in our own country who must hold down their consumption to the absolute minimum necessary to keep body and soul together, and millions in other lands are dying of hunger, there certainly can be no justification for this complaint about overproduction.

As stated before, our problem now is not production, but to stimulate consumption. That, to start with, involves making it possible for every human being to obtain a fair share of that which nature and human ingenuity provide for our sustenance, comfort, and enjoyment.

In the ages gone by the average person could produce very little more than he required for himself. Now, thanks to labor-saving machinery and improved methods, one person can produce enough for a considerable number. In these United States to-day less labor per person is performed than ever before. In fact, the actual working hours per person have been cut down to but a fraction of what they were. Yet our production of everything is setting new high records from year to year.

The real problem confronting us in this country—and every civilized country, for that matter—is how to afford every person an opportunity to contribute his and her share of the labor required for the production of the things we need, so they in turn will be entitled to their portion of such production. Obviously, that involves shortening the working day and week and increasing the wages.

A few of our industrial and business leaders have recognized this for some time and have taken steps to bring this new economic policy into effect. As a matter of fact, big business has begun to see that a new order is necessary if the race is to continue making progress. It is being recognized more and more that society can not afford to ignore the millions of people whom labor-saving machinery has deprived of a livelihood. Unless they are provided for they are going to cause an awful lot of trouble in the very near future.

I do not undertake to say that the writer of the above editorial has found the cause for unemployment or the remedy therefor. He has certainly, however, recognized the seriousness of the situation and the challenge which society faces to-day.

I do not claim that legislation will find a cause or a remedy for unemployment. I do believe, however, that the enactment of proper laws can be helpful in making it possible to avoid periods of economic depression.

Private individuals and organizations have their responsibility and their duty in connection with this question. Until conditions reach a point where men who want to work can obtain employment, the duty that rests upon society and upon our Government, to men and women in misfortune, can not be evaded and should be faced frankly and effectively.

The people of this country look to a leadership that will give a constructive program in connection with this matter.

What is to be our answer to that sort of a case pictured in an editorial in the National Tribune some months ago? This is typical of some of the articles which we read in the newspapers. I quote it because it is a challenge to the leaders in government and to the leaders in society. It reads as follows:

JUST ANOTHER CASE

"This is just another case of a man past 50 who can't obtain employment," wrote Walter S. Campbell, of Cincinnati, to his wife just before hanging himself from a hook screwed into the top of a window sash. Campbell, who was 52, had been forced to live apart from his wife for some years because he was unable to secure work to support her.

"I have suffered with the strain of poverty as long as I can stand it," his last letter continued. "My clothing is all worn threadbare and I am absolutely without money. I have tried for three months to make good, but conditions were against me, and I owe money to everybody from whom I have been able to borrow."

This is not the letter of a man who did not try. Conditions were against Campbell; he was faced by the new industrial dead line which keeps men of middle age out of employment. He found himself up against a stone wall and, discouraged by his fate, gave up in despair.

Thousands of men in the United States to-day are faced with a similar situation. Industry, goaded on by the efficiency experts, throws them onto the human scrap heap and there is no opportunity for them longer to support themselves and their families. If they have no means, and few have, they must become public charges or seek surcease as Campbell did.

We boast of our advance in civilization. We point with pride to our educational institutions. The story of our industrial and economic progress is marvelous. Side by side with this bright picture of man's progress and hopes for his future is the sad story of men who are out of work, willing to earn a living and unable to do so. Those who hope for permanency in our institutions can and must face the solution of the unemployment problem. Unless it is solved, the suggestion is not out of place that the destruction of society and government will become inevitable.

SILVER SERVICE SET OF U. S. S "FLORIDA"

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 13522, 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, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out all after "the" where it appears the first time, down to and including "Florida" in line 8, and insert, "Governor of the State of Florida, as custodian for such State, upon his request, the silver service set presented by the State of Florida for the U. S. S. *Florida*, now out of commission."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the Governor of the State of Florida, as custodian for such State, upon his request, the silver service set presented by the State of Florida for the U. S. S. *Florida*, now out of commission."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 16969) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes. Pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may be extended for 25 minutes, the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. AYRES, in order that he may yield to three Members who were crowded out in our effort to limit debate last night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, pending the motion I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for one minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, to-day marks the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. The display of the American flag in generous profusion throughout the Capital City reminds us of the homage that flows from American hearts in memory of the Great Emancipator. I am sure that I voice a wish that is so profound that it may be called a prayer on the part of every Member of the House of Representatives that the birth, the boyhood struggle, the life of Abraham Lincoln may be as a guiding light to every child of America, and that the mental integrity, the rectitude of character, the devotion to public service of that great soul may be as a fountain spring from which will flow forever inspiration for the highest service of every person charged with the responsibility of the affairs of state. [Applause.]

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Idaho that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. LEHLBACH in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, the present financial, business, and employment depression in which we now find our country, and which is unparalleled in our history, is generally believed to have started back in October, 1929. At that time there was agitation throughout the country that there was over-speculation in the stock markets, and so the Federal reserve system proceeded to take some drastic measures to reduce the brokers' loans, with the distressful result which we all now know. That was the first unfortunate action of the administration in the chain of events to follow.

Almost immediately thereafter, in October, 1929, the stock market crashed. Thereupon there emanated from the Treasury Department through its head, Mr. Mellon, certain statements attempting to "encourage" business and the investor, and, strange as it may seem, as fast as such an "encouraging" statement appeared from the Treasury business became discouraged and the market crashed further, and business fell with it.

Late in the fall of 1929 there appeared certain "encouraging" statements from the White House again assuring the people and business that there was no depression; that business was sound and there was nothing to fear; that this break in the stock market had no connection with and would have no effect on business and would surely and shortly correct itself. The dire aftermath of such encouragement we now know too well.

It is generally believed in business circles in this country that the break in the stock market precipitated the business depression of the country and helped to cause the unparalleled paralysis of our business and the unprecedented unemployment of our workers.

One might imagine that the administration had learned its lesson several times as to the effect of the administration "talking to business"; but, Mr. Chairman, again only yesterday, as reported in the press to-day, the administration talked to business. Perhaps it thought it had learned a lesson, and instead of encouraging business decided to discourage it. Some of us will hope this latest venture outside of the Government's jurisdiction will again have the reverse effect. Heretofore the big artillery of the administration had been called up to the front line—this time the small arms were brought into action.

Three weeks ago the Undersecretary of the Treasury had an appointment to speak before the Bond Club of New York. For some reason, illness or what not, he could not speak at that time, but yesterday he appeared on the stage, some think it was all set at this psychological moment. Yesterday he found time and strength to attend the luncheon meeting of the Bond Club of New York, within a block of Wall Street and the New York Stock Exchange. At noon the Undersecretary of the Treasury spoke to the bond dealers of New York, and caused, according to the newspapers, another drastic break in the stock market. I am not interested in what happened in the stock market except as its action may affect the business of the country. The headline of the news report in the New York Times state, "Mills's hint of bonus upsets Wall Street. Early market gains lost as he indicates 48 hours will bring threat of big loan. Sees $500,000,000 deficit." The news article then goes on to say, prefacing his prepared speech on the soldiers' cash bonus proposals, Mr. Mills made this cryptic remark:

> I am sorry to say that you are going to hear much more in the course of the next 48 hours about these proposals, and I am not entirely sure that the news is going to be as good as you might have anticipated from the statements that have appeared in the press.

Was this giving an inside tip on Government action? Had anyone sold short on that advance information?

It is only a few years ago, as I recall, that some ladies and gentlemen went to jail or fled the country for giving advance tips as to Government information on cotton.

Then the report goes on to say:

> Scarcely had Mr. Mills made this pronouncement before reporters for the financial newspaper news ticker agencies stationed near the door raced for the telephones, followed a little more leisurely by some of the younger bond men not members of the club, who sought to advise their offices as quickly as possible of the latest turn of affairs.

And the market broke. And that after four days of steady gains, which had added to the confidence of business.

On another page of the Times there is a long article headed "Stocks Lose Early Gain. Market Receives Setback When Mills Speech Becomes Known."

In his speech of "encouragement" Mr. Mills "inferred" to the bond dealers and the country that they might expect "within" this "cryptic" 48 hours a bonus proposal which would be passed in the Congress and entail an expense of "a billion or a billion and a half dollars."

Ladies and gentlemen, is that the way for an administration to help stabilize business conditions in the country and restore confidence to its people?

How long, O Lord, how long!

Is it any wonder that the business men of the country look forward to November, 1932, when they can relegate those now in charge of the destinies of a nation to the untrammeled vocations of daily contributors and magazine writers?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BUSBY].

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I do not know that I should take the time of the commitee at this point, but I have asked for very little time.

For a number of weeks the country has been discussing and has been interested in one subject, and that is the subject of doing something to afford relief to suffering humanity. It is not a cry from one section of the country. It is a cry from every section of the country where people are in want, where destitution walks, and where families are unprovided for and men are without employment to gain the means with which to provide for their families.

Two or three days ago I had occasion to wire a number of prominent men, mayors, and well-informed citizens of my district, to try to learn something about the situation in Mississippi.

You have heard nothing from Mississippi. Mississippi and Mississippians will carry on as long as they can. They are not complainers, and I am not bringing this message to you to show a complaint, but rather a condition that exists among our people. I ask you to listen while I refer to a few telegrams.

This telegram is from the mayor of Kosciusko, Miss.:

Conditions here bad; worst I have ever seen. Tenant farmers, white and black, in deplorable condition. Due to financial condition of the country we are unable to handle the situation locally, though we have expended thousands of dollars received locally as well as hundreds of dollars' worth of food and clothing donated locally. Red Cross chapter active here now and handles hundreds of cases daily with food from national organization. My opinion is Red Cross should have help from Government as we are not helping all that should be. Think things improve in the month to come. We hope so.

Another telegram from Okolona, Miss.:

Red Cross inadequate to meet needs of suffering farmers. Feed and seed loans will not help without rations for themselves. Our people want loans and not charity.

That is the attitude that they assume toward the situation. They are not asking for charity altogether. They are asking that they be helped in a way that will be effective.

I call your attention to a letter received this morning:

Amount loaned by Government for feed and seed in many instances will never be repaid as they have no other source to get supplies for themselves and long before this crop can be completed they will be out of money and no place to go to get help, as the Government holds the only security they have.

You must also take into consideration that our banks are either closed or in no position to advance money to make this crop, and our merchants are in no better financial position. I, as loan agent for the Government at this place, know that not half of these poverty-stricken applicants can ever complete this crop on the restrictions laid down on these applications.

I want to refer to the method of relief. We have two bills here—a seed loan bill, and the other more liberal, proposing to make available $20,000,000. The restrictions to be placed about this last $20,000,000, I understand, will make it practically impossible to give to the people who are in want and who are destitute. The fact that we pass the bill, if the relief is not obtainable by them, will not help them greatly. While we are dealing with that subject, we are doing it ostensibly to help the needy and to relieve the suffering, but I doubt if the method we are adopting will reach that end, because security for loans can not be given by people who have no property.

"The Red Cross is helping greatly," you say. It has helped greatly, but the Red Cross receives most of its support from people locally, who are not in a position to render much assistance.

Everyone who observed the pictures I hold in my hand—pictures of destitution in Arkansas—felt a sense of determination to do what he could to relieve suffering, I am sure. Here is one line of 18 little children lined up that they may receive their soup from the beneficent hand that is giving it to them, when others before them in the line have been served. This is a photographic picture, but an actual picture you will find all over that section of the country would bear it out a hundred times over. But that is not the only picture. There is the picture in the cities, and the pictures wherever men are without employment, wherever their families are without sustenance, wherever their families are insufficiently clothed and do not have sufficient shelter and fuel.

We make a great to-do about $25,000,000 proposed for the Red Cross, but we had before us this morning a pension bill, not because the people to be helped by that bill merit anything as having served their country in the Civil War but because they are old and destitute and in want. That bill raised the monthly pension of those individuals, widows and children in most cases, from $30 to $40 a month during the rest of their lives. If this "dole" would hurt the people in the sections who are suffering, would you say that a "dole" that comes by reason of the fact that they are given pensions for the rest of their lives would make them any more undesirable citizens?

Mr. Chairman, I will call your attention to the fact that during the last 40 years millions have been paid in Civil War pensions. Widows and children have received pensions, and in many instances that has been nothing more nor less than a contribution on the part of the Government for no service rendered it or for a fancied service at most. The individuals receiving this money were not at all connected and never were connected in any sense with the Civil War, yet by this method of pensions we continue to make those contributions. I am not condemning that policy and I am not even passing on it one way or the other, but I am calling your attention to the fact that in view of such contributions it would not be amiss for the Government to make contributions to relieve the distress that exists throughout the country.

I call your attention to the fact that this Government has assisted individual citizens time out of mind; it has assisted people in other countries. We sent food, clothing, and other supplies across the ocean during the war to help the suffering people in foreign lands. We were glad to do it. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FORT] told you how the people in Arkansas brought in their provisions and their rations and surrendered them to the Government in order that they might be shipped to the soldiers in foreign lands and shipped to suffering people in foreign lands. When men are willing to work and are out of jobs and can not find work at any price, when men have no property and no way of sustaining themselves and their families because of no fault of their own, I resent the idea of saying that whatever help might be given to them by the Government should be called a "dole" because, as a matter of fact, that which is given ought to be given in a charitable attitude. I resent the idea of calling it a "dole" and saying that it will corrupt the morals of such suffering citizens and make them poor citizens.

No appeal so moves the human heart as the suffering of humanity. Our country, because of her charities, is known throughout the civilized world for her sympathies and active relief work. The peoples of all lands have been her benefactors. We are now faced with conditions that have brought want and suffering to millions of our own citizens. An unprecedented financial panic has been upon us for a year and a half. Men have been forced out of business by financial conditions. Millions of men able, willing, and anxious to work—men with families to provide for—have been turned out of employment. They can not get work at any price. Their families are starving and forced to go to the bread lines provided by public charity, and stand in those lines until others before them have been fed. This is especially true in our cities.

Another great cause of suffering was the unprecedented drought. In all the history of our Nation no drought has equaled the one of last summer. In my section of the South it did not rain from the 17th day of May until the 15th of August following—a period of almost three months cover-

ing the entire crop season. The result was the people worked hard, but their crops died from drought, or made very little. Streams dried up; stock water and drinking water in many instances were almost impossible to obtain. The poorer people have consumed what they had. Owners of lands, even of splendid farms, have fed their tenants until the landowners have nothing left. Banks have failed on every hand, and with the closing of the banks whatever cash we had has been lost. Not more than one-half the taxes have been paid, and homes are being sold by the tax collectors for taxes. Ours is a great country. We are told that too much wheat has been produced for the wheat farmers to get a fair price. Yet millions are without bread. Clothing is cheap, yet millions in our land are not sufficiently clothed to keep them from suffering. Surely something is wrong about the attitude of the managers of this administration. They hoard the great wealth of the Nation in a few hands while millions are hungering.

Such a course is unworthy of our great country. It is little, penurious, and detestable to her men in this House condemning relief afforded by our Government to its helpless and hungering citizens as "doles." Such arguments are made without information of conditions, or purposely made to prejudice. Our Government, under one excuse or another, has for almost its entire history made appropriations for the relief of its citizens. As I have suggested, pensions donated by the Government almost wholly to one section of the country, under the heading of Civil War pensions, have amounted to $7,370,462,014 to June 30 last. During the past year widows and minor children pensioners of the Civil War were given $79,698,163.03. You know, as well as I do, that much of this was given without regard to relieving suffering and to persons, who by the greatest stretch of imagination could not be held to have been influenced in the remotest by the Civil War. They rendered no service directly or indirectly to their country. Would it not be just as proper to call these payments a "dole" as it would contributions by the Government to be administered by the Red Cross to relieve poor, hungering citizens of our Nation? Mark you! the widows and minor children of Civil War veterans received not $25,000,000, as proposed in the bill to give relief to our suffering citizens, but more than three times that much for the year 1930, and this amount will be continued each year on and on at the rate of from about $30 to $75 a month. The appropriations will be made to these favored individuals by our Government, with the hearty approval of those in the administration who are talking so loudly about "doles." I have not said a word about the Civil War veteran himself. I have alluded only to those who, in most instances, had no connection whatever with the war.

I am not necessarily complaining about this situation. It is beyond remedy. Our Government is committed to the course. I have pointed out the situation for comparison to show you how little and contemptible the arguments to me have been advanced by the President and administration leaders as an excuse for denying proper and prompt relief to millions of helpless poor people in the cities and the country of our land. Their course has not been in keeping with our national ideals.

I close with an appeal to you to remember that we are all citizens of our great country. That we all love the same flag and fight to sustain its supremacy. When our country calls we come from every nook and hamlet to do its bidding. Our men and our substance are at its disposal to their utter consumption and destruction if necessary. Let the Nation not stand by unconcerned with food supplies in great abundance, wealth beyond measure, while millions of its poor, helpless, unfortunate citizens—mothers with babes in their arms, little children hungry and in rags, fathers out of employment and unable to obtain work—suffer and can not help themselves. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, the other gentleman to whom I desired to yield time [Mr. LINTHICUM] is not present. He is in conference and I am unable to reach him.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman does not desire to use any more time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT, NAVY

For all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, exclusive of personal services in the Navy Department or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices at Washington, D. C., arising at home or abroad, but impossible to be anticipated or classified, to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, and for examination of estimates for appropriations and of naval activities in the field for any branch of the naval service, $30,000.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question of the chairman of the subcommittee. The committee will recall that it is contemplated to hold at Yorktown, Va., October 16, 17, 18, and 19 of this year, the sesquicentennial celebration of the siege and surrender of Yorktown. In connection with that celebration there should be considered also the Colonial National Monument, which has been established at that point. It is reasonably certain that France will accept this Government's invitation to attend, and will be represented by two or more cruisers as well as by some contingents of troops in the original continental uniforms or copies of those uniforms. I desire to know if the contingent fund provided here will be sufficient to enable the naval officers to adequately entertain the visitors to that celebration. The celebration is not to be local, but national and international in character, and I understand it would be considered desirable to bring those visitors to Washington after the celebration, and possibly to carry them to Annapolis. It would seem that the Government should desire, through its naval officers, to afford dignified and proper entertainment to our visitors representing the French Navy.

Mr. FRENCH. I am glad to say to my colleague and to the Members of the House that the committee gave this matter careful attention. We had the benefit of the advice of the Representative from Virginia, who has just spoken, and these are the facts that controlled the committee: In the military bill an item of $35,000 is carried for the transportation of troops to participate in the event mentioned.

The Navy, however, it seemed would not need money for that purpose, because such of its personnel as might participate in this celebration would proceed to Yorktown on ships, which themselves would be the major part of the Navy's representation, and whatever ships the Navy Department saw fit to detail to this celebration would proceed there without a special appropriation. With regard to the item for entertainment, the committee examined the expenditures under this head for the last two years and found there had been rather sizable surpluses. The unexpended balance for the year 1930 was $16,000, and under the circumstances, and having in mind the amount that will be required for the various purposes, the committee was of the opinion that the item we are carrying in the bill provides ample funds for the purposes to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. BLAND. And it is desired that a part of that fund be expended for that purpose?

Mr. FRENCH. It is the thought of the committee that it would be agreeable to expend a part of the appropriation in that way.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For repairs, preservation, and renewal of machinery, auxiliary machinery, and boilers of naval vessels, yard craft, and ships' boats, distilling and refrigerating apparatus; repairs, preservation, and renewals of electric interior and exterior signal communications and all electrical appliances of whatsoever nature on board naval vessels, except range finders, battle order and range transmitters and indicators, and motors and their controlling apparatus used to operate machinery belonging to other bureaus; searchlights and fire-control equipments for antiaircraft defense at shore stations; maintenance and operation of coast signal service; equipage, supplies, and materials under the cognizance of the bureau required for the maintenance and operation of naval vessels, yard craft, and ships' boats; purchase, installation, repair, and preservation of machinery, tools, and appliances in navy yards and stations, accident prevention, pay of classified field force under the bureau; incidental expenses for naval vessels, navy yards, and stations, inspectors' offices, the

engineering experiment station, such as photographing, technical books and periodicals, stationery, and instruments; services, instruments, machines and auxiliaries, apparatus, and supplies, and technical books and periodicals necessary to carry on experimental and research work; maintenance and equipment of buildings and grounds at the engineering experiment station, Annapolis, Md.; payment of part time or intermittent employment in the District of Columbia or elsewhere of such scientists and technicists as may be contracted for by the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, at a rate of pay not exceeding $20 per diem for any person so employed; in all, $19,243,040, of which $750,000 shall be available exclusively for the procurement and installation of new tools and machinery for shops under the cognizance of the Bureaus of Engineering and Construction and Repair: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and offices of United States inspectors of machinery and naval material for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, shall not exceed $1,624,340.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: On page 17, line 8, before the period, insert a colon and the following proviso:

"*Provided further*, That in order to convert U. S. S. *Wyoming* into a training ship and the U. S. S. *Utah* into a target ship, in accordance with the terms of the treaty for the limitation and reduction of naval armament, signed at London on April 22, 1930, there shall be available $779,000 of the appropriations for the fiscal year 1931, as follows: Engineering, Bureau of Engineering, 1931, $210,000; construction and repair, Bureau of Construction and Repair, 1931, $535,000; and Ordnance and Ordnance Stores, Bureau of Ordnance, 1931, $34,000."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, unless the gentleman wants to speak.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That it is legislation.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would reserve his point of order until I have explained the amendment.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I reserve it.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I hope you will consider this proposed amendment before passing snap judgment upon it. Here is a fund that has been reserved in the Navy from last year's appropriation and therefore this will not cost the Treasury an additional penny. Here are two battleships worth possibly $20,000,000 or $30,000,000, having cost originally about $40,000,000. Under the terms of the London conference they have either to be sunk, scrapped, and absolutely thrown away, or we can make this use of them, which is a very vital one, as we are informed by the Navy Department.

At a meeting of the Naval Affairs Committee on yesterday it approved this measure.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I want to be fair about the matter and say that I reserved the right to file a minority report against this proposed legislation on the ground it is not necessary to have this target at an expenditure of $269,000.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. The gentleman is right about that. It was not unanimously approved, but it was approved by the committee.

With reference to the point just raised by the gentleman from Oklahoma, it is absolutely necessary in the Navy to practice this long-distance firing, and here is a target ship that can be operated by radio control, probably 15 or 18 miles from the Navy, completely out of sight, and operated in connection with airplanes and airplane signals, and there is no other system by which it can be used.

Here is a battleship that can simulate war conditions by being controlled in any direction, just as if there were men on it, and can be operated at a speed of 18 knots. The ordinary target can go only 6 or 8 knots. I submit this is a very essential matter.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the testimony showed it would cost about $175,000 to put radiocontrol on this ship.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. That is my recollection of it.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. And in addition, the statement was made that it was not necessary to find out the effect of explosives, because they already had that information, and therefore the only thing left that this ship could be used for was a target.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. May I answer the gentleman by stating that if you were practicing to shoot deer you would not want to tie a deer to a tree and shoot at him, but you would want to shoot at him when he was running and under actual hunting conditions.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I want to say to the gentleman that we can now tow a target at a speed of possibly 30 knots. That is, if a modern cruiser is used.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. In towing a target that is out of sight you run the danger of shooting the men who may be towing it, and the information before the committee was that they could only tow a target 6 or 8 knots.

Now, here is a ship that is to be absolutely thrown away. This will not cost the Government an additional penny, and we must either waste the ship or use it for this purpose. I submit that this is a reasonable and a proper thing to do, and I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order. The Navy says it is necessary and they want it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will state to the gentleman from Virginia that I reserved the point of order so the House could become acquainted with the object and purpose of the amendment. As I understand, under the London treaty, we are authorized and must scrap or take out of commission three of our battleships.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And this is merely carrying out the law of the land as expressed by the treaty. The treaty provided that the *Wyoming* could be used as a training ship.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. It permitted that.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The turret guns must come off and certain other disarmament take place so the ship may be available for training the Naval Reserve.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The *Florida*, under the treaty, must be scrapped?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And the Government saves approximately $100,000 over the cost of the scrapping of it.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. That is my recollection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The other ship is the *Utah*, and they propose to make a target, controlled by radio, out of that ship?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Which is also permitted under the London treaty.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And the London treaty is mandatory that we must get rid of these ships in some way within one year.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Either destroy them or convert them into this very necessary use.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And if we do not use them as a target and as a training ship, we have only one alternative, and that is to scrap them.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. What you are asking for is to have it used as a target to develop gun power both by radio control or by any other method the department sees fit. That is what this amendment seeks to do.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. That is all.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If this amendment is adopted and permitted to go into the appropriation bill the effect

of it is that between now and next December the Navy Department must commence scrapping the ships, and it does not cost the Government any more money because this is not under the 1931 appropriation. I hope the gentleman from Oklahoma will not insist upon his point of order.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The gentleman takes the position that if we have the money in the Treasury we ought to spend it whether we spend it for any useful purpose or not.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This is a useful purpose to do this.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I am not making any particular point as to whether it comes from the Treasury or not, but if it costs more money it will be worth it; we ought to have it.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. I want to ask the gentleman from Georgia this question: Why is it that the gentleman from Georgia is opposing some additional construction program and at the same time is in favor of scrapping the ships?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will state the reason why "the gentleman from Georgia" does that: He is seeking to comply with the law of the land—the treaty.

Mr. PATTERSON. Does the gentleman interpret the treaty that we have got to go up to the limit?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That has nothing to do with the proposition.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Now, in conclusion, gentlemen, I say whether the money comes out of the Treasury or not, it seems to me it would be folly not to put these two ships in condition for the purpose named. They are hardly out of date as far as combat is concerned, but it is foolish to throw them away when they can be made good use of.

The training ships of the Navy have been reduced to 15. It is much better for the Naval Reserves and for the Annapolis cadets to have for training ships these ships. The Navy Department says that they need them very badly.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I offer no objection to the utilizing of the ship for training purposes, having in mind that we have spent $11,000,000 on modernization of the three battleships referred to that are to be decommissioned. I believe we could put one of these ships in good condition for training at an expenditure of $500,000, but I never would concede to placing the other ship in condition at an expenditure of $269,000 for target practice, when the statement was made that they would not put very much powder in the bombs dropped from the air, that they would fill them with sand and water; and, in addition, the shells that were to be fired from the battleships 20 miles away were not to be loaded with sufficient explosives to do much damage. In view of that fact, I can not conscientiously support any movement that would bring about this large expenditure of money.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. For the first year they would not think of destroying it, but after it had been used for a target, after two or three years, I have no doubt they might experiment with the ship. They can experiment with light bombs and water and sand now to see what they can do, without destroying the ship.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The first time they fired a shell at a distance of 20 miles it would destroy all the electrical appliances of the ship. In addition, it would require an annual appropriation for upkeep.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. The gentleman remembers the testimony of Admiral Yarnell that these controls are under water, and that very little damage would be done above water.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. I understand that the gentleman from Oklahoma has no objections to so much of the amendment as relates to the appropriation for the use of the ship for training purposes, but that he is going to present his point of order with reference to the other aspects of the amendment. Personally I am in harmony with the gentleman's amendment, but it would seem to me, from a practical standpoint, if objection be made to the portion of the amendment which provides more than $200,000 for preparing one of the vessels for a target, and if that objection be good, it would be advisable for the gentleman to make use of so much of the amendment as is not objected to.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I am not going to stand in the way of either of these, because I think they are too important. I think the target ship is more important than the other and costs half the price.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy. There is nothing personal in the matter. I feel that it is subject to the point of order, and that the targets we have at the present time are all that it is necessary to take care of that one point, of seeing how far a projectile can strike and with what accuracy. If the gentleman will amend his amendment so as to take care of just one ship, I shall not object.

Mr. BRITTEN. I hope that the gentleman will not comply with the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Then I make the point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. I think the amendment is clearly in order, Mr. Chairman. The question of expense does not enter into this thing at all.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I would like to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that this is agreeable, as I understand it, to the committee. I hope the gentleman will not object to this.

Mr. BRITTEN. I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order, although I think the amendment is clearly in order.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Well, we will let the Chair decide that. I make the point of order, and I would like to be heard.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield to the chairman of the committee to be heard first.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the point of order made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] does not lie against the amendment, and I base my contention first upon section 468 of Title V of the code, which reads:

> The Secretary of the Navy shall report to Congress at the commencement of each regular session the number of vessels and their names upon which any repairs or changes are proposed which in any case shall amount to more than $300,000, the extent of such proposed repairs and changes, and the amount estimated to be needed for the same in each vessel, and the expenditures for such repairs or changes so limited shall be made only after appropriations in detail are provided for by Congress. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Navy to report to Congress at the beginning of each regular session thereof, in addition to the report directed to be made as aforesaid, a detailed statement showing the amount expended from each of the appropriations for the repair of every ship where such repairs exceeded for any one ship the sum of $300,000 in any one fiscal year.

It seems to me that that paragraph clearly indicates that authorization is not required to effect changes in naval vessels. I do not think that the object of the amendment requires an authorization, but that the committee now may exercise jurisdiction under the statute to which I have referred. The treaty itself, which was approved and promulgated by the President on January 1, 1931, provides specifically that three of the ships of this type shall be withdrawn from their character as military ships. It provides that the *Wyoming* or the *Arkansas* may be converted into a training ship, and we are proposing that the *Wyoming* may be so used. It makes alternative provision for the two other ships, the *Utah* and the *Florida*; either use for target practice or conversion into hulks. It is proposed that the *Utah* be converted into a target ship and that the *Florida* be destroyed.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman refer the Chair to the page and section of the treaty?

Mr. FRENCH. The treaty is in the hearings at page 18 and following. I read now from page 19:

ARTICLE 2

1. The United States, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Japan, shall dispose of the following capital ships as provided in this article:

United States: *Florida, Utah, Arkansas,* or *Wyoming.*

In the succeeding paragraph of the treaty a time limit is fixed within which this work must be done. In conclusion, may I refer the chairman to volume 6 of the Precedents, paragraph 8244. The decision in the instance cited is to the effect that in determining the extent to which treaties authorize appropriations on appropriation bills, ambiguous provisions are to be construed in favor of authorization. But a treaty having been ratified by one only of the contracting parties was held not to have become the law to the extent of sanctioning an appropriation on an appropriation bill.

The London treaty has been ratified by all of the parties and, therefore, it would seem that the amendment falls in line with a ruling already made.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The gentleman from Idaho has raised a very interesting point, one that I have never heard discussed before. That is whether or not heretofore Congress has recognized the right of the Senate to bind the House to pass certain legislation after some ratification of a treaty has been made.

Mr. FRENCH. As the chairman of the subcommittee understands it, a treaty is the supreme law of the land, and a treaty is ratified in a particular way provided by the Constitution. This treaty having been ratified in that way, it seems to me it thus becomes the law, and therefore the provision in the rules requiring that appropriations be authorized is complied with.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am wondering if there is a specific case cited where some appropriation has been made in a special bill, to carry out the provisions of a treaty, without authorization?

Mr. FRENCH. I do not have the precedents before me, but I understand such cases have occurred.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. If the gentleman refers to any treaty, for instance our treaty with Russia for the purchase of Alaska, after the treaty was consummated and ratified, the appropriation had to originate in the House. It is not whether the Senate is binding the House or not. The question is that the treaty becomes the law of the land, and if, within the provisions of that treaty, there is any appropriation or expenditure required, it must naturally originate in the House.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I do not say that I am a parliamentarian, because I am not. I only have a general knowledge of the rules and regulations that apply to amendments. I took the position that inasmuch as the Navy Department felt the committee should authorize this legislation, possibly the Judge Advocate General had rendered a decision that it was necessary to get the permission of the Congress before such an appropriation could be made, and acting upon that information I presented the point of order with the hope that I was justified by the precedents and the rules and regulations in doing so.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I have already made it.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard for about one minute. Under the usual procedure in the House it is necessary to pass a law which is an authorization toward making certain specific appropriations. That authorization law is the law, and under ordinary circumstances it would be necessary to pass an authorization to make these expenditures on the *Wyoming* and the *Utah.* But this condition is quite different from the one usually presented on the floor of the House. Here is the law of the land, already prescribing that certain things shall be done, certain alterations shall be made to these two ships, and they are named specifically. We have agreed to do it. That is the law. We must do it within a specified time limit. That is the law of the land, and it requires no further authorization. There is no need of having duplicate authorizations to appropriate this money.

I contend the gentleman's point of order should not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LEHLBACH). The Chair is ready to rule.

The Constitution of the United States, Article VI, provides that—

This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

A treaty entered into and properly ratified and proclaimed is the law of the land and repeals any previous statute. Conversely, if Congress should thereafter pass a statute which receives the approval of the President, in conflict with a treaty, the later law governs, because treaties and statutes are on the same basis, both being the supreme law of the land while they are in force. Consequently, any authorization carried in a treaty is the basis of an appropriation, just exactly as if it were an authorization passed by an act of Congress.

The only question that remains to be considered is this: Is the language of the treaty which provides that these three ships shall be scrapped as combat ships and which permits one to be used as a target ship and one to be retained as a training ship merely permissive propositions which the Congress must determine to avail itself of by statute. Any doubt that might be entertained on that subject is obviated by section 468 of Title 5 of the United States Code, which was quoted by the gentleman from Idaho, the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill.

In order to make the proposition clear the Chair will quote the language of section 468:

The Secretary of the Navy shall report to Congress at the commencement of each regular session the number of vessels and their names upon which any repairs or changes are proposed which in any case shall amount to more than $300,000, the extent of such proposed repairs and changes, and the amount estimated to be needed for the same in each vessel, and the expenditures for such repairs or changes so limited shall be made only after appropriations in detail are provided for by Congress.

This is legislation which amply authorizes an appropriation for repairs and changes without further law, and removes any question that may remain as to the treaty itself being an authorizatiton for the appropriation. The point of order is therefore overruled.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Does the chairman hold that it is contingent upon the Secretary of the Navy making a favorable report?

The CHAIRMAN. No, it is not; and it shows that appropriations may be made for that without any specific authorization by statute directing the change or repair.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I possibly misunderstood the Chair. I thought the Chair said that the Secretary of the Navy having made a report.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Chair did say so it was through inadvertence.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, permit me to say that the author of the amendment brought it to the attention of the subcommittee and the subcommittee has considered it.

I think that the members of the subcommittee are agreeable to its adoption and I should like to indicate that to the House.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like also to indicate to the committee that this amendment was before the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House on yesterday and was practically unanimously adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LANKFORD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR

For preservation and completion of vessels on the stocks and in ordinary; purchase of materials and stores of all kinds; steam steerers, steam capstans, steam windlasses, and all other auxiliaries; labor in navy yards and on foreign stations; accident prevention; purchase of machinery and tools for use in shops; carrying on work of experimental model tank and wind tunnel; designing naval vessels; construction and repair of yard craft, lighters, and barges; wear, tear, and repair of vessels afloat; general care and protection of the Navy in the line of construction and repair; incidental expenses for vessels and navy yards, inspectors' offices, such as photographing, books, professional magazines, plans, stationery, and instruments for drafting room, and for pay of classified field force under the bureau; services, instruments and apparatus, supplies, and technical books and periodicals necessary to carry on experimental and research work; for payment of part-time or intermittent employment in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere, of such scientists and technicists as may be contracted for by the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, at a rate of pay not exceeding $20 per diem for any person so employed; for hemp, wire, iron, and other materials for the manufacture of cordage, anchors, cables, galleys, and chains; specifications for purchase thereof shall be so prepared as shall give fair and free competition; canvas for the manufacture of sails, awnings, hammocks, and other work; interior appliances and tools for manufacturing purposes in navy yards and naval stations; and for the purchase of all other articles of equipage at home and abroad; and for the payment of labor in equipping vessels therewith and manufacture of such articles in the several navy yards; naval signals and apparatus, other than electric, namely, signals, lights, lanterns, running lights, and lamps and their appendages for general use on board ship for illuminating purposes; and oil and candles used in connection therewith; bunting and other material for making and repairing flags of all kinds; for all permanent galley fittings and equipage; rugs, carpets, curtains, and hangings on board naval vessels, $18,057,500, of which $750,000 shall be available exclusively for the procurement and installation of new tools and machinery for shops under the cognizance of the Bureaus of Construction and Repair and Engineering: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and offices of superintending naval constructors for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, shall not exceed $1,820,000.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOOPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I listened with great interest to the gentleman from Idaho, chairman of the subcommittee, in his special pleading in support of various items in this bill. Throughout his presentation there were many recurring evidences that the gentleman's anxiety remained with him as regards a large number of items appearing in this bill, which under the present rules of the House have no right, rhyme, or reason for either appearing or remaining in an appropriation bill. The chairman having in some cases created, in the style of a Don Quixote, a number of ferocious and imaginary windmills, then proceeded, with able strategy and some display of Greek fire, to entirely demolish those very same ferocious, and in many cases imaginary, windmills.

As one of the instances, may I cite the lines beginning at Nov. 25 on the 26th page and continuing on to the 27th page:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipman appointed from enlisted men of the Navy for admission to the Naval Academy in the class entering in the calendar year 1932 who has not served aboard a vessel of the Navy for at least nine months prior to such admission.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COYLE. Gladly.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This is what has been troubling me: If the Navy is now overofficered and if a reduction is necessary, does not the gentleman believe that it is better to curtail the number when they enter the academy rather than when they graduate?

Mr. COYLE. The gentleman will find from my remarks that I have every sympathy for the idea the chairman advances, but I still submit that as a matter of parliamentary practice he should follow in his legislation exactly the same rules and the same procedure that the rest of us have to follow.

In support of this item increasing the requirements for admission to any naval academy there is at no place in the nearly 800 pages of testimony any scintilla of evidence as to either the ferociousness or the actuality of this dangerous windmill. We have on page 4526 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the words of the distinguished chairman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH]:

I know what was in the minds of the legislative committee when they provided that 100 enlisted men annually should go into the academy.

The gentleman from Idaho creates his danger, writes his cure, demolishes his windmill, all in one breath, because he knows what was in the minds of the legislative committee. He goes on in his statement in support of his cure for what may be an imaginary evil to say that many boys desiring to get free preparation for the Naval Academy are now enlisting in the Navy, whereas if the Government had to support them at sea for nine months while they were studying, perhaps they would not enlist in the Navy as an inexpensive way for them to enter. Mr. Chairman, in making a point of order against this paragraph of the bill, I have been compelled to go into the background of this particular paragraph in order to support one of the four reasons why I ask that the point of order be sustained. Those reasons are: First, that the lines quoted are subject to a point of order because they attempt to legislate under the guise of a limitation of expense. Second, that in fact, as well as by the language of this paragraph, this is not a limitation, but rather an increase of expense, as it would require nine months of sea trip at Government expense in addition to the present preparation work now given these Naval Academy aspirants before any enlisted man whom the authorities desire to see enter the academy would have a chance to enter the Naval Academy, clearly an increased expense rather than a decrease. Third, that any mere change in the verbiage must look not to the legal patter but to the now clearly avowed intent of the chairman of the Appropriation Committee "to accomplish within the appropriation bill that which he says was clearly, according to his mind, the intention of the legislative committee." In my case, Mr. Chairman, instead of following historic precedent, in my next declaration I am offering you the obverse of that precedent and stating that profoundly I agree with every word in support of the idea advanced by the chairman of the subcommittee, but will fight with the last parliamentary weapon his right to say those words in this appropriation bill. Fourth, further, Mr. Chairman, if you would say that this is a proper limitation, then we must make the point of order that the paragraph seeks to impose a limitation covering a period of time at least six-sevenths of which time is outside of and beyond the last day covered under the title of this bill, which is June 30, 1932, and therefore these words are clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Idaho has an obvious remedy by orderly process of legislation, and he should, by virtue of his position, not be exempted, but, rather, more than usually required to follow those processes.

At the proper time, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I propose to offer an amendment to strike out, on page 39, lines 1 to 6, reading as follows:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended in any manner whatsoever by or for the use of a total number of commissioned line officers of the Navy above the grade of lieutenant commander which exceeds the total number of such officers assigned to aviation duty on February 9, 1931.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the question whether or not this language is subject to a point of order may be a closer question than the last one which I advanced, because it is couched in legal patter and formal phraseology; they have complied with the letter of the law while violating in every respect the spirit of that law. I desire to seriously advance for your consideration positive reasons why this wording should be struck out from the bill. As the law stands at the present time the President and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized to assign officers to such duty as they are qualified to perform. Unless

the clear will and intent of this Congress is to be flaunted by legislative subterfuge, I am convinced that the Air Service will require a very considerable expansion in the years to come as regards personnel as well as material. Mr. Chairman, I can visualize the time as being not too far in the distant future when the commander in chief of the American Fleet may exercise that command during maneuvers in training for war from a post in big, fast airplanes or rigid airships. It is possible that that high command may find it just as necessary to be able to fly his own airplane as it was formerly necessary for high command to be able to sail his own gig. The proposal in this present bill limits for the current year all promotion in the Aviation Corps above the grade of lieutenant commander—at least, I suppose that is the intent of the language, which is in some measure obscure. The number of officers at present in the Air Corps qualified to exercise command of an aircraft carrier or of a rigid airship or of a squadron of either or both is exceedingly limited, and the young men in the Air Service are only acquiring one year's experience in one year's time. The senior survivor of the *Shenandoah* disaster has considerably more experience than rank, and yet there is a serious attempt to stifle initiative and to stop progress in this most important and most rapidly developing science of all other sciences which are a part of the national defense. The chairman of the subcommittee has been now for nearly two years a member of a joint committee of this Congress appointed to report out a joint pay bill for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Coast Survey. I am, I know, at many points entirely in accord with this gentleman's ideas on the subject of individual pay.

Personally, I am convinced that the best interests of the Naval Service and of the Aviation Service are not met through such a large excess of current pay to the men in aviation. It changes their manner and mode of living to a scale far less modest than that required of other officers in the Naval Service. And, unfortunately for all of us, it is hard to scale down to a modest basis, and the aviators seriously endeavor to avoid being taken out of the Aviation Service because of the reduction in pay that it entails. That officers of a higher rank are made aviators by some minimum process of air experience to the enrichment of their own pockets, and not particularly to the advantage of the Naval Service, has been hinted. But this appropriation bill, gentlemen, is not the place for the reformer to hold forth. If I may invite the attention of the Chair and the Members of this House to the situation as regards this joint pay bill, I think my meaning will be clear. A number of attempts have been made in the Seventieth Congress to provide much-needed legislation regarding the promotions, legislation which is needed to avoid sending on the retired list this year nearly one-half of the class of 1911 at the Naval Academy, and yet every time that legislation has come up for consideration the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations for the Navy has raised the point that while the question of pay remains in the custody of this special joint committee, that promotion is included within the general subject of pay and is a corollary of that general subject. That the legislative committee can not take jurisdiction while the joint committee is considering it should apply also to appropriation law. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that sauce for the legislative committee goose is also sauce for the Joint Pay Committee gander.

However this question of promotion may be determined, and however the fate of this year's graduating class at the Naval Academy is determined—both of them are at issue in this appropriation bill, where neither of them should be present—the fact yet remains that the Appropriations Committee has determined that it is better to educate reserve aviators at a cost of $19,000 each, who at present remain but one or two years after education, than it is to take the young men graduating from the Naval Academy and educate them as aviators, to remain, in most cases, for their active professional lives as officers of the Navy. I am, however, convinced, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that the disproportion existing between the pay of the officers of the Air Service and the pay of the officers in ordinary service is too great, and that some method should be found, following proper legislative channels, to see that the aviators get but a moderate increase while flying and get, in addition, very much increased compulsory Government insurance.

I desire to submit to the Congress at the proper time an amendment, on page 21, lines 6 to 13. Strike out the words:

> Not to exceed 5,499 commissioned officers on the list, exclusive of officers designated pursuant to law as additional numbers, 1,455 warrant and commissioned warrant officers on the inactive list, exclusive of commissioned officers, who may revert to warrant or commissioned warrant status in accordance with the law.

These words again, Mr. Chairman, are properly subject to a point of order. The law, as it exists at the present time, fairly definitely states the maximum limit of officers, warrant officers, commissioned officers, and warrant commissioned officers. If the limits represented by this bill are approved by the Congress, a condition will arise by virtue of which not over one-half of this year's graduating class will find a place in the Navy. It will be necessary, accordingly, to give some 200 young men, educated at a cost of $13,000 each, each one of whom is obligated to serve at least two years in the Navy of the United States as an ensign and thereafter at the pleasure of the President, one year's full pay and allow them to go about their own business and for that approximately $350,000 is required to so pay them. In addition, we would waste the $14,000 per graduate, the cost of his education—the Secretary of the Navy says in excess of $13,000—which multiplied by 200 members of the class runs into a great many millions of dollars. In addition, if that condition is allowed to continue from year to year until about the year 1940, and if by the year 1940 we have built up the new ships and new types of ships provided for under the London treaty, we will be seriously short of young officers available to man these ships as watch and division officers, we will be short of officers to command submarines and destroyers, we will be short of pilots and squadron commanders for the Air Service, and the pacifist propaganda will have been as nearly complete and successful as is this much-discussed 5-year program in Russia, nearly complete and successful. The question of the authorized commissioned strength has been determined by law, and while there are some parts of the existing law which are not entirely clear, an attempt to clarify them has been made through the Attorney General of the United States, and in turn, before rendering a decision of this very question, he is awaiting the action of this Congress. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee attempts to decide this question for the Attorney General, or at least to preclude the possibility of any determination by the Attorney General, except one which the chairman desires to put before the Congress and before the country as the "undoubted intention of the legislative committee." Again, Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to find in the 800 pages of the hearings any serious recommendation by the President, by the Budget, by the Members of Congress, by the officers of the Navy Department advocating this scuttling paragraph.

On pages 14 and 15 of the hearings I find, under the examination of the Secretary of the Navy, a serious request for an increase of officer personnel to provide for ships of the future, and I find no testimony from the Secretary of from anyone else that asks for any drastic reduction. No one, I am sure, will accuse this administration of shaking the big stick or of advocating unnecessary expansion of the naval service, but I do find the Secretary of the Navy asking that provision be made to take care of 200 young men from the Naval Academy who will otherwise have to be discharged with one year's pay. The Secretary says:

> The Government has expended something over $13,000 for the training and education of each of these young men, and their services are needed in the fleet to-day. As a step, it would meet the requirements of the treaty Navy; I consider it very desirable that these young men be retained if possible, rather than discharged to civil life. In my annual report I recommended that the number of appointments to the Naval Academy be increased from four to five for each Senator and Representative. This is necessary if we are to gradually build up to the officer strength

necessary to man the Navy allowed under the Washington treaty. With five appointments we would in 1941 be well under the number required.

Mr. Chairman, it behooves the Members of this Congress to read that statement of the Secretary of the Navy before they vote on this appropriation bill and to note particularly, when they are reading this statement, the following exchange of question and answer in the middle of page 15:

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Secretary, the statements that you have just made to the committee touching a possible increase in the number of midshipmen at the academy, and also a possible increase in officer strength from 4 per cent to 5.3 per cent, are chiefly upon the basis of the number of officers you would regard as necessary to officer the Navy if we were to have a naval establishment built up to that which is permitted under the London naval treaty?

Secretary ADAMS. Or approaching it somewhat; not necessarily up to the full.

Now, my colleagues of the Congress, I ask you seriously to consider the question asked by the chairman of the committee, the answer of the Secretary of the Navy, and the action which the chairman of the committee recommends to this Congress. In answer to the question of the chairman of the legislative committee on the floor of this House, the gentleman from Illinois inquired:

Is the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] in favor of the American Navy being equal to the British Navy in accordance with the London treaty, or is the gentleman opposed to that?

The first time this question was answered, and the gentleman from Idaho did not answer quite responsively, although he received quite a bit of applause at the end of his answer. Again quoting from the RECORD:

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman did not answer my question.

Mr. FRENCH. I think I answered it about as directly as it could be answered.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is the gentleman for or against our having a navy equal to England's?

Mr. FRENCH. I will tell the gentleman that I am in favor of our country being equal to Great Britain.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Idaho in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in two successive paragraphs has answered the same question both "yes" and "no," but his action in defending the item on page 21, lines 6 to 13, of this appropriation bill is a clear, definite, and positive answer to the effect that he, the chairman of the Naval Appropriations Committee of the House of Congress, is absolutely opposed, now or at any time in the future, to our acquiring that equality in ships or men to man these ships given us as our positive rights under every treaty that we have signed with Great Britain.

With your indulgence, I would like to quote from memory the words of two great men and great leaders, and, although I quote from memory, I believe I will quote accurately. In the Sixty-ninth Congress, on the only occasion when I remember the Speaker of the House leaving his chair to make a speech from the floor of the House, I distinctly remember that Mr. Speaker LONGWORTH stated:

To the rest of the world we owe a treaty obligation not to exceed Great Britain's Navy; but to America we owe an obligation to have a strength not less than the strength of any other nation.

Mr. Chairman, those words and that theory I most heartily indorse, and I believe the real patriots of America indorse just exactly that principle. Do not let us fool ourselves, my colleagues, we get fooled often enough when we sit down around the conference table; and again I quote from memory the words of a man since gone to his reward, a man of real leadership in this House and a great Pennsylvanian, but above all, a great American, Thomas S. Butler from this very rostrum said:

It is our fortunate history never to have lost a war, but it is our unfortunate fate never to have won a conference.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen and ladies of this committee of the House, there is enough pacifist poison in this proposed naval appropriation bill to stifle and set back our national defense to the point where instead of equality with Great Britain, we will be on the way to become a second-rate power. I have never, Mr. Chairman, been an advocate for the greatest navy in the world, but always have been ready to answer to the charge of being an advocate of the best navy of its size. I have never thought that in order to procure mere equality with Great Britain we should build ship for ship and train man for man with that of any other power. I have hoped, I have believed, I am convinced that Great Britain and America will stand together to keep and maintain the peace of the world. There is no time within sight, within the imagination of which I am capable, when America and Great Britain would be engaged in hostilities with each other. If that time were ever to come, Mr. Chairman, the very civilization builded up through 2,000 years would be atremble; but there is a danger, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues of the House, that a time may come when America and Great Britain will have to stand together to keep the peace of the world, perhaps by force of arms, and then are we again going to live in security and peace while some one else does our fighting for us, while some one else saves civilization, while some one else sheds the tears and the lives and the treasure? The gentleman from Idaho has advanced the thought that because we are a very wealthy Nation, because Canada borders us on the north for 3,000 miles, because of the oceans that are on both sides of us, and, perhaps, although I do not remember his words to that effect, because Mexico borders us to the south, there is no need for our having equality with Great Britain. Mr. Chairman, I consider it a part of Great Britain's right that we should not only have equality with her, but stand with her in those things that make for decency and order.

In the comparatively brief time that I have been here I notice a dangerous and growing tendency to put into the hands of the Appropriations Committee all of those matters which were formerly handled by the legislative committee. It was quite clearly intended that the Appropriations Committee should be an adding-machine check-up on the Bureau of the Budget and an incident to the adoption of the Budget. There was no thought or intention on the part of the Members of the House—since the gentleman from Idaho claims that he knows what was in their minds, I, too, claim that there was no intention on the part of the House—to pass all legislative matters over to the Appropriations Committee. The present existing condition has been arrived at by indirection and by gradual encroachment. There is, however, being raised up in the Congress a more and more vocal, a more and more real, and more and more threatening opposition to the present methods.

Gentlemen and gentlewomen of the House, just in order that it might be made a matter of record, it is a fact that Great Britain's program of scrapping scraps five ships, all of which are below the 23-knot speed. The remaining British fleet has to-day a speed of 23 knots, based on the speed of the slowest ship, this fleet having gained nearly 2 knots in speed through the scrapping of all of their slowest ships. On the other hand, the American Fleet, based on the speed of its slowest battleship, is not in excess of 21½ knots. Each of us has remaining available for use to keep the peace of the world 15 first-class ships. Great Britain undoubtedly will maintain her 15 ships as a fleet in being manned and ready to go. The United States this year takes 1 of the 15 and puts it in reduced commission with a small complement and assigns it to the training service, leaving but 14. Of the 14 remaining, 3 were due to be modernized some time ago and are still to be modernized, but are not provided for in this bill. As a consequence, if Great Britain has a force of 15 available for the keeping of the peace of the world, and America's obligation is to equal Great Britain's, America does not meet this obligation, because to-day her effective modern fleet available to take to the seas in defense of the country is not 5 to 5, but 11 for America and 15 for Great Britain. It was perhaps rather prophetic that Uncle Tom Butler should have said:

America never lost a war, but she never won a conference.

I hope the amendments offered by the legislative committee will be given serious consideration and accepted by the House.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE

ORDNANCE AND ORDNANCE STORES, BUREAU OF ORDNANCE

For procuring, producing, preserving, and handling ordnance material, for the armament of ships; for the purchase and manufacture of torpedoes and appliances; for fuel, material, and labor to be used in the general work under the cognizance of the Bureau of Ordnance; for furniture at naval ammunition depots, torpedo stations, naval ordnance plants, and proving grounds; for technical books; plant appliances as now defined by the "Navy Classification of Accounts"; for machinery and machine tools; for accident prevention; for experimental work in connection with the development of ordnance material for the Navy; for maintenance of proving grounds, powder factory, torpedo stations, gun factory, ammunition depots, and naval ordnance plants, and for target practice; not to exceed $15,000 for minor improvements to buildings, grounds, and appurtenances of a character which can be performed by regular station labor; for payment of part time or intermittent employment in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere, of such scientists and technicists as may be contracted for by the Secretary of the Navy in his discretion at a rate of pay not exceeding $20 per diem for any person so employed; for the maintenance, repair, and operation of horse-drawn and motor-propelled freight and passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes at naval ammunition depots, naval proving grounds, naval ordnance plants, and naval torpedo stations; for the pay of chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, naval ordnance plants, and naval ammunition depots, and for care and operation of schools during the fiscal year 1932 at ordnance stations at Indianhead, Md., Dahlgren, Va., and South Charleston, W. Va., $11,930,585: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, watchmen, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, naval ordnance plants, and naval ammunition depots for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, shall not exceed $1,028,000.

For purchase and manufacture of smokeless powder, $1,000,000.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In 1921, under an Executive order issued by President Harding, there was established a coordinating officer in these words:

The Chief Coordinator, General Supply, appointed under the provisions of Executive order of July 27, 1921, shall exercise general supervision, subject to the Director of the Budget, over the coordination of the routine business activities of the governmental organization, with particular attention to methods of purchasing, liquidation of supplies, specification of materials, advertising, warehousing, employment, manufacturing, disbursing, and other ordinary business activities of the Government.

This Executive order was designed in the interest of economy and to see to it that all the routine business of the various governmental departments was coordinated so that the Government could get the best rates wherever possible. There was established under the director of the bureau a coordinator of traffic. As shown by the report of the Director of the Budget for the fiscal year ending this June this coordinator of traffic issued 4,000 routing advices, representing 51,000 carloads of Government property, of which 48,000 carloads moved by all rail or rail and water, and 2,000 carloads moved by water. Most of the Government departments have taken advantage of this traffic coordinator. There was established some land-grant railroad lines, which had for their purpose the giving of cheaper rates to the Government. However, the Navy Department has refused consistently to take advantage of the services of this traffic coordinator, under the Director of the Budget, and refused to go along with the other departments in their traffic work. The Navy Department in its bids requires that all of its goods are to be delivered at a point designated by the Navy Department and paid for by the shipper. In other words, the Navy Department requires a commercial bill of lading while the other departments, in purchasing supplies, get a Government bill of lading. The other Government departments, acting under the advice of the traffic coordinator, buy their supplies f. o. b. at the plant. Thus the other departments are able to take advantage of the cheaper rates over these various land-grant railroads.

It seems to me that the Navy Department, anxious to economize at the expense, for instance, of workmen in the navy yards, might economize a little at the expense of the railroads and follow the scheme set forth by President Harding, set forth by the Director of the Budget, set forth by the coordinator of traffic, and followed by the various other departments and hereafter provide in their contracts that goods are to be delivered to the department f. o. b. at the plant and then let the Government ship them and get the advantage of a cheaper rate wherever they can. I understand there will be a saving in the purchases of this year of close to $2,000,000 by that method.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I would like to say a few words with regard to the appropriation for our Naval Reserve officers. The appropriation has been cut twice in the last two years, and I have here a protest from the president of the United States Naval Reserve Officers' Association, Lieut. Commander M. R. Wortley, of Detroit.

The appropriation for Naval Reserves in 1930 was $4,740,000; in 1931, $4,720,000, a cut of $20,000, and in the present bill the appropriation is cut $326,000 more.

Commander Wortley says, with a great deal of pertinence in a letter to me under date of February 6, protesting against these cuts and asking that the amount be restored to the figures of 1931:

Our Navy, as the first line of defense, would be largely dependent upon the strength of its reserves in the case of national emergency. Although this reduction in appropriations for Naval Reserve activities will undoubtedly be attributed to the present "economy wave," it would seem that those who are seeking to reduce the size and efficiency of our national-defense agencies are yearly becoming more successful. While under the impression that that principle of the United States naval policy which aims "to make the Naval Reserve secure in its status" was a definite actuality, various States (including Michigan) have generously subscribed both morally and financially to the support of the Naval Reserve and the part that it is intended to play in our general national-defense structure. I will venture to estimate that the aggregate expenditures by States and municipalities has in the past two or three years exceeded the amounts appropriated by the Federal Government thereby enabling the Naval Reserve to "carry on" so that a dependable reserve might be available for our country's first defensive agency.

I am very doubtful if this side of the picture has been explained by the Navy Department either to the Budget Director, the Naval Affairs Committee, or the subcommittee on appropriations, and if it is at all possible for you to get these facts before them at this late date, I shall appreciate very much your doing so.

Mr. Chairman, the able and courteous gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], who is in charge of this bill, has been good enough to inform me that this cut of $326,000 is largely due to an economy in ships. I also believe it is true they have cut down the number of ships not only on the Atlantic seaboard but on the Great Lakes. Of course, the ship tonnage on the Great Lakes exceeds the tonnage, probably, of any one definite place in the world. For instance, the traffic passing Detroit exceeds that passing through the Panama and Suez Canals, with the traffic at Liverpool thrown in.

The country should utilize our Great Lakes sailors as naval reserves and also the available young men who hold shore jobs.

While I realize that nothing probably can be done in the House just now to increase the facilities for the Naval Reserve, I think the record should be made for the Senate.

I hope the Senate will restore the $326,000 which has been cut out of last year's estimates.

Will the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] kindly give the House the reasons for depriving the loyal and valuable naval reservists of this $326,000?

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the interest my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLANCY] has in the reservists, an interest he has manifested heretofore in presenting matters to the chairman of the subcommittee. The particular item to which he directs attention at this time is one that was brought to the committee from the department through the Budget, and refers to a modified arrangement for training reservists of the seagoing branch that has the approval of the department and, in fact, so far as the committee is aware, originated within the department. It will mean, to some extent, a change as to the craft that will be supplied to the reservists. Certain Eagle boats and sub-chasers will be withdrawn. Other craft, more particularly destroyers, will be

substituted, and some shipkeepers will be eliminated. The new policy will permit expenses to be reduced, and the arrangement, we are advised, will be more efficient for the reservists than under the present system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman wants more time, I shall be pleased to ask that the gentleman have an additional five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Michigan be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, thanks for the additional time. I shall probably not consume the five minutes, but I believe the importance of the Naval Reserve can not be overestimated, and I know that many reserve officers and patriotic men, such as Commander Thornton Brodhead, Lieut. Col. J. M. O'Dea, Lieut. Col. Walter C. Cole, have protested very vigorously against these cuts, as well as Commander Wortley. Colonel Cole is national president, I believe, of the Military Reserve Officers Corps.

Now, compare the way you treat these Naval Reservists with the Coast Guard, for instance. You increase Coast Guard items by many millions. Why? Because they enforce prohibition laws. I know that five additional Coast Guard ships were sent to the Detroit River with a complement of 120 men, at great cost, after Canada had put an embargo on liquor, and when there was no necessity whatever for these boats coming there, as there was already a large number of boats and a large number of prohibition guards stationed there.

I think it is pertinent at this time to lodge these protests and to have a complete discussion of the matter. We know very well if war should come and an untrained man or a partially untrained crew were put in charge of a naval auxiliary the damage which that untrained person or persons might do could hardly be estimated. On the other hand, if they had adequate training, if they were efficient, and if their morale was increased by the satisfaction of feeling that the Government was doing the right thing by them, it is also hard to estimate how much more valuable they might be, for instance, in hunting down submarines or in capturing prizes of war, or in guarding supply ships or transports.

For these reasons I hope the Senate will restore the $326,000 to the Naval Reservists as their patriotic association emphatically requests.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

PAY, SUBSISTENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

Pay of naval personnel: For pay and allowances prescribed by law of officers on sea duty and other duty, and officers on waiting orders (not to exceed 5,499 commissioned officers of the line, exclusive of officers designated pursuant to law as additional numbers, and 1,455 warrant and commissioned warrant officers on the active list, exclusive of commissioned officers who may revert to warrant or commissioned warrant status in accordance with law), pay—$30,886,052; rental allowance, $6,081,474; subsistence allowance, $3,727,648; in all, $40,695,174; officers on the retired list, $5,597,360; for hire of quarters for officers serving with troops where there are no public quarters belonging to the Government, and where there are not sufficient quarters possessed by the United States to accommodate them, and hire of quarters for officers and enlisted men on sea duty at such times as they may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable, $3,000; pay of enlisted men on the retired list, $3,580,110; extra pay to men reenlisting after being honorably discharged, $2,566,370; interest on deposits by men, $3,000; pay of petty officers, seamen, landsmen, and apprentice seamen, including men in the engineer's force and men detailed for duty with the Fish Commission, enlisted men, men in trade schools, pay of enlisted men of the Hospital Corps, extra pay to men for diving, and cash prizes (not to exceed $73,300) for men of excellence in gunnery, target practice, and engineering competitions, $66,600,000; outfits for all enlisted men and apprentice seamen of the Navy on first enlistment at not to exceed $100 each, civilian clothing not to exceed $15 per man to men given discharges for bad conduct or undesirability or inaptitude, reimbursement in kind of clothing to persons in the Navy for losses in cases of marine or aircraft disasters or in the operation of water or air borne craft, and the authorized issue of clothing and equipment to the members of the Nurse Corps, $1,422,728; pay of enlisted men undergoing sentence of court-martial, $162,932, and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint; and apprentice seamen under training at training stations and on board training ships, at the pay prescribed by law, $1,199,520; pay and allowances of the Nurse Corps, including assistant superintendents, directors, and assistant directors—pay $687,880, rental allowance $18,240, subsistence allowance $21,960; pay retired list, $22,510; in all, $750,590; rent of quarters for members of the Nurse Corps; pay and allowances of transferred and assigned men of the Fleet Naval Reserve, $10,264,216; reimbursement for losses of property as provided in the act approved October 6, 1917 (U. S. C., title 34, secs. 981, 982), as amended by the act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 34, sec. 983), $5,000; payment of six months' death gratuity, $150,000; in all, $133,000,000.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 21, lines 6 to 13, inclusive, strike out the following: "(not to exceed 5,499 commissioned officers of the line, exclusive of officers designated pursuant to law as additional numbers, and 1,455 warrant and commissioned warrant officers on the active list, exclusive of commissioned officers who may revert to warrant or commissioned warrant status in accordance with law)."

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. To that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma make his point of order?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. As I understand the amendment it increases the authorization for the number of officers in the Navy. If that is true there has been no legislation passed by this body authorizing such increase. In other words, it is legislation on an appropriation bill unauthorized.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to strike out a limitation on the appropriation which has been put in the bill. I do not think the point of order is well founded at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair does not think that this amendment amounts to legislation on an appropriation bill. It merely strikes out language in the bill. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I respectfully invite the committee's attention to this amendment that I have offered. I shall seek to endeavor to explain it to the House so that you can determine whether or not the position I take is well founded or whether the position set out by the Naval Affairs Committee is one which should prevail.

In my opinion the limitation which the committee has placed in the bill and which I moved to strike out should be stricken from the bill.

The language which it is proposed to strike out places a limitation on the number of officers and warrant officers that can be paid from this appropriation. You will bear in mind that it fixes it at 5,499.

The number of officers authorized by law is 4 per cent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy. That is on the statute book to-day. You are entitled to have an officer personnel of 4 per cent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy. That is fixed by statute and can only be changed by repeal or modification of that percentage. The authorized enlisted strength is 131,485, and, in addition thereto, 6,000 apprentice seamen and some 14,000 men attending trade schools.

That is what the law authorizes to constitute the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy—131,485 plus 6,000 apprentice seamen plus 14,000 attending trade schools.

Let us see how we determine how many officers there shall be. The law says we are entitled to 4 per cent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy. The number of men attending trade schools has heretofore not been computed in the authorized officer strength as the strength of line in the Navy was well under 4 per cent of 137,485.

We are entitled to have 4 per cent of the authorized enlisted force, which is 151,485, and we have only been basing our 4 per cent upon 137,485. Why have we been doing

that? It has been due to the fact that the 4 per cent was well under the 137,485 men.

Last year, when it was thought that it would be necessary to discharge a certain number of midshipmen, the law relative to the amount to be paid them upon their discharge and the authority for making such payment was examined, and the Judge Advocate of the Navy decided that the law authorized 4 per cent of 151,485—that is, 4 per cent of the authorized enlisted strength, 4 per cent of the 6,000, and 4 per cent of the 14,000. Bear in mind now that these 14,000 men, these 6,000 men, are just as much a part of the Navy as anyone who has enlisted in the service. This will give an authorized strength of 6,059, and under the way that we have been calculating the 4 per cent, you would have only 5,499.

As I stated, the reason why we did not include in the calculation the 14,000 at trade schools was because of the fact that the 4 per cent was under the 137,000. The question as to the actual authorized strength of the Navy has been referred to the Attorney General of the United States, who declined to rule upon this matter before the adjournment of Congress, as he has stated that clarifying legislation must be enacted by Congress before adjournment, which would render unnecessary such a decision upon his part. Bear in mind that the Judge Advocate General has ruled that the Navy Department is entitled in their calculation of 4 per cent based on 151,485, and not upon 137,485. That has been referred to the Attorney General and the Attorney General has refused to render an opinion on it in view of the fact that Congress is in session.

The elimination of the language suggested would, if the Attorney General ruled that the authorized strength was 6,059, permit the commissioning of all the midshipmen at the Naval Academy and all midshipmen who would be graduated from the Academy prior to 1939, provided Congress continued to name four midshipmen to the academy for each Representative. What I am seeking to do is to permit the Attorney General to interpret the law as already enacted by Congress to see whether or not we are entitled to base our calculation of 4 per cent on 151,485. If the Attorney General holds that we are entitled to base our calculation of 4 per cent on that total figure, then it means that the 200 midshipmen at the Naval Academy will receive commissions. If, on the other hand, the Attorney General holds that we are not entitled to take into consideration the 14,000 that are at trade schools, it means that the 200 men at the Naval Academy do not get their commissions. What I am seeking to do by this amendment is to permit the legal department of the Government to interpret that which Congress has already said is the law.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Is it the gentleman's thought that if the Attorney General should rule that you are entitled to base your 4 per cent on the 151,485, that then these boys under the law would be entitled to a commission and entitled to pay, which they could go into the court and bring suit for.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly. When you put this limitation on, if the Attorney General holds that you are entitled to 4 per cent of the 151,485, then they are entitled to a commission and will get a commission, but this bill says that they do not get any pay. Therefore, they will have a commission and the bill prohibits them from being paid. If they are entitled to a commission and you are appropriating to pay for only 5,499, I ask you which one that has a commission will be entitled to pay? Would it be the ones at the bottom or the top? Under this amendment you can pay only 5,499 if the Attorney General holds you are entitled to have 6,000. I ask the gentleman from Idaho which ones would be paid, the ones at the bottom or the ones at the top?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If the law is passed as these gentlemen want it, in this bill, how many midshipmen will be trained and out of their commissions this year?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It means approximately 200 that will not receive the commission.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What are you going to do with them?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am trying to permit them to have an opportunity to have the Attorney General construe the law.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What does the Committee on Appropriations propose to do with these young fellows?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Pay them $720 and let them go.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And thus add to the rolls of the unemployed?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. COYLE. The year's pay, I believe, is in excess of $720.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It amounts to from $720 to $1,000.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman kindly inform the House if this amendment be adopted and the Attorney General rules that you can increase a certain number of officers, how many that increase will amount to?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If you take 4 per cent of 151,485, then you would be entitled to have 6,059 officers. We have to-day 5,499.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. That will give us about 500 more?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; and I can tell the gentleman when we will need them.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. What is the plan to take care of them in the future, after the 500 have been utilized?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It will become absolutely necessary in the next four or five years, on account of the 12 ships that we are now building, to raise the per cent from 4 per cent to some other figure. It is absolutely necessary to have more officers in the Navy to-day than the 4 per cent authorized, as soon as these ships go into commission.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is it not a fact that the operating force planned for officer personnel at the present moment provides for 5,925 officers, practically 500 more than are allowed under this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Did not the Secretary of the Navy and other officers of the department recommend that the number be increased from 4 to 5 per cent in order to take care of the situation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The gentleman realizes we have 600 officers sailing the seas here in Washington. We should utilize some of those men in other places.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] should be answered in this way: That this bill as drawn does permit an additional 60, based on extra numbers to come in, because the 5,492 is exclusive of the extra numbers.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The committee had some doubt as to the wisdom of inserting this limitation. We first thought of carrying the limitation as it was last year, namely, 5,492, because there was some doubt whether we should allow the additional 60 based on extra numbers, but under the language the bill as drawn excludes from the limitation of 5,492 the extra numbers which the Attorney General held should be taken into account. I can see the force of the gentleman's suggestion, that if the Attorney General should decide that under existing law a further additional number of officers were entitled to commissions, such addi-

tional number would be given their commissions, and yet this limitation, if not changed or stricken out, would prevent payments to a large number of officers holding commissions pursuant, forsooth, to a ruling of the Attorney General.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has again expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It is my own opinion, however, and the opinion of our committee, that there will be no additional number of officers because of the language which the Attorney General will be called on to construe. The language referred to relates alone to temporary forces, and can not be construed as furnishing the basis for additional officers in the Navy.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman state again the condition that will exist unless the gentleman's amendment is adopted, striking out this limitation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If this limitation prevails, and if the Attorney General holds they are entitled to have the 4 per cent based upon 151,000, it means that the boys at the Academy will get their commissions. They have a commission from the Government as an ensign in the Navy, and there will be no pay in the bill for them.

Mr. YON. Would it be an assured fact that those in the lower end and not those in the higher end of the rank would be affected?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is no way to tell. There is only pay for 4,599 and there may be 6,000 men. Would you pay an ensign or would you pay an admiral? Both have the same contract with the Government. Both hold a commission. And for that very reason this limitation is unwise and should be stricken from the bill, because it is purely a question for interpretation by the Attorney General. If the Attorney General holds we are entitled to have 6,069 officers and the bill only carries pay for 5,499, which one of the 6,000 is going to get paid?

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Did I understand the gentleman to state that the ensigns have a contract with the Government?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They have an implied contract.

Mr. SABATH. That when they graduate they must receive their commissions and remain for life officers of the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; not at all. It is an implied understanding when they are sent to the academy that if they graduate and make the necessary marks they will receive commissions as ensigns, and the law requires them to remain in the service for two years unless the Secretary of the Navy permits them to resign.

Mr. SABATH. That is, it is mandatory upon the ensign to remain two years in the service, provided the Government has need for his services?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. But there is nothing in the law that compels the Government to utilize his services and keep him on the pay roll?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Unless the Government needs him.

Mr. SABATH. Unless the Government needs him.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Now, let me prove to the gentleman the need of them. What is the necessity of having more officers in the Navy? I make this statement to-day without fear of successful contradiction, that within two years this House will be asked to increase the per cent of officers allowed in the Navy. Why do I make that statement? We are now appropriating in this very bill money to build 12 ships that will come into commission between July 1 of this year and July, 1935. By the 1st day of July, 1931, there will come into commission three cruisers. By July 1, 1932, there will come in two cruisers and a submarine. By July 1, 1933, there will come in two additional cruisers. By July 1, 1934, one airplane carrier and two cruisers. By July 1, 1935, there is another cruiser. There are 12 ships that must be completed between now and 1935. There are not enough officers in the Navy to-day to man those ships. Ships are not being taken out of commission, so you can not take officers from ships that are taken out of commission and put them upon these ships.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALE. This limitation of 4 per cent on the number of officers was placed in effect in 1916, was it not?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly.

Mr. HALE. At that time we had 40 less ships in commission than we will have even after the program advanced by the gentleman from Idaho is put through under the terms of the London treaty.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. HALE. Further than that, since that limitation of 4 per cent was put on, not only have we increased the number of ships greatly but the character of ships has been changed.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is the point.

Mr. HALE. A great many smaller ships have come into use, such as submarines and destroyers, requiring a larger percentage of officers and the whole branch of aviation has developed.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from New Hampshire expresses it correctly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has again expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object for a moment. The gentleman has had 20 minutes. We ought to bring this to an end shortly. I wonder if we could agree upon the time?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There were only two speeches made in regard to this in general debate.

Mr. FRENCH. Of course, that was not the fault of the chairman of the subcommittee. The chairman spoke on the subject and he can testify that the gentleman from Georgia interrupted him considerably on the same point. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 45 minutes, but there ought to be some arrangement by which the time can be equally allotted to those in favor of the amendment and those opposed to it. Could we have an understanding that the 45 minutes will be equally divided between those for and against the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. There could be such an understanding, but recognition is entirely in the hands of the Chairman and no one can control time under the 5-minute rule. The Chair will endeavor to divide the time equally and he will endeavor to recognize those gentlemen who have formally indicated that they desire time. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. This limitation has been put in the bill in order that we may keep the number of officers at 5,499 plus the extra numbers in the grade which are now allowed by law.

The Attorney General decided as far back as 1922 that the authorized number of officers of the line was 5,499. Last summer he decided they should have in addition to that 59 extra numbers in the grade and which should not be counted toward that. A year ago the number of officers in our Navy exceeded the number in the British Navy by about 200. Just what the status is to-day I do not know. I have not satisfactory information which enables me to say. It would seem that with the number of ships that the British have in commission that an excess of 200 over what we have ought to be a fair allotment of officers for our Navy.

These 14,000 apprentices, to be apprentices temporarily in the Navy for instruction purposes, were provided for under the act of July 1, 1918.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The trouble as I see it is that we have a lot of boys at the academy who went there with the understanding that they were coming out as officers, but now you propose to turn them out on their graduation day as waifs, and it does seem to me this committee ought to make some adequate provision for those people.

Mr. TABER. Let me finish and I think the gentleman will understand the situation. I do not think there is a chance of any competent lawyer who has studied the situation saying that the number of line officers under the law should exceed 5,499; but if it should be held to exceed that number, and those 14,000 would be counted, what would it mean? It would mean that automatically you would have 5 more admirals, 20 captains, 35 commanders, a large number of lieutenant commanders, a large number of lieutenants—senior grade and junior grade—and you would not have a great number of ensigns. It seems to me this thing ought to be kept where it is in an orderly shape.

I want to read you what took place in the hearings on this subject:

Mr. FRENCH. What is the attitude of the department now on the the matter of the application of the 4 per cent principle to the 14,000 enlisted men in the trade schools?

Admiral UPHAM. At the present moment there is nothing being done about it at all.

Mr. FRENCH. I know; but something may be done.

Admiral UPHAM. I do not think so.

Mr. FRENCH. If you can get a favorable ruling from the Attorney General, would not the Navy Department just proceed to expand as rapidly as it could upon the basis that the 4 per cent extended to those men?

Admiral UPHAM. Mr. FRENCH, we are only trying to get the number of people we need. I have not been in sympathy with any effort to jump into that 14,000 people. That has not been a part of my thought at all; because I thought it was playing the game in a more straightaway fashion to come down here and state what our needs are, and that is what I have endeavored to do by having these charts put on the board.

That is the situation, and that is the last word the Navy Department has given to us. We understand that since that time some other officers of the Navy, following a ruling of the Judge Advocate General—and you know he is an admiral and not a lawyer—that confuses this situation, have asked the Attorney General for a ruling, and he has refused an opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the time has been fixed by unanimous consent, and I think the understanding was that each man was to use five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that if anyone having the floor asks unanimous consent, at the expiration of his time, to extend his time, the Chair will be constrained to put the request; but the Chair will state to the committee that such time will come out of the 45 minutes that has been allotted. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. The limitation was put in the bill with a view of maintaining orderly procedure and keeping things within bounds. If we should have this increase of 560 officers it would mean an increased expense bill for the Navy, with all the additional enlisted men and staff officers and for ships and for pay and retired pay, of $75,000,000.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has not answered my question. What is to become of the boys at the Naval Academy?

Mr. TABER. The boys went into the academy under the law as it stood. The law provided that there should be 5,499 commissioned officers in the Navy, and they understood that a commission would be given to them if there was a vacancy in the line of the Navy when they graduated. Unfortunately Congress has provided for too many midshipmen; there is a surplus, and it is destroying the morale at Annapolis. That condition ought to be corrected, and it is provided that if these boys are disappointed they will get one year's sea pay, and we have carried that in the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Cut off some admirals. Cut off some of the higher-ups.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman can find some way in which that can be done, that will be fine; but I do not see any way in which such a law can be passed, and I do not see any sense in loading up our Naval Academy with a lot of boys who can not hope to received commissions.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HALE. It was only two or three years ago that the Appropriations Committee provided money for three appointments for each Member of Congress, was it not?

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. HALE. And it was on the recommendation of the Naval Appropriations Committee that the number was increased to four, and that was within two or three years.

Mr. TABER. Yes; and it was a great mistake. It was made under an absolute misapprehension of what the situation was, and now when we find the actual facts we desire to correct the situation and reduce the number of appointments so that in the future the boys who enter the academy and make good can have a commission. Too many have completely destroyed the morale of the academy.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have endeavored to find in these 800 pages of hearings any positive evidence of anyone charged with responsibility for the conduct of the naval service that there is an excess of officers which should be reduced. Of course, you would not expect to get that, perhaps, from the naval officer, but, certainly, no one can accuse this administration of shaking the big stick, and I did find a very considerable amount of interest in the statement of the Secretary of the Navy which I found on pages 14 and 15.

In this statement I find that he says there will be need by the year 1940, which can only be met by five appointments per year, unless we are going to continue to draw all aviators from the aviation reserve cadets, as was suggested by the chairman of the subcommittee having this bill in charge.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COYLE. Yes.

Mr. TABER. The chairman of the subcommittee did not suggest that we draw all our aviators from the reserve. He said some of them.

Mr. COYLE. I accept very gladly the correction of the gentleman from New York. The chairman of the subcommittee advocated, however, letting the 200 men go, who will graduate this year and leave the naval service at the time of graduation, receiving one year's sea pay as an ensign at the time they go instead of taking the graduates of the Naval Academy to be trained as naval aviators.

Every year there are needed to come into the aviation service an inflow of young pilots. For my part, I am very much in favor of adopting this amendment, because it will insure that all of the graduates of the Naval Academy are taken into the naval service and given a chance for the training before we go into outside walks and give temporary commissions at a cost of $19,000 apiece to men from the aviation reserve.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COYLE. I have but five minutes.

Mr. YON. I want to ask the gentleman a question that will fit in very well here. Does not the gentleman think it would be a terrible thing to shut out these young men who have put in four years of work at the Naval Academy with the expectation of entering the service of their country?

Mr. COYLE. I do think it would be a very serious thing, and I think it would be doubly serious if the next day after these ensigns were let go the Navy were to reach out to Yale and to Harvard and to the other universities and bring in men to take the places of these men that they let go the day before.

Mr. BRITTEN. And at the same pay.

Mr. COYLE. At exactly the same pay, while they are in the service and, in addition, Mr. Chairman, they are under no continuing obligation to serve the Navy, whereas these men who graduate at the academy have a definite 2-year obligation to serve when they accept their commission and a continuing obligation to serve during the pleasure of the President.

It does seem to me this amendment, Mr. Chairman, should be adopted if we are to save any chance of approaching parity with Great Britain in any year within the next 20 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and I hope the committee will adopt it.

In the first instance, ladies and gentlemen, the amendment aims to strike out some language which affects only one set of officers in the Navy, the line officers, who can come from only one place practically, and that is the Naval Academy. It does not affect officers of the Supply Corps or the Medical Corps or the Civil Engineering Corps or the other staff corps. It affects only the line of the Navy.

Fifteen years ago we provided by legislation that 4 per cent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy shall be officers of the line, the men who run the ships. This has not been changed until now. It has not been necessary until now to ask for an increase of that 4 per cent. The Navy Department has asked for it, and why? Because we are confronted with the condition that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] just indicated—a demoralized situation at Annapolis, because 200 boys appointed by you and by me, who will pass their examinations highly, not the highest but who will pass them highly, can not be commissioned this year because we have no place for them, because of limiting legislation like this providing there shall not be exceeding 5,499 line officers in the Navy at any one time.

The question will be asked, why educate these boys at the academy if we have no place for them? We have a place for them, gentlemen, if we can get rid, legally and honorably, of 500 or 600 men who came out of the ranks during the war and became young officers and who are now blocking the promotion of these boys from the academy.

This is the reason the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is necessary to-day. There should be no limit on the total number except the 4 per cent of the authorized enlisted personnel as provided by law.

Certainly there is no one here who would willingly educate a boy at an expense of $15,000 to $20,000, who comes from some little town down in Texas or in Missouri and has his heart set on being commissioned in the Navy as an ensign, and then turn him down. His town is proud of him, and his State is proud of him. He is graduated, and then he is told, "I am sorry, but, because of certain legislation enacted by a recent Congress, we can not commission you. We are going to give you one year's pay and send you out into the country with a good education." But please remember that he is now a specialist, trained to run ships; a naval officer educated in navigation, engineering, radio, fire control, and the like—handicapped to some degree by the particular education we have given him. He could not take the place of an average graduate from Yale or Harvard. He has been educated along a different line. He knows history and a language or two, he knows the higher mathematics, but he has been educated for the Navy specifically.

Now, while you talk about 5,499 officers, those are just line officers who come from the Naval Academy and no place else. If the gentleman's amendment carries, there will in all probability be 200 additional boys commissioned as ensigns in July of this year. If the amendment does not prevail, they will fail to get a commission.

Mr. HALE. Is it not true that, if these 200 graduates are permitted to receive commissions in June of this year, before the end of the year by normal attrition the number of officers will become reduced below the limit of 5,499 men?

Mr. BRITTEN. I am not sure that the number will go below, but it will not be much above 5,499. By all means let us care for these boys.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If this amendment is adopted, will it take care of the graduates this year from the Naval Academy?

Mr. BRITTEN. It will, undoubtedly.

Mr. Chairman, it is noted that on pages 25 and 26 the following new language appears:

Provided, That the appropriation "Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, 1931," shall be available for the pay and allowances of not to exceed 5,499 commissioned officers of the line on the active list, exclusive of officers designated pursuant to law as additional numbers, and shall be available to pay one year's sea pay to surplus graduates of the Naval Academy, as provided by law.

The Judge Advocate General of the Navy has held that the total number of commissioned officers allowed in the Navy is 4 per cent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy plus apprentice seamen and men in trade schools. This gives a total of 6,059 officers plus extra numbers. If the appropriation act be passed with the language above quoted included, there will be a question for determination of how many midshipmen may be discharged as surplus. This will lead to an impossible situation, since the total number to be paid will be 5,499 plus additional numbers, whereas the total number that may be commissioned under the law as construed by the Judge Advocate General will be 6,059 plus extra numbers. If the Navy Department discharges as surplus midshipmen who graduate from the Naval Academy in excess of those necessary to bring the number of commissioned officers of the line of the Navy up to 5,499 plus additional numbers, there will be about 200 midshipmen discharged who are in excess of those who may be paid under this act, but not in excess of the authorized number of commissioned officers of the line, as held by the Judge Advocate General. It is, therefore, advisable that all language restricting the number of commissioned officers who may be paid from this act be stricken from the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the language which it is proposed to strike out places a limit upon the number of officers who can be paid from this appropriation. The law authorizes an officer strength equal to 4 per cent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy. That authorized enlisted strength is 131,485, and in addition thereto 6,000 apprentice seamen and some 14,000 men attending trade schools. The number of men attending trade schools has heretofore not been counted in computing the authorized officer strength, as the strength of the line of the Navy was well under the 4 per cent of 137,485 (131,485 plus 6,000). Last year, when it was thought it would be necessary to discharge a certain number of midshipmen, the laws relative to the amount to be paid them upon their discharge and the authority for making such payments were examined, and the Judge Advocate General of the Navy decided that the law authorized 4 per cent of 151,485 (131,485 plus 6,000 apprentice seamen plus 14,000 men at trade schools). This would give an authorized officer strength of 6,055, exclusive of extra numbers. Admiral Leigh, the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, very frankly explained to the committee the situation, and the committee last year wrote into the bill a limitation of 5,499. The question as to the actual authorized officer strength of the Navy has been referred to the Attorney General of the United States, who has declined to rule upon the matter

before the adjournment of Congress, as he has stated that clarifying legislation might be enacted by the Congress before adjournment, which would render unnecessary such a decision upon his part. The amendment offered is a clarifying one. The elimination of the language suggested would, if the Attorney General ruled that the authorized strength was 6,059, exclusive of extra numbers, permit the commissioning of all midshipmen now at the Naval Academy and of all midshipmen who would graduate from the academy prior to 1939, provided Congress continued to maintain four midshipmen at the Naval Academy for each Representative and Senator.

The Navy needs practically this number for the ships that have already been built or which are authorized, appropriated for, or building. We have accepted certain restrictions as to the size of our Navy by the terms of the treaty of London, and there is no effort to increase in any way those limits. We Members of Congress will unquestionably authorize a considerable part of the tonnage permitted us under that treaty, if not all of it, and by the year 1940, 10 years from this date, we will need a considerably greater number of officers than we now possess or have in sight from all the graduates that the Naval Academy will produce by that date. The elimination of this language from the appropriation bill will, if the Attorney General holds with the Judge Advocate General that the authorized officer strength of the Navy is 6,059, permit the commissioning of all the midshipmen who will graduate from the Naval Academy this June. If the Attorney General disagrees with the Judge Advocate General, then the number that can be commissioned will be the same as that which has been arbitrarily written in the bill. The officer strength of the Navy is distinctly limited by law and can not be changed except by law. No limitation such as is written in this bill is therefore necessary. If the Attorney General rules that the laws passed by Congress provide for the commissioning of these graduates from Annapolis, they should be commissioned, particularly so as the Navy has at this time a very definite need for them and foresees in the very near future an even greater need. If the Attorney General holds that the law does not provide for the commissioning of these young men, that the Navy is not entitled to them, there is no need for this limitation. I can not too strongly impress upon my colleagues that it takes longer to train officers than it does to build ships.

Trained and competent officers can not be improvised in a day, and the strength of the officer personnel must be built up by slow and gradual steps. If the laws already on the statute books permit us to retain these Annapolis graduates, by all means let us do so. If they do not permit us to retain them, a decision by the next Congress as to the number of officers that the Navy should have will be in order. In either case the restrictive language in this bill is unnecessary.

With reference to the warrant officers, the situation is somewhat different. A number of former warrant officers who are now lieutenants are due to appear before a promotion board in December of this year. If they fail, the law makes it mandatory that they revert to their former status of warrant or chief warrant officers. Consequently, it is impossible to determine just how many warrant officers we may have, as one can not definitely foresee the number of lieutenants who will revert to warrant status on account of failure to pass the required examination. It is not the intention of the Navy Department to increase unduly the number of warrant officers, although a request for 15 such officers additional was made to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, I think the House should know the attitude of the committee on this matter. I am frank to say that since the question has been raised as to whether this limitation should really be in the bill, it is my opinion that it is not necessary that it should. The attitude of the committee when the limitation was inserted, was this: That the Attorney General would never construe the law in question as authorizing any additional officers, and that it would be proper to carry a limitation as to line-officer strength similar to the limitation carried in the last appropriation bill, allowing in addition to the number of 5,492 officers, the 60 officers which the Attorney General, since the passage of the last bill, had held should be added to the line of the Navy, based on the extra numbers.

Now, if the Attorney General should hold, after the passage of this bill, that another law justified a further increase in the number of line officers, then the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is correct in stating that this limitation he complains of would not permit the payment of salaries to such officers of the appropriations carried in this bill. Such officers could go into the Court of Claims and bring suit for their salaries.

I offer, therefore, to the gentleman from Idaho this suggestion: That he enlarge the limitation by adding thereto the following words: "And exclusive of officers that the Attorney General may under existing law hold are entitled to commissions." I think the gentleman from Georgia would accept that as a substitute for the amendment he has offered, since it would accomplish the full purpose he has in mind. All who have listened to this debate must agree that many matters have been discussed that have nothing to do with this limitation. The limitation would work an injustice to some officers if the Attorney General should hold that additional officers can be commissioned under existing law.

Mr. BRITTEN. Would the gentleman be willing to change the words "Attorney General" to "Judge Advocate"?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No; I think it should be left to the Attorney General. While I am convinced that the Attorney General will not construe the language referred to as authorizing additional line officers, yet I do feel that those affected by the limitation should have an opportunity to secure from the Attorney General, through the Navy Department, his construction of the language in question.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. If the Attorney General rules that there should be additional officers will there be enough money in the bill to pay them?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. HALE. I take it that the gentleman holds that if the law is as the gentleman from Idaho thinks it is there is no need of a limitation because it is existing law and if a limitation is put in it deprives the Attorney General of the right to make a ruling.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No; but if he makes a favorable ruling the limitation would deny them their pay out of the appropriations carried in this bill.

Mr. COYLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. COYLE. The question was asked the gentleman from Alabama whether there was money enough provided in the bill to pay them in the event that they were commissioned. As I understand it will cost the Government less if they are commissioned than it will if they are let go.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; because the old sea pay is higher than the present pay of an ensign.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, if some of these gentlemen, with their great ability, would devote only half of their energies to the millions that have been pleading for aid and assistance, and to those who have been pleading for a cash bonus, and also in aid of those unemployed, I think their services would be appreciated much more by the country than their efforts to increase the officers of the Navy. My first vote on the naval appropriation bill was in 1908. At that time the bill provided appropriation for two battleships, and appropriated the sum of $108,000,000; and the country was horrified. This bill to-day carries $346,000,000, an increase of over 300 per cent in 22 years, notwithstanding the half dozen treaties that we have entered into within the last few years since the war. I therefore do not know how much greater our military appropriations will be if we have a few more disarmament conferences. To my mind it is to be regretted that otherwise well-meaning persons should be so influenced by these naval offi-

cers as not only to give them all they ask, but all they could possibly dream of. I feel it is high time that some one at some time, somewhere, should call attention to these unjustifiable increases for these naval officers. Of course, I realize the great interest that is taken in these 200 boys who will be graduated from the Naval Academy at the expense and cost to our Government of $18,000 each, as to what will become of them if this amendment does not prevail. There are thousands of boys, not the sons of these naval officers, who would be thankful to the Nation if they had the opportunity to receive the four years' education and then be left free to accept employment in civil life.

I think the worry in the minds of some of these gentlemen is unjustifiable in respect to these 200 young men. I am satisfied, that whether they will be needed or not, the naval officers have influence enough in this House to see to it that they are appointed, and that places be found for them. It is therefore unnecessary for you gentlemen to worry about them. I recognize that they are nearly all the sons of the naval officers; because invariably, any outsider appointed to the Naval Academy, to whom the alternate is the son of a naval officer, fails and the alternate passes. If you have any doubts, then I ask you to investigate, and satisfy yourselves that my statement is correct.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to my naval colleague from Chicago.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman from Illinois has been in the House very creditably for a long time. Has he in all those years ever appointed to the Naval Academy or to the Military Academy the son of a naval officer or an Army officer?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I have.

Mr. BRITTEN. When?

Mr. SABATH. Many times. In fact I venture to say that quite a large per cent of my boys whom I have appointed in the district, happen to be the sons of naval officers, and in West Point, the sons of Army officers. I did not appoint them directly. I appointed boys from my district, and then I was pleaded with by some officers here and there to give their boys a chance as an alternate, and invariably when I yielded, being soft-hearted, I found that the principal failed and the alternate passed. Therefore, I advise you, who are interested in having your principal pass, not to appoint the son of an officer as an alternate.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, whenever the naval appropriation bill is being considered it is amazing how active the Representatives from the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, California, and Washington are. I will not charge that it is because of the fact that they have in their respective States navy yards and Navy activities, as surely they can not be influenced to work so diligently to secure these large appropriations for the few thousand men in their navy yards, to the detriment of the taxpayers in their States. It is to be regretted that the same activity is not forthcoming for the needy millions of enlisted men who so bravely served the Nation in the World War, and who are now pleading for relief. It is remarkable how easily any increase, regardless how large, can be had for the officers; and how impossible it is to secure deserved and much-needed aid for the enlisted men. Personally, I know the reasons and influences responsible, for within the last few days I have received many communications from various sources, but all instigated by the same group of financiers who seem to control and domineer legislation in this House, and who, notwithstanding their opposition against the immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates on the ground that it would increase taxation, are, nevertheless, through the Navy League, ever ready to advocate additional millions for the activities of the Navy and the War Departments. To prove my assertion, I will read a portion of one of the many letters which I have, and I am certain each of you has, received. This letter and resolution comes from the Investment Bankers' Association of America, and says:

* * * The enactment of legislation to cash the World War certificates involves these dangers:

1. The money market would be disorganized to the serious detriment of all industry and agriculture.
2. Business recovery and progress would be hindered by making too costly legitimate borrowing which is necessary at favorable rates to increase employment and to bring about a substantial improvement of business conditions.
3. All security values would be depressed to the extent of threatening the stability of many banks and commercial organizations.
4. Refunding operations of our Government would be retarded and made more costly.
5. Taxation would be increased to the detriment of progress in business recovery, at a time when taxation should be decreased to aid in such recovery.

Does this not convince you that the policy of these interests is millions for killing and not a cent for living; billions for destruction and not a cent for construction? I am certain that the same avaricious, unscrupulous financiers who by means of false and misleading representations, robbed millions of their life savings—bankrupted business—closed banks—drove over 10,000 people to suicide—and have thrown and are keeping millions out of employment—this very group of financiers, which now has in its vaults billions of dollars worth of the safest and best stocks and bonds, acquired for one-half of the price for which they unloaded them on the public in 1927 and 1928—this same combination which controls 80 per cent of all of the bank deposits and available cash—the same war profiteer—these same forces seem to control the White House; yes, and domineer this House.

They tell us and the country, that we can not and must not appropriate a dollar for the starving thousands in our midst. They will not permit the aiding of the three or four million ex-service men now in need, by cashing, or even advancing 50 per cent on their adjusted-service certificates. They will not permit the relieving of the thousands of banks now in a very critical, or at least, embarassing situation, which could be relieved by a reasonble extension of the rediscount rule. All this, because—they claim—they are fearful of inflation. But this certainly was not their position in 1928 or 1929, when they were fleecing the public of millions upon millions every day, through their inflation manipulations.

If the President, Mr. Mellon, and the influential men behind them, would only make a survey of conditions, I am certain that they would desist in their heartless and inhuman position, and would—if not for the purpose of relieving from starvation—as an insurance against the so-called bolshevism—permit legislation which would relieve, at least to some extent, the alarming conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I always try to visualize every question from a national standpoint in as broad a manner as possible. It will be remembered that in 1916 we passed a bill, if I am correctly informed, that authorized the number of officers to be 4 per cent of the enlisted strength. Since that time we have engaged in a world war, where it was necessary to have a Navy of 500,000 men. I am informed that the number of officers that we have now is very similar to the number we had then, and so, if it was possible to take care of a Navy that had 500,000 men in it during a period when it required the resources and finest capability of everyone, then why is it necessary to increase the number of officers when we have only 90,000 men in the Navy?

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Not now. As I view it, some way ought to be found to take care of those who are going to graduate at Annapolis this year, but surely we ought to be sensible enough to visualize what is going to take place in the future, and if this same condition is to arise year after year, there ought to be some way to limit the number so that the members and the individuals who are the beneficiaries of that action will not be embarrassed.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, as I see this proposition, answering the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], I do not know how it may be out in his section of the country, but the boys who go to the Naval Academy from down in my section of the country, and I think it is so with most of

the membership here, come from the high schools and from the country districts, and they select the Navy as a place to make a record. The worst thing that could happen to these young fellows who have had four years of training at the Naval Academy is for this Congress, because, forsooth, there are a few pacifists in the country who want to cut down the Navy, to cut these boys off and absolutely destroy all hope and ambition for them in the future. I can not conceive how we can do a thing of that sort. If, as has been said, there are 5,000 men in the Navy who are officers who ought not to be there, then retire them and get them out of the way.

But do not take these young men, in the flower of their youth, and absolutely close the door of hope to them. It seems to me that would be the worst thing we could do.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. I may say to my friend there is legislation now pending that will permit officers who have come out of the ranks to be retired; and when they are retired, as soon as this law becomes effective, they will make room for these boys in the Naval Academy and the number will then be below 5,499.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Let us graduate these boys and give them their commissions.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Permit me to propound a question to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], as he will close the debate. I ask the gentleman if he will have any objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama, that the proviso limiting it to 5,499 plus the 60 extra numbers remain in the bill, and in addition this language:

And exclusive of officers held by the Attorney General to be entitled to commission under existing law.

All I am asking is to accord these boys at Annapolis the right to have the Attorney General give them a day in court and a hearing. If the Attorney General holds we are entitled to count 4 per cent on 151,000, then they will get their commissions. If the Attorney General holds they are to count on but 137,000, they will not get their commissions.

I have spoken to members of the committee, the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Alabama, and the gentleman from Kansas, and all of them are perfectly willing that this question be referred to the Attorney General. I merely ask that those boys have an opportunity to have their case heard before the Attorney General, to have a day in court. I trust the gentleman will accept the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HALE. I am against the gentleman's proposed amendment. The reason I am against it is because there is a possibility of these 200 graduates being excluded from their commissions.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Permit me to say to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. HALE] that if the Attorney General holds the 4 per cent is to be computed on 137,000, they do not get their commissions.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Let us not divide our forces. Let us vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia as it was originally, and we will save these boys at the academy. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, what is the issue? The law provides an authorized officer personnel in what the committee believes to be 5,499 officers of the line. Again, we shall graduate some 200 more midshipmen from the Naval Academy than we have vacancies. The committee proposes to pay the surplus graduates the compensation that they are entitled to under the law, which will be from $1,700 to $2,100 each, and let them go from the academy with their graduation certificates showing completion of four years at the academy and a fund adequate for one or two years' postgraduate work in some educational institution in civil life. The proponents of the amendment seek to force an artificial interpretation of present law and pretend to authorize officer commissions in the Navy.

The proponents of the amendment—unintentionally, I think—have misled Members of the House by causing them to feel that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] prevail it will clarify the matter so far as the surplus graduates at Annapolis may be concerned. That is not the case, as I shall indicate during my remarks.

I may also say that I am not in sympathy with the substitute amendment which the gentleman asks me to accept, because I think it would add confusion to confusion.

Now, if you wish the Attorney General to legislate, or if you wish the Judge Advocate General to legislate, and not have legislation by the Congress, a good way to invite it would be by passing the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia. Let us consider the various factors.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] suggested that the language of the bill applies only to officers of the line and not to staff officers. That is precisely what we sought to do for the reason that the number of staff officers is in part controlled by the number of officers of the line. The staff officers are in part contingent upon the officers of the line, and hence we did not need to refer to them specifically.

Again, the amendment proposes to strike out the language of the bill which would limit pay to 5,499 officers of the line, and such extra numbers as are authorized by law. The committee believes that the authorized number of officers, aside from about 60 extra numbers, is 5,499 and no more. The Navy Department some time ago called upon the Attorney General for an opinion, but the Attorney General indicated that he did not desire to pass upon the question, as it could be acted upon by the Congress which was in session.

It is the opinion of the committee that the gentleman from Georgia is wrong in his interpretation of the law. The law provides that the line officer personnel shall be 4 per cent of the authorized enlisted strength—that is, 131,485 enlisted men—exclusive of 6,000 apprentice seamen, and exclusive also of 14,000 men in trade schools who were "temporarily" provided for.

The gentleman from Georgia is correct as to the application of the 4 per cent to the two figures 131,485 enlisted men, plus 6,000 apprentice seamen; that is, a total of 137,485. Four per cent of 137,485 is 5,499. But the gentleman from Georgia is wrong in his application of the 4 per cent to the 14,000 men of the trade schools. These were provided for temporarily, according to the statute, and they can not be regarded as part of the regular authorized Naval Establishment. Surely the Congress did not intend to base permament officer personnel upon temporary enlisted personnel.

However, the committee did not want to proceed blindly in the matter, and in addition to its closest study it called upon the Comptroller General for advice touching the question. The Comptroller General has made a very comprehensive study of the subject and he has cited the language of the code to which the gentleman from Georgia referred, and then he went further than that, which the gentleman from Georgia did not do, and he cited the statute. The statute, curiously enough, includes language that was omitted from the code. The code omitted language which I have pointed out, carried in the statute, to wit, that the 14,000 enlisted men of the trade schools are "hereby temporarily authorized." I shall insert the full paragraph of the statute, which has not been amended since that time with respect to men in trade schools:

That the act approved May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 85), entitled "An act to temporarily increase the commissioned and warrant and enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out all of the first and second sections of said act, after the enacting clause, and by substituting therefor the following:

"That the authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Navy is hereby temporarily increased from 131,485 to 181,485; the authorized number of apprentice seamen is hereby temporarily increased from 6,000 to 24,000; and the authorized number of enlisted men of the Flying Corps is hereby temporarily increased from 350 to 10,000: *Provided*, That the phrase 'authorized enlisted strength,' as applied to the personnel of the Navy, shall mean the total number of enlisted men of the Navy authorized by law,

exclusive of the Hospital Corps, apprentice seamen, those sentenced by court-martial to discharge, those detailed for duty with Naval Militia, those furloughed without pay, enlisted men of the Flying Corps, and those under instruction in trade schools: *Provided further*, That the number of enlisted men for instruction in trade schools shall not at any time exceed 14,000, which number is hereby temporarily authorized: *Provided further*, That the President is authorized, at any time during the period of the present war, when in his judgment it becomes necessary, temporarily to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy, as provided for herein, by the addition of 50,000 men." (40 Stat. 714.)

Now, what does the Comptroller General do? He cites the general law. He cites the statute to which I referred. He cites it at length. Then he renders a decision, in which he says:

It would appear therefore that this temporary additional number was not intended—

That is, the 14,000—

to be included in the total permanent authorized enlisted strength, on which the total number of permanent commissioned officers are based; but, on the contrary, was included in the total of the authorized temporary increases which provided the basis for the appointment of temporary commissioned officers as provided in the same act.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, this was a war measure, and yet Mr. VINSON brings in that temporary provision of a war measure and wants the Congress to use it as a basis for adding 560 additional officers to the Naval Establishment.

I want to ask, ladies and gentlemen, if you do, what will the Comptroller General do? Following on down to the end of his letter—and I am going to print the whole opinion in the RECORD if I may—we come to this conclusion:

From this statement of the law it would appear there is no question but that surplus graduates for whom no vacancies exist, discharged with one year's pay, would have no further valid claim against the Government.

Ladies and gentlemen, if the gentleman [Mr. VINSON] and the other members of the Naval Affairs Committee want this question determined, let them bring in a bill from the Naval Affairs Committee, and let the Congress pass upon it. Let the Congress say whether or not it wants 5,499 officers or wants to add 560 more to that number.

Or, again, let us say specifically whether we want to add the graduates of this year's Naval Academy class and succeeding classes to the officer personnel.

Let us not say it in this slipshod manner and pass the question up for interpretation upon the part of the Judge Advocate General or the interpretation of the Attorney General, of which we know nothing in advance. Ladies and gentlemen, if you approve the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia you will throw the decision into the courts, and I know that is not what you desire to do. The committee is moving along in the only authorized way. We put in the limitation specifically so that there will be no litigation, so that those young men graduating from the academy in excess of the number necessary to fill out the authorized officer strength may receive everything they are entitled to under the law. Again I say let the appropriate legislative committee bring in a bill providing for issuing commissions to the surplus graduates of the academy or going further providing additional officer personnel for the Naval Establishment. I do not think such legislation should be passed; I do not think we need more officers, but at any rate this would be the direct way to handle the question.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman stated in the beginning of his remarks that the modified amendment suggested by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], which I think is satisfactory to the other members of the committee, would add confusion. Let me say that the words of this amendment follow the amendment that you yourself, with the assistance of the secretary, Mr. Pugh, drew, whereby we excluded extra numbers, and why did we exclude them? We excluded them because after the last Congress adjourned, and after the committee had put a limitation in the bill of 5,499, the Attorney General held that there were additional officers entitled to a commission because of the extra numbers, so when we came to write the bill this time, out of respect for the opinion of the Attorney General, the committee wrote that language, and now the modified amendment proposes to permit the Attorney General to pass on this further question.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; the Attorney General ruled that the additional officers numbering something like 60 are authorized by existing law. My contention is that while that is true, the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Georgia aims to base officer strength upon temporary law.

Here, Mr. Chairman, permit me to insert the decision of the Comptroller General.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 12, 1931.

Hon. BURTON L. FRENCH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. FRENCH: There has been received your letter of January 31, 1931, as follows:

"Section 2, title 34, United States Code, prescribes the commissioned line officer strength of the Navy, providing that it shall be a fixed percentage of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy.

"Sections 151 and 152, title 34, United States Code, prescribe and define the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy.

"The authorized line officer commissioned strength generally has been understood to be 5,499, or 4 per cent of 137,485.

"In an opinion rendered May 19, 1930, the Attorney General held that officers designated pursuant to law as additional numbers in grade were not to be counted within the authorized number of commissioned line officers. The Attorney General was asked by the Navy Deartment in connection with the question upon which his opinion of May 19, 1930, was rendered, if men under instruction in trade schools, numbering approximately 14,000, should be included or excluded from the authorized enlisted strength in determining the commissioned line officer strength, and he refused to express his opinion at that time one way or the other.

"I should like to have your opinion as to whether or not men in trade schools may be counted in determining the commissioned line officer strength of the Navy, and, if so, whether or not the Government would be in duty bound to give commissions to Naval Academy graduates in excess of 5,499 officers, exclusive of additional numbers, even though we should write into the naval appropriation bill a limitation on the number of commissioned line officers for pay purposes.

"In this connection I invite your attention to section 1057, title 34, United States Code, which provides that if there be a surplus of graduates, those who are not commissioned as ensigns in the Navy, or assigned to fill vacancies in the lowest grades in the Marine Corps or Staff Corps of the Navy, shall be given a certificate of graduation, an honorable discharge, and one year's sea pay.

"In other words, I wish to know if the men in trade schools are to be counted in arriving at the commissioned line officer strength which would have the effect of increasing the commissioned line officers strength to a figure which would enable places to be found for the entire coming June graduating class, whether or not commissions could be denied to those graduates which would exceed a limitation in the appropriation bill, and the Government's obligation to those not commissioned be completely discharged if they were given a certificate of graduation, an honorable discharge, and one year's pay.

"Or, again, can we control the situation in the appropriation bill by limiting the money.

"I should like to have your opinion at the earliest practicable moment."

In the cited opinion of the Attorney General of May 19, 1930 (36 Op. Atty. Gen. 233), it was advised that the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Navy, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, should be computed upon the basis of 4 per cent of 137,485, comprising the permanent authorized enlisted strength of 131,485 plus 6,000 apprentice seamen; and, in determining whether the number of officers thus computed have been commissioned, there should be excluded, officers designated pursuant to law as additional numbers in grade, and in regard to the question as to whether 14,000 enlisted men temporarily authorized by the act of July 1, 1918, for instruction in trade schools may be included in the figure, 4 per cent of which is to be taken in computing the number of commissioned officers of the line, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, it was said:

"* * * This question is left in considerable doubt by the pertinent acts of Congress, which do not clearly disclose whether or not such men are to be counted in computing the number of commissioned officers. The intention of Congress on this subject is obscure, and it therefore appears most desirable that clarifying legislation be enacted well in advance of the graduation from the Naval Academy of the class of 1931."

It does not appear whether steps have been taken to clarify the legislation on the subject, as suggested by the Attorney General, and it is assumed for present purposes that no such steps have been taken. However, a bill, S. 5612, has been introduced and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, providing for the ap-

pointment as ensigns in the line of the Navy all midshipmen who graduate from the Naval Academy in 1931.

It had been previously advised by the Attorney General in his opinion of September 5, 1922 (33 Op. Atty. Gen. 311), that the total number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Navy should be computed at the present upon the basis of the total authorized strength of 131,485 men, as provided in the act of July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 714), and not on the total actual enlisted strength of 86,000 provided by the act of July 1, 1922 (42 Stat. 799).

The view expressed in the opinion of May 19, 1930, that 6,000 apprentice seamen could also be counted was that that number was a part of the total permanent authorized enlisted strength which was neither included in the authorized enlisted strength of 68,700 which might be increased to 87,000 by the President whenever in his judgment a sufficient national emergency exists, as provided by the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 575), nor in the authorized enlisted strength of 131,485 as provided in the act of July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 714), and that such permanent number of apprentice seamen had not since been changed. The suggestion that 14,000 enlisted men under instruction in trade schools could also be counted apparently is based on the assumption that 14,000 enlisted men in trade schools was also authorized as a permanent addition to the permanent authorized enlisted strength of 131,485 by the act of July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 714). That act, after increasing the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Navy from 87,000 to 131,485, amended section 1 of the act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 85), in so far as here material, to read as follows:

"That the authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Navy is hereby temporarily increased from 131,485 to 181,485; the authorized number of apprentice seamen is hereby temporarily increased from 6,000 to 24,000; and the authorized number of enlisted men of the Flying Corps is hereby temporarily increased from 350 to 10,000: *Provided*, That the phrase 'authorized enlisted strength' as applied to the personnel of the Navy, shall mean the total number of enlisted men of the Navy authorized by law, exclusive of the Hospital Corps, apprentice seamen, those sentenced by court-martial to discharge, those detailed for duty with Naval Militia, those furloughed without pay, enlisted men of the Flying Corps, and those under instruction in trade schools; *Provided further*, That the number of enlisted men for instruction in trade schools shall not at any time exceed 14,000, which number is hereby temporarily authorized: * * *"

I find no specific authority prior to the act of July 1, 1918, for the assignment of enlisted men for instruction in trade schools, but apparently the practice existed under the general authority of the Secretary of the Navy to assign enlisted men to duty, the number so assigned being within his discretion and included in the number designated as the "authorized enlisted strength." In the first proviso, quoted above, this phrase as applied to the personnel of the Navy was defined to mean the total number of enlisted men of the Navy authorized by law, exclusive of six classes of men therein described which had theretofore been excluded, and in addition another class "those under instruction in trade schools," which had theretofore been included. The phrase so defined appears to be equally applicable to both the permanent authorized enlisted strength and the authorized enlisted strength as temporarily increased. The second proviso, quoted above, places a limitation on the number of enlisted men for instruction in trade schools by providing that the number shall not at any time exceed 14,000, and authorized temporarily that number by the clause "which number is hereby temporarily authorized." Apparently this 14,000 so temporarily authorized was intended as a temporary increase in addition to the authorized enlisted strength as temporarily increased in that act to 181,485. That such was the intention is indicated in making appropriations in the same act, page 728, for pay of enlisted men as follows:

"* * * pay of petty officers, seamen, * * * 181,485 men, plus 10,000 men for aviation service, plus 14,000 men in trade schools: * * *"

Furthermore, if it had been intended that those 14,000 men should be a part of the total permanent enlisted strength in addition to the permanent authorized enlisted strength, it would seem that such intention would have been indicated by omitting the word "temporarily" so that the clause would have read "which number is hereby authorized." It would appear, therefore, that this temporary additional number was not intended to be included in the total permanent authorized enlisted strength on which the total number of permanent commissioned officers are based but, on the contrary, was included in the total of the authorized temporary increases which provided the basis for the appointment of temporary commissioned officers as provided in the same act, page 715.

On the whole I would say the inclusion of the 14,000 men temporarily authorized by the act of July 1, 1918, for instruction in trade schools, in the total authorized enlisted strength of the Navy, for the purpose of computing the authorized number of commissioned officers on the active list of the line of the Navy (and which apparently contemporaneously and continuously have not been so included by the Navy Department) is not supported by the law.

I am also of opinion that Naval Academy graduates of the class of 1931, may not be commissioned as ensigns in excess of the vacancies existing.

Acts prior to March 7, 1912, provided for the commissioning of graduates of the Naval Academy only to fill vacancies. Acts of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 285); March 2, 1889 (25 Stat. 878); July 26, 1894 (28 Stat. 124).

The act of March 7, 1912 (37 Stat. 73), provided:

"That the course at the Naval Academy shall be four years, and midshipmen on graduation shall be commissioned ensigns: * * *"

The act of July 9, 1913 (38 Stat. 103) provided:

"* * * That midshipmen on graduation shall be commissioned ensigns in the Navy, or may be assigned by the Secretary of the Navy to fill vacancies in the lowest commissioned grades of the Marine Corps or Staff Corps of the Navy."

Apparently it was not the intent of Congress by omitting to insert after the words "ensigns in the Navy," the words, "to fill vacancies in that grade," that the graduates shall be commissioned ensigns in excess of vacancies, thus increasing the number of ensigns provided by law. As was said in 28th Opinions of the Attorney General, 530, "when Congress has seen fit to make increases in the numbers of officers in the Navy, either generally or in particular corps or grades, it has generally used specific and apt language to accomplish that object."

The act of July 9, 1913, should therefore be construed, in connection with the act of 1916 limiting the number of commissioned officers of the line, as if it expressly provided that midshipmen on graduation shall be commissioned ensigns to fill vacancies in that grade.

The act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 285) is the only law containing provisions for surplus graduates. Such provisions have not been expressly repealed and are contained in section 1057, Title 34, United States Code, referred to by you, but the rate of pay of midshipmen has been changed. Only one rate of pay is now in effect and is provided in the act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 146) as follows:

"* * * and the pay of midshipmen shall hereafter be $780 per annum, * * *."

From this statement of the law it would appear there is no question but that surplus graduates for whom no vacancies exist, discharged with one year's pay, would have no further valid claim against the Government.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. McCARL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. FRENCH and Mr. VINSON of Georgia.

The committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 91, noes 50.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. I desire to ask whether the unanimous-consent agreement entered into a little while ago was to close debate on this entire section or just on this particular amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. On this particular paragraph and all amendments thereto. That is what the Chair understood the request to be.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel, $154,040,870, of which sum $1,000,000 shall be immediately available, and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel," shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law and shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That the appropriation "Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, 1931," shall be available for the pay and allowances of not to exceed 5,499 commissioned officers of the line on the active list, exclusive of officers designated pursuant to law as additional numbers, and shall be available to pay one year's sea pay to surplus graduates of the Naval Academy, as provided by law: *Provided further*, That additional commissioned, warranted, appointed, enlisted, and civilian personnel of the Medical Department of the Navy, required for the care of patients of the United States Veterans' Bureau in naval hospitals, may be employed in addition to the numbers appropriated for in this act: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipman whose admission subsequent to January 30, 1931, would result in exceeding at any time an allowance of three midshipmen for each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in Congress; of one midshipman for Porto Rico, a native of the island, appointed on nomination of the governor, and of three midshipmen from Porto Rico, appointed on nomination of the Resident Commissioner; and of two midshipmen for the District of Columbia, except that nothing herein shall deny pay to or prevent the admission of any midshipman admissible within the number of appointments permissible under the provisions of the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1931 who may enter the Naval Academy in the class entering next after the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to repeal or modify in any way existing laws relative to the appointment of midshipmen at large, from the enlisted personnel of the naval

service, or from the Naval Reserve: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipman appointed from enlisted men of the Navy for admission to the Naval Academy in the class entering in the calendar year 1932 who has not served aboard a vessel of the Navy for at least nine months prior to such admission.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve points of order against two parts of this paragraph. I do not desire to speak on the points of order for the moment, but I want to offer an amendment and proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves points of order against the paragraph and under the reservation desires to offer an amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can not offer an amendment under a reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order of the gentleman from Wisconsin is well taken. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will dispose of his points of order before offering his amendment.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against the following words appearing on page 26, line 25:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipman appointed from enlisted men of the Navy for admission to the Naval Academy in the class entering in the calendar year 1932 who has not served aboard a vessel of the Navy for at least nine months prior to such admission.

The CHAIRMAN. Just what is the gentleman's point of order—that it is legislation?

Mr. COYLE. That it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and if it be decided to be a restriction under the Holman rule that it applies to a period beyond the termination of the period for which these appropriations are made.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LEHLBACH). The Chair is ready to rule. The proviso to which a point of order has been raised reads:

That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipman appointed from enlisted men of the Navy for admission to the Naval Academy in the class entering in the calendar year 1932 who has not served aboard a vessel of the Navy for at least nine months prior to such admission.

This proviso merely limits the appropriation carried in this act or in this paragraph, it makes no difference; it limits it so that it may not be used to pay a midshipman appointed from the enlisted personnel who has not served nine months on a vessel of the Navy. It is purely a limitation and the point of order is overruled.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to withdraw the other point of order, and I submit an amendment striking out the lines concerning which the point of order has just been overruled. Beginning on page 26, line 25, strike out all of line 25, and all of lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, on page 27.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COYLE: On page 26, beginning in line 25, with the word "*Provided*," strike out line 25, and all of lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 on page 27.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take five minutes to discuss this amendment. I bring it up at this time for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the fact that this is not a limitation in expense but rather an increase of expense; that it costs more to send them to sea for nine months, and if this Congress desires to eliminate appointments from the enlisted men in the naval service, it should do so by the orderly processes of legislation, after hearings held and after determination by some committee that appointments from enlisted personnel are not in line with what we desire.

It does actually cost more to send a man to sea for nine months, and I have failed to find anywhere in the 800 pages of hearings before the Appropriations Committee any testimony by any officer or any member of the committee to the effect that there is a serious situation which should be cured.

Mr. HALE and Mr. LAGUARDIA rose.

Mr. COYLE. I yield first to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. HALE. I was just going to ask the gentleman what the existing law is with reference to such appointments?

Mr. COYLE. The existing law is that up to 100 enlisted men per year may be designated by the naval authorities for admission to the Naval Academy.

Mr. HALE. And what period of time is required to be spent in training?

Mr. COYLE. So far as I know, there is no definite limit on the period of time, but a man is rarely designated until he has served six or eight months in the naval service.

Mr. HALE. Does this provision mean that men before they are appointed to the Naval Academy from the enlisted service will have to spend nine months more in the service than they would under existing laws?

Mr. COYLE. Not necessarily, I will say, but it does mean that the man who desires to fight his way from the ranks into the Naval Academy has to start so early that he does not have the necessary fundamental education, and the effect of this provision, I feel quite surely, will eliminate entirely any enlisted men getting a real chance to go to the Naval Academy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COYLE. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania I regret I find myself in disagreement with his views. I think the committee's position on this is, indeed, sound. As a matter of fact, I would like to see it arranged so that before any boy can go to the Naval Academy he must serve at least one year in the Navy. You would then eliminate all the class distinction that occurs in the ranks later on. [Applause.] I hope this provision will prevail, because then we will get boys who had a bona fide intention of serving in the Navy before they went to the academy. I think this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. COYLE. May I say to the gentleman that I am in accord with what he wants to do and with what the committee wants to do, but I maintain this is not the right place to do it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COYLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania has the interests of the Navy at heart, but does not the gentleman believe that in view of the action of the House just now in voting as it did, there is clearly a surplus of officers, and this is one way to curtail the supply of officers, because, otherwise, we will have a regular Guatamalan navy, composed of all officers and no enlisted personnel.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I want at this time to withdraw the amendment, expressing myself in entire accord with what the committee is trying to accomplish, but not at all in accord with the method by which they are attempting to accomplish their purpose.

By unanimous consent, the Coyle amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do this in order to make a statement in connection with the matter discussed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYLE]. Perhaps I may have been more responsible than other members of the committee for writing this language in the bill, and my reason for insisting that the committee do so was because I was on the legislative committee when the law was enacted authorizing a limited number of the enlisted men to be given appointments to the academy. We have recently been convinced that a number of young men were entering the academy after enlistment who have never really rendered any service required of the enlisted personnel.

These candidates before enlisting have taken special training for Annapolis, and are well prepared to take the entrance examination, and on enlistment request assignment to one of the training schools where they are kept and given further instruction, with a view of preparing to take

the entrance examinations. They are permitted, after a certain course at the training school, to take the examination, without having served as an enlisted man on any ship attached to the fleet.

This places them in unfair competition with the real enlisted men of the service.

The number of appointments from enlisted ranks is 100—last year this was exceeded by about 25 who successfully passed the entrance examination. Some of the real enlisted men who passed the examination but without the high grades that some did, who were specially trained, were in danger of losing their appointment. This provision in the bill is intended to require every applicant from the ranks to serve as an enlisted man for nine months on ship before he is eligible to take the examination.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. Under the language here can not the purpose be defeated by simply tying up some old boat in shallow water and letting them serve on that boat? Should we not provide that they shall serve on board a vessel at sea, so we will know whether they can stand the rolling tides or not before they ever go to the academy?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I am sure the committee will accept such an amendment.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer such an amendment. On page 27, line 4, after the word "vessel," add these words: "At sea with the fleet."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DOWELL). The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 4, after the word "vessel," insert "at sea with the fleet."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from South Carolina will follow my thought, I think he would want to strike out the words "of the Navy," or have his amendment come in after the word "Navy."

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I accept the suggestion of the gentleman from Idaho. The fact is I am a shoal-water seaman myself. [Laughter.] I did not know exactly where to anchor, and if the suggestion is correct, I offer the language after the word "Navy."

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the gentleman from South Carolina modifies his amendment and the Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 4, after the word "Navy," insert "at sea with the fleet."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the words "of the Navy."

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 4, strike out the words "of the Navy."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, lines 21 to 24, inclusive, strike out the words "and allowances of not to exceed 5,499 commissioned officers of the line on the active list, exclusive of officers designated pursuant to law as additional numbers," and insert in lieu thereof "all officers commissioned in accordance with law."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to note in the present bill the appropriation that has been made for the purpose of paying retired regular officers of the Navy. This appropriation was made to carry out a very proper and justifiable policy and the officers who are retired and who will receive the benefit of this appropriation are the officers of the regular Navy who have been retired for disability with pay. Such officers with regular officers of the Army, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard occupied the same position as the emergency officer who served during the World War and who received disabilities while in service to a permanent extent of 30 per cent or more and who have been retired with pay under the emergency officers' retirement act. I believe that all officers, either regular or emergency officers, who have been disabled in service to a degree provided by law should be retired with pay. However, the position occupied by the officers of the regular service, as compared with the emergency officer, is very interesting in view of the Reed amendment which has been tacked on in the Senate to the independent offices appropriation bill, if it ultimately is adopted and becomes a law. At the present time the independent offices appropriation bill is in conference, and the Reed amendment is one of the issues which is in controversy between the two branches. The Reed amendment applies only to emergency officers who have been retired with pay and who are employed in civilian life by the Federal Government. It in no way affects an emergency officer who has been retired with pay and who is employed in any other capacity. This amendment in substance provides that an emergency officer retired with pay in the civilian employ of the Federal Government shall not receive his retirement pay and at the same time a salary from the Government in excess of $2,000 per annum.

The amendment does not apply to the officers of the regular service who are at present in the civilian employ of the Federal Government, and it should not. The same should not apply to disabled emergency officers of the emergency service. If a policy such as intended in the Reed amendment is to be adopted, it should apply to every officer who at present is retired with pay and who is employed by the Federal Government in excess of $2,000 per year. We at least should be consistent and not penalize the emergency officers who have been retired with pay and who are in the Federal service. There is a right way to do the right thing and there is a wrong way to do the right thing, and to those who believe that the emergency officers' retirement act should be repealed, or a salary limit placed upon those in the Federal service, the Reed amendment is the wrong way to undertake to do the right thing. Personally I do not agree with the limitation or repeal, but even to those who do, I submit this procedure is unfair and results in unjust discrimination.

I do not intend by these remarks to intimate that the mover of the Reed amendment intended to be unfair, but assuredly the operation of his amendment, if it becomes law, will result in not only unfairness but unreasonable discrimination. At the present time officers of the Regular Army and enlisted men who had been retired with pay for service rendered, having served the number of years necessary for retirement, can enter the service of the Federal Government and their retirement benefits will not be disturbed until they reach a salary limit of $2,500. Why allow $2,500 in this case and impose a limit of $2,000 per annum in the case of disabled emergency officers? It must be borne in mind that the $2,500 salary limit that I have referred to does not apply to officers in the regular service who have been retired for disability incurred in line of duty. Such officers in the regular service can enter the Federal employ, and, irrespective as to what salary they receive, they will also receive their retirement pay. I had previously said that I considered this to be correct, but I also consider that if it is correct in the case of the officers of the regular service, that it is equally correct in the case of the officers who rendered emergency service.

Prior to 1924 all officers and enlisted men of the regular service came within the $2,500 per annum salary limitation when they entered the Federal service in civilian capacity if they had been retired, irrespective as to whether they were retired for service or for disability. On May 31, 1924, Public Act No. 161 of the Sixty-eighth Congress was approved, which amended section 2 of the legislative, executive, and judicial

appropriation act of July 31, 1894, by expressly permitting officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard "who have been retired for injuries received in battle or for injuries or incapacity incurred in line of duty" to hold office in civilian capacity despite the limitations of the act of 1894. That is the law upon which I predicate the statements which I have heretofore made. Throughout the Government service, I understand, and in the Veterans' Bureau itself, there are regular officers, retired with pay for disability, who are now so employed and who will not be affected whatsoever by the amendment of the Senate to which I have made reference.

In other words, we have a situation where a Regular Army officer might have been captain of a company in the World War and the emergency officer might have been a lieutenant in the same company, and they both went over the top and received substantially the same wounds, and upon returning to civilian life the Regular Army officer is retired with pay for disabilities and the emergency officer is retired with pay for disabilities under the provisions of the Fitzgerald-Tyson Act. The result of both retirements, coming under different provisions of law, is substantially the same. Both men later enter into the employ of the Federal service in civilian capacity, and both, let us say, are employed at the Veterans' Bureau in the same capacity and receiving the same pay, let us say, for example, $5,000 per annum. Under the Reed amendment the Regular Army officer would receive not only his salary but his retirement benefits and the emergency officer, wounded in the same action and in substantially the same manner and to the same extent, and an officer in the same company with the captain, would have his retirement benefits taken away. I can not see the logic of this position, and even those who oppose the principle under which retirement for disabilities is based should not allow such discrimination to exist between officers who served in the same war but who served under a different descriptive designation.

As one emergency officer retired with pay in the Federal service receiving $2,000 per year recently convincingly said:

> It has been suggested, and in good faith, that I accept the smaller salary and the more menial position in order that I might still come within the benefits of the retirement act. I have never attempted to turn backward. How pitiful this type of action would have been when I was leading my men against enemy machine-gun replacements.

I think that this particular retired officer is justified in entertaining such opinions, particularly discriminations which I have referred to above which exist with reference to him and his fellow officers who served in as like capacity as he did during the World War.

I sincerely trust that the membership of the House will give this matter logical and rational consideration; not the consideration which flows from the operation of the emotional mind; and if so, I am satisfied that the House will not agree in the Reed amendment. This whole situation is brought about because one man in the Veterans' Bureau received $9,000 a year and there is some question as to whether he was retired properly. We should not permit that to determine our mind with reference to others who have been retired in the proper way and with reference to whom there is no cloud overhanging. I have no knowledge as to whether the man who has been named has been retired properly or improperly; I assume, in absence of additional evidence, that he has been retired properly. However, if there is evidence that is wrong in connection with his retirement, that case or any other case that looks suspicious could receive individual investigation, instead of being used as a means of putting into operation an amendment so drastic and so discriminatory in its operation as the provisions of the Reed amendment.

The following letter was received by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY], who made such a brilliant speech only a few days ago in opposition to the Reed amendment, and in which I concur. This letter was sent to Congressman CONNERY by the Disabled Emergency Officers' Association of the World War and explains their position, a position which I consider tenable and sound.

THE DISABLED EMERGENCY OFFICERS OF THE WORLD WAR,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1931.

Hon. WILLIAM P. CONNERY, Jr.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONNERY: The Disabled Emergency Officers of the World War wish to thank you for your remarks on the floor of the House of Representatives February 9, 1931, in which you so ably defended the emergency officers' retirement act and opposed the Reed amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill which was adopted by the Senate February 6, 1931.

The undoubted purpose of the Senate was to correct certain alleged abuses in the administration of the Tyson-Fitzgerald Act (45 Stat. 735) pertaining to a few individual cases. It is the desire of our organization to emphatically state that the roll of retired emergency officers of the World War is, and should be, an honor roll. If there are any officers on this roll through error, fraud, or maladministration they should be stricken therefrom, but certainly without prejudice or injury to those who are properly retired.

The Tyson-Fitzgerald bill was not enacted into law as a charity or to save its beneficiaries from starvation. On the contrary, it was as a matter of right and justice to compensate disabled emergency officers in some measure for physical handicaps that were inflicted on them in the military service in line of duty. This law became a reality as the result of several years' efforts on the part of all organizations of veterans of the World War. It was intended, in so far as legally possible, to put the disabled emergency officer in the same status as a retired Regular Army officer injured in line of duty.

We do not believe the Senate fully realized the injustice and damage that would be done to these disabled officers if this amendment is written into law. There should be no distinction between disabled emergency officers themselves. Some are working for State and city governments; some are engaged in civil enterprise; while others, including many postmasters, are receiving salaries from the Federal Government for services honestly and efficiently rendered. This amendment, carried to its logical conclusion, would affect those working for the Federal Government alone. They have as much right as the officers working for private industry or State or city governments to earn what their services are worth, in addition to the award they are receiving from the United States Government for their handicap because of physical disability incurred in line of duty.

The Congress by definite action (act of May 31, 1924, Stat. 245) permits officers of the Regular Army and Navy retired for disability incurred in line of duty to work for the Government and receive salaries, without limitation, in addition to their retired pay. Two cases in point—a retired Regular Army major is employed in the Veterans' Bureau as one of the members of the retirement board which determines the rights of emergency officers under the provisions of the Tyson-Fitzgerald Act. A retired lieutenant commander of the Navy is on the Board of Appeals which often has to pass upon the applications of emergency officers for the benefits of this law upon appeal. Surely the Congress of the United States does not intend that these retired officers of the Regular Army and Navy shall continue working for the Government and deny the same right to retired disabled emergency officers.

The first consideration of the Government toward the veterans of all wars is to compensate in some measure those who received injuries in line of duty. They are given a preferential right under the civil service laws, rules, and regulations of the Government. It is the desire that they shall have positions where they may find such employment as their physical handicap will permit them to perform. The Congress of the United States and the people of this country do not want them reduced to a charity basis. It was never intended that the amount they receive as compensation for this physical handicap was all that they should earn or receive. Every encouragement has been and should be given to them to fight the battle to overcome the handicap which is theirs because of their service to their country. This amendment is not only contrary to but is the very antithesis of the purpose for aiding disabled veterans and permitting them to carry on and become useful citizens of this Republic.

We feel that the Senate in its desire to correct alleged abuses in the administration of Public Law No. 506 has placed a bar against the efforts of disabled emergency officers to surmount their handicaps in their fight to overcome the physical disabilities which were incurred in the service in line of duty.

If the Reed amendment becomes a law, the first man who was retired under the provisions of the Tyson-Fitzgerald Act, Capt. Frank J. Jervey, who was decorated by his country and by foreign governments for bravery on the field of battle, will lose his right to retired pay. He received eight enemy machine-gun bullet wounds, one of which caused the loss of his leg. He is now employed by the United States Government in the War Department. He must resign from the Government or be denied his disability retirement pay. His health and physical disabilities make it impossible for him to do manual labor. Our great industrial organizations do not want a man thus physically disabled and would not give him employment. He has a right to seek employment from this Government. To the praise of the officials of the War Department, he has a position which will permit him and his family not only to live but perhaps lay aside something for declining years. Captain Jervey's case is typical of many others.

We are confident that if the true facts and the sure injustice of this amendment are fully understood by all Members of Congress

it will be defeated. We therefore appeal to you and to the Congress of the United States not to permit this injustice to prevail. It would be greatly appreciated if you will have this letter read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order that all Members of Congress may fully understand the position of this organization.

Very respectfully yours,

H. TURNER LEWIS,
National Vice Commander.

The Clerk read as follows:

FUEL AND TRANSPORTATION, BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

For coal and other fuel for submarine bases and steamers' and ships' use, including expenses of transportation, storage, and handling the same and the removal of fuel refuse from ships; maintenance and general operation of machinery of naval fuel depots and fuel plants; water for all purposes on board naval vessels, and ice for the cooling of water, including the expense of transportation and storage of both, $8,513,171: *Provided*, That fuel acquired other than by purchase shall not be issued without charging the applicable appropriation with the cost of such fuel at the rate current at the time of issue for fuel purchased: *Provided further*, That the President may direct the use, wholly or in part, of fuel on hand, however acquired, to be charged at the last issue rate for fuel acquired by purchase, when, in his judgment, prices quoted for supplying fuel are excessive: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the purchase of or payment for any kind of fuel oil of foreign production, except by or for vessels in a foreign port.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: Page 29, line 2, after the word "excessive," strike out the colon and insert a period and strike out lines 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I hope no one will think that by offering this amendment I am not as thoroughly in favor of the use of home products as anyone on the floor. I would like to see those used, of course, but I am wondering if the committee had considered carefully the effect of the provision in the operation of purchasing in the Navy Department. For instance, take it out on the west coast. Suppose they buy a million gallons of fuel oil. How can they determine that the original crude oil was produced in this country or in Mexico? Would not that impose a burden of tracing every bit of that oil to see that it was produced in this country, otherwise the comptroller would hold up the payment of the bills. Has the committee considered that?

Mr. FRENCH. It seems to me that particular feature could be made by requiring a certificate from the bidder. I shall be glad to yield to my colleague from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] on that subject.

Mr. AYRES. It was intended at the time that this should not be operative until 1932. In the meantime arrangements will be made whereby the certificate of the bidder will accompany his bid to show that the oil was produced in the United States.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Does the gentleman think that a certificate of a bidder would be sufficient for the Comptroller General to pass it and approve the bills?

Mr. AYRES. I think so.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There would be very little difficulty in establishing the origin of such a large quantity of oil. It is not like going out and buying a few gallons, but, as I understand it, the Navy contracts in large quantities and it is easy to trace the origin of the oil.

Mr. AYRES. That is the theory the committee had.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Members of the House evidently have observed that the committee has passed more or less without ceremony the question of the number of appointees to the Naval Academy by the Members of Congress, and so forth. Nothing has been said on the floor to-day to indicate that this bill carries a reduction of appointees to the Naval Academy from four to three. On page 26, line 9, that provision is carried. All of us know that the Navy Department in the Secretary's annual report asked that the number of appointees to the Naval Academy be increased from four to five from now on, looking ahead to the London treaty navy, when we will require some 6,994 line officers.

It takes longer to make a naval officer than it does to build a ship, and he is more important than the ship. The only place where these naval line officers are made is in the Naval Academy. Day before yesterday in general debate the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] indicated that he had objected in committee to this Naval Academy reduction. His speech indicated that there was considerable division of opinion among the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having in charge this bill pertaining to this reduction. It is done without any expert advice from the Navy Department or any officer in the Navy. It is an arbitrary reduction under the guise of economy.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. TABER. It is not an arbitrary reduction. It was made after a most careful study and in the interest of the Naval Academy.

It is made with the view of keeping the Naval Academy somewhere near the needs of the Navy. This year when we are still operating as far as graduates are concerned on the basis of three appointments, and which we will do for one year more, there will be a surplus of 200. The attrition figures that appear in the last six years are an average of only 220. In normal years that will result in an increase of 100 to 125 in the line officers of the Navy.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman says the figures were not arbitrarily arrived at. Who in the Navy Department recommended this reduction?

Mr. TABER. The Navy Department submitted all their figures, and we have been over all the figures for several years back. Nothing is done arbitrarily when it is done after full and complete investigation. The gentleman wants a great big surplus of students over at Annapolis, so that we can educate three or four hundred more than we need, and it is the worst thing we can do because it entirely destroys the spirit of the boys at Annapolis.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentlemen who have this bill in charge took all the advice which the Navy Department presented and then ignored it; they threw it into the wastebasket, notwithstanding that within the last three years these same gentlemen came to the House and increased the number of appointees to the Naval Academy from three to four. What has changed their views in the last three years? Has the Navy become smaller?

Mr. TABER. A study of the situation has changed their views.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman may have studied it, but there is great difference of opinion in the gentleman's own committee.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HALE. The Navy Department not only did not recommend a reduction but recommended an increase from four to five, did it not?

Mr. BRITTEN. I called attention to that fact a moment ago; yes.

Under the London treaty we are providing for many new ships of various sizes, requiring many additional officers. We are expanding aviation in the Navy tremendously. I think I am not exaggerating the situation when I say that aviation in the American Navy is so far ahead of aviation in any other navy on earth that they can not be compared in the same breath. I am told that by members of our commission who went to London for the conference last year.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Aside from what the London conference permits us to construct, we are now building 10 ships that will go into commission between now and 1935, are we not?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield.

Mr. FRENCH. Did the gentleman say that the aviation branch of our Navy was superior to that of Great Britain?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. Is the gentleman serious in saying that in any regard, in any respect, the American Navy surpasses the British Navy?

Mr. BRITTEN. In naval aviation we certainly do.

Mr. FRENCH. That is a very refreshing thing for the gentleman to state.

Mr. BRITTEN. Admiral Bridgman, of the British Navy, and other British officials do not quote me in their own interest at this conference, and they do quote the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. FRENCH. It is a very refreshing thing to the House to know that the gentleman from Illinois is willing to admit that in some degree, at least, we are superior to some other nation.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is one of the reasons we need more officers. There is only one channel from which we can get line officers. They can not come from Harvard; they can not come from Yale. They must come from the Naval Academy at Annapolis. Our success in the World War, as far as the Navy was concerned, was due to that fine foundation of officer personnel that saved the very life of the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

You will recall that the Fleet Corporation wanted to train its own men for the thousands of ships that they were building all over the United States, ships of concrete, of steel, of wood, of anything that would carry supplies. They had set up schools to educate their own enlisted personnel. Finally they broke down and went to pieces, and they came to the Navy for help. The Navy Department had reckoned in advance. Admiral Moffet was one; Admiral Leigh Palmer, Chief of Navigation, was the other. We had 52,000 men at the Great Lakes training station at one time when the Emergency Fleet Corporation failed in its efforts to get men. The Navy stepped into the breach and supplied the men and saved the day. That was only done because we had sufficient officer personnel to educate and train these men.

Suppose we have a surplus of young officers coming out of the academy. Is that serious for a country like ours? Every one of these men is a national asset. Suppose we have 5 or 10 per cent of them who are down low and finally do not get commissions. They are a national asset in time of emergency, because they can man a boiler room, an engine room, a radio room, a turret, or command a ship if need be. The reason we are not making a fight on this limitation of three is because a majority of the subcommittee, as I read the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama, are in favor of four, and they are going to let the Senate do it rather than have the legislation perfected here where it should be done. I want to serve notice to the country through the newspapers that the House is not in accord with this reduction that has been made by the subcommittee. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the action of the Appropriations Committee in reducing the number of appointments from four to three is presumably predicated upon the fact that the strength of the line of the Navy will, with the graduation of the present class, reach the limit of 5,499, exclusive of such extra numbers as there may be, and the further fact that it may be necessary to discharge a certain number of the class graduating in June of this year. It is true that this year about 200 midshipmen must be discharged unless remedial legislation is enacted, but this is in considerable part due to the very unusual conditions existing throughout the country, which have materially lessened the number of resignations and retirements. So long as we propose to maintain a Navy we must maintain it properly manned, and when the ships which Congress has already authorized and appropriated for are completed the Navy will require about 500 more officers than are at present authorized; and in addition, as we build ships under the limitations imposed upon us by the treaty of London, additional officers will be required. A continuation of the 4-appointment basis and the commissioning of all midshipmen who will graduate between the present year and the year 1940, will, it is estimated, bring the Navy to a strength not exceeding 6,087 line officers, and probably the figure will fall considerably under this. Three appointments a year will not produce sufficient graduates to maintain the strength of the line of the Navy at 5,499, and at the same time permit appointments to be made to the Marine Corps and the Supply Corps, as has been done in the last few years. The continuation of four appointments for each Representative and Senator is a matter of much concern to the welfare and efficiency of the Navy, and even if a small surplus must be discharged each year, it is highly desirable to continue the four appointments.

The additional midshipmen cost little, as the plant is already provided for and the overhead will continue whether 500 or whether 1,000 midshipmen are there. The continuation of four appointments, in case there is an excess of graduates over the number required for the service, will permit the commissioning of those of higher general ability, the ones being discharged being those at or near the foot of their respective classes.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Navy in his annual report recommended that five appointments be authorized in order to meet the needs of the Navy that can be definitely foreseen, but before the Appropriations Committee he expressed a willingness not to press for five appointments this year, as he wished more definitely to see what ships Congress proposed to build under the limits imposed by the treaty of London; but he definitely recommended that four appointments should be continued and that all midshipmen graduating from the Academy under the 4-appointment basis should be commissioned. This cut of the midshipmen from four to three would be a very serious blow to naval efficiency. There are two ways in which navies may be crippled: One is by scrapping ships, the second is by scrapping personnel. We have gone far along the road of altruism in scrapping ships, but those ships which the Navy of the United States retains must be fully manned. As I previously pointed out, three appointments will not maintain the officer strength at the limit now imposed by Congress, and an even greater number of officers is required than the present limitations permit. Four appointments should most certainly be authorized by the Congress.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

A little while ago the House voted upon a question that involved the total number of officers of the line. I have no doubt that the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Georgia carried because the Members of this House felt that unless they voted to support the amendment that was offered some hardship would be done those dear, fine boys who are graduating from the Annapolis Academy this year and who might not receive commissions. There will be a surplus of something like 200 midshipmen over and above what the law provides now for officers of the line. In my judgment those young midshipmen, in spite of the vote you cast, will not receive their commissions. I have not the slightest doubt, from an examination of the law and the studies that have been made, that the brief statement I made to you this afternoon is correct. Nevertheless by your vote you chose to give the benefit of the doubt to the surplus midshipmen. I commend most heartily the spirit that prompted the vote, and I know it did not turn upon the question of whether or not you feel that 200 additional officers ought to be given to the Naval Establishment.

With regard to whether or not we are graduating enough from the Naval Academy to supply the officer personnel of

the Navy, the 200 surplus we are having at this time is upon the basis of appointing at the Academy not four, not five, but three. The graduates this year entered when Members of the House had the privilege of appointing three. The attrition in the Naval Establishment has been going on at a fairly definite rate.

I was not in favor of raising the number from three to four two years ago. I thought it was a mistake; I still think it was a mistake, and the surplus you have to-day confirms the statement I made at that time. You have now nearly 200 midshipmen over and above the number of vacancies existing in officers of the line in the Navy. Do we want to increase the difficulty by providing an extra midshipman to be appointed so that you will appoint four? Next year you will have the graduates from the academy on the basis of three appointments that were made four years ago. You will then have a surplus. Two years from now you will begin to have the effect of the appointments upon the basis of four, and instead of having a surplus of 200, the chances are it will be 230 or 240, and then the boys who graduate from the academy will come with the same plea and with the same claim to recognition as the boys have come to you to-day and they will say, "We have graduated from the academy; we want our commissions now."

Ladies and gentlemen, what will be your answer? Will you feel you must then commission all surplus graduates? We are in deep earnest when we tell you that for the sake of those boys you ought not to base appointments so as to produce surpluses. Rather, sound judgment advises that we hold to the number requisite to feed the officer personnel of the Navy. Three will do it. It will give more than enough to meet the attrition in the officers of the line and leave some for the other branches. You are going to have the same problem next year and the next year and the next year if you permit Members of the House to name an additional midshipman to the academy.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Gentlemen of the committee, you have been regaled for the last five minutes by the chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations handling this bill. He has given you much information that sounded very reasonable and he has given it to you as facts. I want to read something to you out of the hearings before the House Naval Affairs Committee recently. I want to quote the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation on the particular point under discussion. Admiral Upham, the chief of that bureau, made this statement:

> If we continue the 4-appointment basis of midshipmen throughout this period of 10 years to come, and allow all graduates or the regular percentage, about 86 per cent, to go into the line of the Navy, all of them to be commissioned, we would not, till 1940, exceed by something like 30 the needs for the present Navy and the Navy that is now on the stocks and being built.

That statement by Admiral Upham does not agree with the statement of the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. FRENCH. If the gentleman would analyze that statement, he would see that it presupposes an authorization for more line officers than the law now permits. If the gentleman would consult our hearings and examine the data furnished by the department, he will find an analysis, made by the department, of the statement he has read.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I am quoting the gentleman from the department who appeared before the Naval Affairs Committee with authority to speak for the department, and who had in his possession at that time all the facts the gentleman has mentioned, and it is not necessary to consult other hearings. I will read further from the hearings before the Naval Affairs Committee:

> Mr. DARROW. As I gather from that, unless we do pass this legislation and permit extra appointments, we will have an actual shortage of officers to man the Navy.
>
> Admiral UPHAM. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. WOODRUFF. There is a shortage there now, is there not?
>
> Admiral UPHAM. Yes, sir; when we commissioned the last class in 1930 we were shy about 160, and if we commission the class of 1931 we will be shy 14.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, I submit that testimony for what it may be worth. I call your attention to the fact that the officer submitting that testimony to our committee is a responsible officer of the Navy. He is Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, and I want to say that in my opinion what he has stated are the facts.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. On page 15 of the hearings before the Naval Appropriations Subcommittee, the Secretary of the Navy himself says this:

> With five appointments we would in 1941 be well under the number required.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes; I do not think any member of this Committee of the Whole or any member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations should challenge the statement of men like Admiral Upham, the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, and the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes; certainly.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman think when there has been an attrition on the average of only 220 during the last six years and the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation goes ahead and estimates an average attrition of over 300, we should question it?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I think the Secretary of the Navy and Chief of the Bureau of Navigation are well qualified to speak for the Navy Department, and they have spoken very plainly upon this subject. No Member of this House should question that these gentlemen were in full possession of the facts when they appeared before our committee nor that the testimony submitted by them was based upon these facts.

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. Does not the gentleman think the House should be impressed, notwithstanding the statement of Admiral Upham, whom, by the way, all members of our subcommittee admire very much, by the fact that to-day we have a surplus of 200 midshipmen upon the basis of three appointments over and above the attrition? How does the gentleman reconcile that with the statement he has quoted?

Mr. WOODRUFF. The gentleman knows very well that was brought about by a condition that existed during the war.

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, no.

Mr. WOODRUFF. The gentleman from Idaho knows further that there are ships upon the stocks now being built that must be manned sometime in the very near future, and that this will require many officers in addition to those now on the rolls.

Mr. FRENCH. But whether or not that be correct, I am speaking of existing law. The law fixes the officers of the line at 5,499. We have a surplus from the academy now of approximately 200. This surplus has come about through those who were appointed four years ago—six or seven years after the war. The fact is attrition has not created sufficient vacancies and we find ourselves with this surplus upon the basis of three. The trouble here is that some are confusing statements of department officers as to desirable conditions under authorization that does not exist with what the department is entitled to have under present law.

Mr. BRITTEN. May I answer the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the surplus at the academy this year is brought about by the class of last year and the year before?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, no; the gentleman did not understand me.

Mr. BRITTEN. The surplus is brought about in this way, I will say to the gentleman. It is brought about by war legislation that permitted six or eight hundred of the enlisted personnel to become officers of the line. These men are in the line now, and we want to get them out of the line. We can not discharge them because that would not be humanly fair. We can not retire them, because under existing law they can not be retired, and we can not promote them because they have not sufficient education to be promoted under a professional examination. This is the

reason there is a surplusage at the Naval Academy. There is no place for these 200 men to go, due to war legislation and not due to the class of last year or the year before.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman has missed the point entirely. Let me say that I realize the commissioned line officer strength of the Navy is composed of a number of former temporary officers, permanently commissioned after the war, but under the law they are a part of the authorized strength of 5,499. Irrespective of whether the department needs more than 5,499 or not, and irrespective of what hearings, graphs, or tables may show, until legislation may be had increasing such number, nothing we can do here or that has been proposed here will provide vacancies for excess graduates. Our committee is circumscribed by the law. We have acted pursuant to the law to care for situations for which the law as it stands is responsible.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to proceed for about five minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I said that my colleague from Illinois had missed the point entirely in the matter of my remark that the present surplus is caused notwithstanding the fact that the appointments were made upon the basis of three and not four.

If the gentleman will turn to the officers of the line about eight years ago, at which time we went from five to three, he will find that the number of officers of the line was approximately 4,000, somewhat more, perhaps. At that time the committee decided that if we would reduce from five to three we would have a sufficient flow of young men into the academy to create a sufficient number of graduates to meet attrition and provide additional officers gradually to build up the officers of the line. At that time, mind you, the number of officers of the line was something above 4,000. Then upon the basis of three we have been creeping up gradually until to-day the graduates from the academy that will go out this coming June will go over the 5,499, and there will be 200 of them who will be graduated who, unless some law may be passed to take care of the situation, will not be able to be commissioned.

This is the situation I want to address myself to, and it is one that is of importance to the House. I hope this House will not think of increasing the number of midshipmen, because already we have a surplus.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FRENCH. I should prefer not to at this time.

This surplus is upon the basis of three appointments to the academy. After the coming June graduating class we shall begin to receive a still larger surplus because of the increase to four appointments to the academy, which became effective with the class entering in 1928.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. FRENCH. In just a moment.

I have here in my hand an analysis of the attrition among the officers going back to 1925.

The attrition in 1925—and by attrition I mean officers who retired, who resigned, who died, who were dismissed, who were transferred, or who deserted—the total number representing the attrition was 243; for 1926 it was 203; for 1927 it was 206; for 1928 it was 187; for 1929 the attrition was 189; for 1930 it was 298.

Now, then, turn to the hearings. Turn to the graduating record to which the gentleman has referred, and what do we find? On the basis of the appointment of three to the academy there will be graduated this June, exclusive of 35 to be commissioned in the Marine Corps and the Supply Corps and those physically disqualified, 374 midshipmen. For 1932, partly three appointments and partly four appointments, there will be 351 available for line appointments. Then for full four appointments, commencing with 1933, the number is given as 346; 1934, 372; and for 1935, 367. In every one of these years to which you have referred there is a surplus over and above the average attrition of officers in the Navy.

So, gentlemen, when you look the matter squarely in the face it must be apparent that upon the basis of three appointments the attrition will not only be taken care of but there will be some surplus that could be absorbed by the Marine Corps and Supply Corps.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is trying to convey to the House that there are various surpluses arising each year from the graduating class in the Naval Academy. This year it is evidenced by the inability of 200 graduates to get into the line of the Navy.

Mr. FRENCH. That is correct.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman prefaces his argument with the statement that these surpluses ensue from three appointees to the Naval Academy rather than four. He might just as reasonably go a little farther and recall the time when each Member of Congress had five appointees. That is just as reasonable to account for the surplusage to-day as three or two or any number. The surplusage is only evidenced when the surplusage can not be met by commissions into the line of the Navy. This year 200 will be graduated and not be commissioned. But if you take the war hump out, men who came out of the ranks that are older, who have less education than have the men who come from the academy; if you take them out, there would be nothing said about surplusage, because every graduate would be commissioned.

Mr. FRENCH. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. BRITTEN. I did not propound a question; I tried to enlighten the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. FRENCH. I think the gentleman obtained the floor under false pretences. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I had hoped this bill could be finally disposed of to-day, and to save time I have dissuaded some from offering an amendment to increase or rather restore the number of appointments to the academy.

I stated to the committee on last Tuesday, as appears in the RECORD of that date, that this was a matter about which our subcommittee were in disagreement. The committee was divided three to two. There are four lawyers on this subcommittee, and it was not unusual to find that they were in disagreement as to the facts pertaining to this matter. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] and the other two members who concurred in his conclusions, were convinced their position was correct, and supported by the hearings, I am sure.

The gentleman from Kansas and myself were equally as positive that our position was correct and fully justified on the evidence submitted and set out in the hearings. In my speech of last Tuesday appearing in the RECORD attention was called to certain parts of the hearings, which Members of the House were requested to read so that they could intelligently pass on the differences between the members of the subcommittee who prepared this bill. Only by reading the hearings can the membership of this House be fully prepared to vote on this very important matter.

I went so far as to say to the House that the Senate committee, I was informed, had given study to the House hearings and had announced they were not in favor of reducing the number of appointments from four to three, thus assuring that this difference between members of the subcommittee would likely be thrown into conference. Knowing the uniform fairness of the gentleman from Idaho, if differences between the House and Senate on this question should arise and be thrown in conference, I am confident he would be willing for this question to be brought back to the House for its decision. That is why, since all Members are now trying to hurry up the consideration of appropriation bills, I felt we could defer until a later time differences which would entail considerable discussion. In the meantime the

Members of the House are urged to read the hearings relating to this matter.

These hearings, I respectfully submit, show that the officials of the Navy Department advise that if you will take into account the annual attritions that may be reasonably expected, based on the average of the last 10 years, that within less than 12 months from the graduation of the class in June, 1931, if all graduates are commissioned, you will have less than the authorized line strength of the Navy; that the same result will follow within 12 months from the graduations of the classes in June, 1932, 1933, and 1934, respectively, assuming that all graduates in each of said classes are commissioned. Charts were submitted in proof of these claims, which charts will be found in the hearing, and I challenge the gentleman from Idaho to show wherein these charts are incorrect, based as they are on the average attritions annually for the past 10 years.

In June of this year, if the graduating class is commissioned, the officer line strength will exceed the authorized strength, but before the class is graduated in June, 1932, the attritions, due to death, resignations, and other causes, will reduce the number of line officers below the authorized strength of 5,559. The same results will recur in 1932, 1933, and 1934, as shown by the hearings.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman referred to the attritions of several years. I have the attrition figures for each of the years, going back to 1925.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; and the gentleman will find that the average as stated for the past two years is correct.

Mr. FRENCH. The average they stated for six years preceding 1931 was 220 a year.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is even higher than some of the years. They have been quite fair. The gentleman stated a few moments ago that in 1929 it was 298. The charts show less than that figure in 1930. Let the gentleman again examine the figures in the hearings. If the Members of the House are to intelligently pass on the difference between the members of the subcommittee, I suggest they carefully read all of the evidence appearing in the hearings on this subject; the pages are given in my speech appearing in Tuesday's RECORD. In the next four or five years we have a number of ships, now building, that will be commissioned, 3 in 1930, 2 in 1932, 2 in 1933, 2 in 1934, and 1 in 1935. The 10 ships are 10,000-ton cruisers, and to this number of cruisers must be added one submarine and one aircraft carrier, now under construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Clerk has read beyond this section. Is this debate in order?

The CHAIRMAN. This debate is running along by unanimous consent and can be stopped by objection at any time.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I share the feelings of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] and will conclude by saying, read the hearings, you who are interested in the matter so that if there should arise differences between the House and the Senate and if you are given the opportunity to pass on such differences, you will be able to do so with the full information that was submitted to the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

For contingent expenses and minor extensions and improvements of public works at navy yards and stations, $150,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he will not consent to pass over the paragraphs in the bill relating to the Bureau of Aeronautics, beginning at the bottom of page 36. I have an amendment to offer to which I have given considerable study and in which many Members in the House are interested. I think we could better dispose of the matter to-morrow morning.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman means to pass over that beginning with line 21, on page 36, and running through pages 37, 38, and 39 down to line 6?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. I would have no objection to that.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph beginning with line 21 on page 36 down to and including line 6 on page 39, be passed over to be considered when next the committee meets.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. Does the gentleman intend to go to the increase of the Navy to-night?

Mr. FRENCH. I thought possibly we would run through the bill if we could.

Mr. BLACK. I do not like to object to anything the gentleman asks but I have some amendments I want to offer on the increase of the Navy.

Mr. TABER. Would it not be better to wait until we get to that and then if necessary we can rise?

Mr. BLACK. I withdraw the objection.

Mr. AYRES. Then, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a similar request to that of the gentleman from New York relative to page 42, to which I desire to offer an amendment, which will probably be discussed for some time.

I want to offer a similar request as to the Marine Corps, beginning on page 41 and extending to page 43.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I shall withdraw the request I made. It is apparent there are some controversial factors in several paragraphs, so I shall move that the committee rise when we reach the paragraph on aeronautics.

The Clerk read down to and including line 20 on page 36.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEHLBACH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 16969) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the Naval Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, directed him to report that they had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 16415) entitled "An act 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," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KEYES, Mr. SMOOT, Mr. JONES, Mr. GLASS, and Mr. BROUSSARD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES (H. REPT. NO. 2290)

Mr. ESLICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, with amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 38

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 33,000 additional copies of House Report No. 2290, Seventy-first Congress, being a report of the special committee to investigate communist activities in the United States, of which not to exceed 25,000 copies shall be printed for the use of, and as may be directed by, the special committee appointed by the House of Representatives; 5,000 copies for the document room of the House, and 3,000 copies for the document room of the Senate.

With the following amendments:

Strike out in line 2, the words "thirty-three" and insert in lieu thereof "twelve."

In line 6, strike out "twenty-five" and insert in lieu thereof "four."

In line 7, after the word "of," strike out "and as may be directed by the special committee appointed by the House of Representatives" and insert in lieu thereof "the House."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, this is a reduction in the original number?

Mr. ESLICK. Yes, sir; a reduction from 33,000 to 12,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

SAM ROBINSON

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks to include an article written by the brilliant representative of the Portland Oregonian, Mr. John W. Kelly, concerning the long service of 50 years of Sam Robinson, an employee of this House. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article:

[From the Morning Oregonian, Saturday, February 7, 1931]

AT THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

By John W. Kelly

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 6.—When Judge M. C. George, of Portland, was a Member of Congress, Sam Robinson was on the job, and Sam has been on the job ever since. "I'm 71 years old," says Sam, and throwing back his overcoat he thumps his chest with mighty blows, and adds, "I'm sound as a nut."

Samuel Robinson is one of those unsung heroes of the congressional machinery. He doesn't get his name in the papers, but he has plugged along loyally for half a century, working far into the night on his messenger-boy service. He is not rated as a messenger boy, but essentially that is his duty, for he has to chase after Congressmen wherever they are to be found in Washington. Mr. Robinson is one of the few attachés who knows every Member of Congress by name and where he lives. The latter is quite important. Mr. Robinson, with his 71 years resting lightly upon him, scouts around until he finds his Congressman quarry with the pertinacity of a hungry coyote looking for a Grant County sheep.

It is the grave responsibility of Sam to submit to Congressmen the typed sheets of the shorthand report of their remarks. Before a Member is quoted he is given a chance to repent, perhaps, and cut down the linage that the aforesaid remarks will consume in the RECORD. Few repent. Instead of condensing their statements they take advantage of Sam and elaborate them. Given this opportunity, Congressmen will take a 200-word observation and expand it into a page or two pages. The Congressmen have the privilege of correcting their grammar and editing their own words, but they are more interested in stringing them out and consuming more space.

For 50 years, boy and man, Sam Robinson has searched for Congressmen high and low until he finds them, hands over the copy and awaits the pleasure of the author. Sam never argues. He lets the lawmakers talk. If they tell him to wait until they brew 1,000 words of burning wisdom so he can get it over to the Printing Office, it is all right with Mr. Robinson. He has known thousands and thousands of Congressmen in his long service, so the quirks of human beings worry him not at all. Heat of summer, the rains of spring, the lightning storms and blizzards all find Sam Robinson trudging from place to place with the copy in his pocket. In the other days when Washington was not so spread out and the hotels were close together it wasn't so bad. Then, a couple of years ago, more than 150 Congressmen lived in one hotel and that was duck soup for Sam. He could get almost every man he wanted under that roof. Now the Members live everywhere, and as Sam can't walk all over town in a night, he has a colleague with a flivver who does the downtown area.

It means nothing to Sam to wake a Congressman up at 1 a. m. and have the notes approved, revised, and expanded. Unless the Congressman holds out on him Sam will have the copy back in time for the speech to appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which every Member is served by the breakfast hour.

No one knows Sam but the Congressmen. He has trotted thousands of miles on his nocturnal rounds. He is entitled now to retire on pay, but he doesn't want to. He considers the eternal chasing after Congressmen is the best of exercise and keeps him fit as a fiddle. It has never occurred to Sam what a favor he would do to the people if he would sometimes fail to find his man or lose the manuscript out of his pocket.

ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. HANCOCK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the important question of the settlement of the adjusted-compensation certificates.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANCOCK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, I come here to address you on a matter of national importance, which has undoubtedly for many weeks been engaging your serious and sincere thought. I am satisfied that you are as keenly and sympathetically concerned as I am in arriving at a just, sane, and sound conclusion. Because of your greater knowledge and experience many of you are much abler qualified to discuss the merits of the legislation concerning action on the soldiers' adjusted-compensation certificates than I will perhaps ever be.

THE BARE-BONE FACTS REGARDING SETTLEMENT OF SOLDIERS ADJUSTED COMPENSATION CERTIFICATES

I have, however, since coming here last fall been devoting to this proposed legislation many, many hours of thought and study. Feeling that there was a possible chance of my being able as a result of my thought and study to contribute something of value toward the solution of this very important governmental and economic problem is responsible for this effort to-day. My purpose and hope is to aid in securing achievement rather than in advertisement. Political reaction is a remote consideration, for the veterans in my district and State know already my attitude toward this legislation. In the very large district which I have the honor to represent there are perhaps 15,000 ex-service men and in my State there are perhaps in excess of a hundred thousand of these men, about two-thirds of whom are holders of these Government obligations. Having heard within the past two months from practically every Legion post in my district and from many outside, and having received in the form of letters, telegrams, and ballots approximately 4,000 communications from veterans and business men requesting my aid in helping them to realize at once payment at full face value of these certificates, there can be no doubt regarding the statement which I have just made. Ninety-nine per cent of the veterans in my State, I am sure, favor this plan, and the Legislature of North Carolina has recently by joint resolution gone on record in favor thereof.

It is, therefore, indeed gratifying to know that my constituents' views are in full accord with my own. Since my service in the camp during the war was so short, I could not under the act be a holder of a certificate.

My consideration of this legislation has brought me irresistibly to the conclusion that justice demands and sound economic enterprise warrants the immediate payment of these certificates at full face value. I believe that the payment of these obligations to a very large majority of the holders, as quickly as practicable, would be more helpful to them and their dependents now than at any time in the future. Most of us, I am sure, will subscribe to that statement. To feel otherwise would present a most unpleasant mental picture of the future, depressing, distressing, and deplorable. Notwithstanding some very able views to the contrary, I am thoroughly convinced that payment now would instantly, materially, and permanently help business. These conclusions were reached after either listening to or reading practically every statement that has been presented to the Ways and Means Committee and many of the comments of the press throughout the country. The basis of these conclusions will be found throughout this statement.

In our effort to do justice to our soldiers we should of course recognize the responsibility of seeing that injustice is not done to others. The soldier himself would not, I am sure, have us do otherwise. He is, first, a citizen of this country as well as its noble defender. In my consideration of this matter I have tried to view and analyze it not only in its individual standing but in its coordinate relation to other governmental and economic problems. I have tried to consider the soundness of the business principles involved and not be unduly influenced by its human aspects. Though sentiment is rightfully a powerful and indispensable element

in all phases of life and relations of business, sound economic enterprise and operation of government can not and should not rest in matters of this kind upon this basis alone. In private endeavor our position could be different.

I desire to say further, at this stage of my argument, that I am not advocating payment of the full amount of these debts because I am a Democrat. Consideration of this legislation should be pitched in the heights and held there. In my judgment, political affiliation and party division should be entirely removed from our deliberations concerning it. About three and one-half million veterans hold these certificates to-day as creditors of this Government, and more than 10,000,000 men, women, and children are directly interested in this legislation. These men are to be found in every walk of life and represent a splendid cross section of this country in religion, politics, and society. They are scattered throughout the length and breadth of this great country. When they fought our battles and saved this Nation, they fought as Americans, and we should consider this legislation only as representatives of the American people. The New England States should lock hands with the South Atlantic, and the West should lock arms with the East.

The solution of this problem should be the conclusions of statesmanship rather than a political accomplishment.

May I digress here for a moment to state that we should at all times, in our effort to legislate for the people whom we serve, see this Nation as a whole, and see it steadily. This is a great and distinguished body of men and women, upon whose shoulders rest grave and far-reaching responsibilities. A wrongful tip of the scales of legislation can at any time bring disaster to millions. I think it wholesome for us to constantly bear in mind in all of our decisions that this Nation is composed of 40 and 8 States, and that any legislation which accords to some privileges above and beyond the others is unfair, unjust, weakening to the foundations of our Union, and violative of the rights of a free people.

Though I believe with all my heart in the principles of the Democratic Party, I hope and I pray that I may never be so biased in my position here in this Congress that I may not act first as an American citizen and be ever fair and sensitive to the rights of those who believe otherwise. Failure to do this would reflect upon the virtue and genuineness of those principles. As various colors make up a pure white, so should our efforts blend toward the accomplishment of what is right and best for the largest number of people. To show the 120,000,000 people of this great Nation by our acts that this is always the controlling purpose and motive underlying every legislative enactment is to my thinking the best insurance of a continuation of loyalty on the part of the true American and the surest safeguard against the growth and spread of communism. In the fulfillment of this high conception of government lies our national security.

Having approached this subject, now let us consider in sincerity its various aspects and the basic factors involved. In the light of the final development of the soldiers' certificate, I can see no just reason for constant and continuous reference to them as a bonus. After several years of thought, effort, and agitation, Congress as a matter of national duty, undertook to adjust for each soldier military earnings with civil earnings. Of course all of us know that services of this character could not be valued in dollars and cents. To him who served here a dollar a day was authorized, and to him who served overseas a dollar and a quarter, the maximum amount allowed being $500 for home service and $625 for foreign service. Though it is safe to say that a large majority of the ex-service men desired cash payment then, for reasons which a great many of you gentlemen know, it was decided that they should be paid with a certificate, which according to the plan has the operative effect of an endowment policy with the exception that there is no cash surrender value.

The $1 a day for home service and the $1.25 a day for foreign service, based upon the number of days the individual served, constituted the basic credit in the nature of a single net premium. To this, an addition of 25 per cent was added to each soldier's credit to make the plan attractive and appealing. There is still a difference of opinion about this feature. On the total, the act authorized that there should be appropriated sufficient money each year to pay 4 per cent premium toward the maturity in 1945 of these certificates. The Government has never provided funds for the basic credit or premium. Up to the present time it has taken about $112,000,000 of taxes each year to do this, and this amount, invested by the Treasury Department in a special fund, lacks now only $34,000,000 of constituting the necessary reserve. The face value of the certificates in force is $3,426,768,507. The loan value of unmatured outstanding certificates is $730,905,000. The present value of the certificates outstanding is $1,770,000,000. The number of certificates issued is 3,498,376, and the average value of each certificate is $1,008. Though the soldiers are supposed to have accepted this arrangement cheerfully as the best solution of the legislation then pending, it was, as we must admit, largely a compromise arrangement, greatly to the advantage of the Government. The result almost indicates that it was an ex parte proceeding, and it is therefore not surprising, in the light of what has happened, that some should at times refer to their certificates as a "tombstone" bonus. Since more than 50 per cent of the present face value of outstanding certificates represents the present value of the Government's evidence of indebtedness to the soldiers, I can not but feel that the use of the word "bonus," as descriptive of these certificates is prejudicial to the rights of the veteran and especially in his effort now to receive an impartial consideration on the merits of his request for their anticipated redemption in cash or with bonds.

In view of the sorrowful economic plight in which millions of people of this great, rich Nation have found themselves for the past 18 months, business leaders and public officials have quite naturally been seeking some remedy. Legions of cures have been suggested. We all recognize, however, that in human ailments resort to the surgeon's knife should be the last remedy. At the same time we well know that the continued application of plasters and poultices can have little effect if the diseased organ is within and continues to poison the entire body. When we consider the deplorable conditions surrounding many of our best people to-day, in the light of the abundance of money, foodstuffs, and other supplies in this country, the lack of which to these millions has brought them to the shadows of poverty, suffering, and starvation, we are obliged to admit that either the present method of treatment is inadequate and ineffective, or the policies of government demand radical revision. For many years certain classes of people in this country have been growing rich, while certain other classes have, without fault of their own, been growing poorer. Look at the records mount of those whose incomes are a million annually. By some strange twist of political economy or governmental activity, the once valuable holdings of the farmer, small business man, and average citizen have been rapidly depreciating in favor and value, while the holdings of the few have been appreciating and growing in value. For many years farm lands in many sections of this country have been declining in value. To-day farm products are so cheap that some agricultural States are almost on the verge of bankruptcy. This contortion or economic transition has struck such a staggering blow to the back country, the manhood of which has always constituted one of the main lines of defense in times of peace and war, that to-day, figuratively speaking, large portions of this great country are flat of back.

In making this statement I am fully mindful of the fact that I am likely to be immediately denounced as a demagogue. Is not the realization of its truth and actuality what makes it sound so appalling? From observation and study I have long since learned that few men in public life can champion the cause of the average man and woman conscientiously and fearlessly and escape this unjust and trite criticism. By the same process we have also observed that the young man who accepts, as sheep follow sheep over the stile, the views of those who sit so high in the seats of the mighty that they can not visualize the people without bending over,

will be nicknamed a statesman. Real statesmanship is an accomplishment earned through the performance of duty and is not to be acquired through favor.

No man who has opposed this legislation admires big-business genius and loves to see business, whether it be in money, bonds, stocks, motors, or steel, grow and prosper in a legitimate way more than I do. I further believe that the exchanges of this great country serve necessary and useful purposes when they are properly operated and administered as mediums or channels of trade. Any legislation that would impose an unjust burden on them would be equally as wrong as legislation which would impose a similar burden on the masses of the people. Big business and little business should work together in sympathetic concern for each others welfare. Government should protect both within the limitations of the law, and, so far as it is humanly possible, the burden of Government should be shared in proportion, according to their respective abilities. Neither, however, should dictate or control the conduct of the Government toward the other.

To make my acts here consistent with wise business principles, constructive and beneficial economic enterprises, and sound national policy shall ever be my constant aim.

My study of this legislation makes me believe that no legislation has been proposed for consideration by this Congress which offers greater promise of real help in restoring the lost ground and bringing about economic equilibrium and, shortly thereafter, real business stability, than does the proposed legislation to pay off in cash or with bonds as rapidly as practicable the full face value of these certificates. Since they are admitted obligations of the Government and constitute a debt of $3,500,000,000 on its balance sheet, the only question which we are now faced with is that of deciding whether or not the Government should, under present conditions, anticipate their maturity as an act of justice and a part of the unusual business program necessary for economic stabilization. Is such legislation sound or unsound? Has the soldier, in his emergency, the right to ask his Government for payment of the debt it owes him? What position should the soldiers' obligations hold in the financial scheme of the Government? If we are willing to admit that this is a just debt and that the condition of the average soldier makes his request proper, will the Government's finances and general economic conditions warrant payment at this time?

What I have said surely indicates that I have the highest respect for the Treasury Department's responsibility. At the same time, I am not in the least surprised that the Secretary of the Treasury should oppose this legislation. His recent position is entirely consistent with his former attitude, which has, in my opinion, been inhuman, unfair, and unsympathetic since the war toward the Government's obligation to the soldier. His tactics now, however, are significantly different. He knows that the Government's finances and credit are too strong and secure to halloo "Wolf, wolf" again or pull the "deficit scare" as was done in 1923. Probably realizing that the people of this Nation recognize the justice and validity of the soldiers' request to-day for payment, he has for the first time, according to my information, during his tenure of office felt the need of additional backing in support of his position. Maybe he has not forgotten the trifling error of nearly a billion dollars he made in 1923, which was largely responsible for defeating the soldiers' claims. As a result, about a dozen representatives of insurance companies, banks, bond brokers, and bond dealers, together with two or three other big-business executives, came to his rescue. Mr. Mellon never has or never will see the human side of government. A business genius, a man of great wealth, his perspective is greatly different from the average smaller business man. He has probably never walked the side streets nor mingled with the crowds. He has looked upon the tall buildings, while we have looked upon the country shanties. Only by seeing both can we legislate wisely. The Treasury Department should not be the master, but rather the servant of the people. My ideas of the purpose of life and the duty of government would make me pity rather than condemn his viewpoint. Personally, I believe he is as honest in his opposition to this legislation as those of us are who advocate it.

Under the Constitution, however, is it not our province and duty to initiate legislation in the interest of the people rather than to be forced to continuously rubber stamp one man's views? Can this body of men and women in daily, constant touch with all the people always be wrong and he be right? Are we not even collectively as patriotic about and as solicitous concerning our finances as an appointee to office, even though he may be by such appointment the regarded fiscal head of the Government? Is it right that this intelligent body of men and women should, with a full knowledge of the facts, never be able to devise a wise and sound appropriation measure, if, forsooth, the Secretary of the Treasury should have a different view? The change may not be imminent, but the time is not far off when the people of this Nation are going to insist, demand, and have a greater voice in the affairs of their Government. Then and then only shall we merit and appreciate the benefits and freedom which come from a truly representative democracy.

To have expected that Mr. Mellon would come before this committee and throw the weight of his official position and powerful personal voltage on the soldier's side of the scales would have been equally as rational as to expect the advent of time when the Biblical camel would be able to slide through the eye of a needle.

There have been some who have said that this plan would militate against the best interests of the rights of disabled veterans. All of us know that the first duty of the Government, which view is held by the veterans themselves, is to take care of the disabled soldier. All of us know that this is being done partially, and we hope in time it will be done fully. There is no kinship, as I see it, between the duty of the Government to take care of the disabled soldier and its obligation to pay its debt to the others. Do we not rejoice with those who were so fortunate and blessed as to have escaped the horrors of war and its devastation, with body whole and mind sound?

As I stated near the beginning, I have had the privilege of listening with keen interest, yet without conviction, to the able views and arguments which have been presented by the gentlemen who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee at the invitation of its chairman in opposition to any legislation for the soldiers. How many of them on their own suggestion would have come here voluntarily and testified as they did, if Mr. Mellon had not sounded the keynote? It was quite clear in several instances, from their first utterance, that they were here to indorse Mr. Mellon's views. One of these gentlemen, who is the president of the American Bankers Association, undertook to speak for all the banks of this country with the exception of four or five thousand small country banks, when, as a matter of fact, not 1 per cent of the banks were previously consulted, nor had any of them up to that time made a study of the various bills now before the Congress. Through this association many banks were wired to enter immediately their protest. This was to be expected as a part of their propaganda. I am very happy to state that up to this hour only one banker in my State has expressed to me his opposition to this plan or a fear of the economic repercussions and retardation of business which this gentleman predicted would result if this legislation is passed. All of them know that this Congress is their Congress, and many would appreciate the soundness of the business principles involved in this plan if it was carefully and impartially presented to them.

It is quite significant that practically all of the outside opposition to this legislation emanates from bond brokers, dealers, and investors in bonds. Some of these gentlemen stated that the sale of any substantial amount of bonds at this time would be very difficult and would be attended with serious consequences. Others said a reasonable amount could be floated or financed with little or no disturbance. Nearly all of this chosen group responded admirably to the call. Even the bond market for a few days heard its master's voice and acted accordingly. Who has displayed the calmness so essential in solving problems of this kind? In

this connection, it is well to bear in mind that before the war our bonded indebtedness amounted to about $1,000,000,000; since then it has amounted to around twenty-five billion. The wealth of this country, as you all know, has increased within the last 15 to 18 years from around eighty billion to more than five hundred billions of dollars. Was not the changed conditions caused by the war in large measure responsible for this increased wealth? To-day there is more than fifty billions of dollars on deposit in our banks, about thirty billions of which is in savings deposits belonging to about 50,000,000 depositors. Time money is cheaper than it has been in 37 years, and the tendency is still downward. Within the past 30 days this Government has sold its bills at a rate of less than 1 per cent. A few months ago sale of Treasury offerings in a large amount was made at 1¾ and 1⅞ per cent, and these securities have been so much in demand that they are now selling to yield less than 1¼ per cent. Each year, according to the testimony of Mr. Mills before the Ways and Means Committee, there is available for capital investment in this country around $7,000,000,000.

Could there ever be a more favorable situation from the standpoint of finances than now to undertake payment of these certificates? Practically all of the eminent and distinguished gentlemen who have appeared before the committee took the position that a large issue of Government bonds at this time would affect adversely the holders of all grades of bonds. Many of them admitted, however, upon close questioning, that the investor in bonds who clipped his coupons on their due dates and held his bonds for maturity would not be affected. However, if some of their prophecies would actually come true, the issuance of these bonds would result in a depreciation to an amount running into the billions. Comparing these statements with actual performance in the past, something strange and curious has also happened in this country with respect to bonds, or they just naturally go up and down at the will of the operators and manipulators and without regard to the laws of supply and demand. If the issuance of two or three billions of dollars of bonds to-day would have such a calamitous effect, why did not something dreadful happen during the time when we were a much poorer Nation, yet increased our outstanding bonds from a billion to twenty-five billion? Why was this bond disaster talk not brought out in 1923? Have we since then invested too heavily in foreign loans or remitted too many billions of their debts? Of course, all of us recognize the value of seeing our bond and security markets stable, and many of us recognize that a good security market is essential to good business.

Since there is no evidence before the committee that this legislation would cause more than a temporary decline of a few points—and about that there is no definite information, since this will be our first experience with an issue of this size during peace times—are we to be blinded in our view of the particular economic advantages that would accrue to the public generally by mere speculative opinions of the temporary effect on bonds? Do we not know that a fluctuating decline of a point and a half on the total bonds outstanding in this country would show a loss to the holders if they sold them of a billion to two billion dollars any old day? Conversely, if they go up, it would mean that much profit to the holders if they should sell. Do we not also appreciate the fact that values on the bond and stock exchanges of this country can and do affect the paper values of securities a billion and more dollars in four or five hours trading? Is it not a fact that within the last 10 hours of trading the appreciation in securities in this country amounts to more than enough to absorb the maximum amount of bonds which would be necessary to pay off in cash the full face value of every certificate which might be presented for redemption?

What better security could be offered to the large army of investors who look yearly for sound investments than a soldier's compensation bond bearing 3½ per cent? Since practically all of the conservative investors and sagacious bond dealers rarely ever pay more than par for bonds and frequently buy them less on big declines, as for instance when Liberties touched 82, would their temporary loss or markdown of a few points in the bonds carried in their portfolio be just reason for opposing an act that means saving many small banks and small merchants and generally stimulating business throughout the country? Would this new offering of bonds make the sale of stale and indigestible securities on the shelves of bond houses more difficult? Because there is a smaller profit in the handling of Government issues than in the handling of industrial or municipal issues, is it possible that the reduced margin of profit in the handling of Government bonds to the disadvantage of the bond dealers should receive more than passing respect in our broad consideration of this problem? As a matter of fact, is not the handling of bonds, after all, largely a matter of one hand washing the other? Do you not really believe that for every bank that would be adversely affected there would be 100 benefited?

It is well and wise to remember that some of the institutions which were represented here in opposition to this legislation, whose representatives now state that this bond issue could not be successfully floated without serious economic disturbance, and especially with harmful effect on the bond market, were less than two years ago admonishing the people that stocks which had reached dizzy and unconscionable heights were cheap. We were seriously told, of course with good intentions, that we were living in a new era, with a new style of economics; that prosperity eternal had come to pass; and that poverty was being banished forever. America was being sold to Americans, and there just was not enough to go around. Some of these houses were underwriters of various issues, and had salesmen scattered throughout this country selling stocks for their account at prices never before witnessed in the history of this country. To repeat the sad story of what happened would be adding fuel to the flames in which many small and large investors lost their financial lives. Should not their error of judgment then be properly considered in giving weight to their judgment to-day? The whole set-up of the opposition, and I speak with the utmost deference and respect, is not unlike a note with many indorsers. Such paper does not have a prime rating—there is obliged to be weakness somewhere.

If this, my friends, were a procedure in court the distinguished chairman serving as the judge and the distinguished members of the committee as the jury, after the proposal for the payment of these certificates, as outlined in the various bills before you, had been read in the nature of a complaint, and the testimony of the bankers and big business men considered as the answer, I am sure you would have no difficulty in anticipating the real issue now pending before you and the court of public opinion. By going to the bone and calling a spade a spade, is not that issue, stripped and bare, just this: Shall the Government, which is in better and sounder financial condition to-day than at any time in all its great history, anticipate under these conditions the payment of its honest debt to the soldier at a time when it must be admitted that his needs are greater than at any time since he became the protector of bonds? Or shall we make him wait, perhaps many of their families in hunger and dire want, 14 more years in order not to disturb temporarily the business of speculators and traders in bonds and the bond market generally? I use the words "speculator" and "trader" in no derogatory sense, because I appreciate that these men occupy a useful and respected position in the business world. Notwithstanding their views, which are naturally influenced by the nature of the business in which they are engaged, there are leading economists and students of finance who believe that in the long and broad view the good effects of this legislation would be reflected in practically all classes of securities.

I would certainly not advocate this legislation if I did not hold this view. Of course, it is a matter of common knowledge that if the usual and customary happens as business improves—and it will do so if this measure passes—stocks become increasingly attractive and bonds, except as investments for reserves, lose their high favor and gradually de-

cline in keeping with the law of supply and demand. In other words, when the stock market begins to reflect the advent of better business and stocks begin to discount larger earnings, some bondholders sell out their bonds and buy stocks.

The testimony before the committee by some of the gentlemen opposing this legislation is to the effect that this is not a "money" panic but is a "confidence" panic. This thought was further elaborated by the statement that at no time during this depression and pestilence has it been difficult to borrow money at a reasonable rate of interest on good security. Does the viewpoint of the opposition to this legislation now indicate that it is not a confidence panic? Of course, very few people in this country have at this time, as I said before, what might be termed "good security." All of us know that not 5 per cent of the people of this country have ever been able to take advantage of 1 and 2 per cent money. This is available only to the preferred borrowers. To others, so far as directly supplying their personal demands is concerned, it might as well remain in the mint. All of us know that about three-fourths of the money of this country is held by a few large institutions. And let me say here that of all the cowards in the world, none can compare with the dollar. It runs faster and hides more securely at the first signal of danger than any other thing in the world. Whenever we can make it do its full duty many of our big problems will have been solved.

In this connection many of us also know that one of the main causes which have been assigned as responsible for this unusual and unparalleled economic depression and pestilence is the fact that this country has overexpanded, and that we are suffering with excess plant capacity. Whether this has contributed to the drastic falling off within the past 15 to 18 months of our export trade I am not in a position to say. I do know that if the manufacturing establishments of this country were operating at full capacity there would be a daily accumulation of surplus goods and products. Would the sale of bonds to pay off these certificates take away from business money needed for further industrial expansion? Under present conditions where else can it be needed? As desirable and beneficial as it might be for this Government to continue to float big foreign loans in order to provide credit for the purchase of our goods and to prevent a further accumulation and hoarding of the gold in this country, which now, by the way, amounts to more than four and a half billion dollars and increased during the past year over three hundred millions, would the issuance of bonds to pay off these certificates adversely affect this program? Is it not true that a large portion of financing of foreign loans will be undertaken by the French Government, which is dividing the honors with this country in its accumulation of gold? For what other purpose, in the usual or unusual course of trade, is it desired that the $7,000,000,000 seeking investment this year should be appropriated?

Common sense and practical judgment and personal observation tell us that what this country needs to-day is an increase in the purchasing power of the public. Just as the anæmic needs a transfusion of blood, so business throughout the entire country, and especially in the small towns and country villages, needs money. With values destroyed, men have no security on which to borrow from the banks. Surely the distribution of this comparatively small fund throughout the entire country could not cause an artificial inflation as has been referred to by those opposing this plan. Could there ever be a time when the diffusion and distribution of these funds would be more helpful? Only yesterday the Associated Press carried a news item showing the per capita circulation of money in the United States had reached the lowest level since 1914 during January of this year, when it dropped to $37.11, figured on a basis of a population of 124,000,000 people. This item further states that the only time in recent years that the per capita circulation had been lower than last month was in June, 1914, when it dropped to $34.92.

Not only would these funds be used to relieve suffering and distress but debts would be paid which would automatically melt frozen credits. All of us desire to avoid extreme deflationary and inflationary measures, for we know that all excesses are unsound and objectionable and cause reactions more undesirable than the original state. Many of our great leaders have in effect subscribed to this plan of treating sick business. Spend money, buy now, has been the slogan. Back in 1929, after the table of cards had fallen, our President, in his earnest desire to thwart the catastrophe which seemed imminent, called the captains of industry and leading financiers together in the hope of keeping the wheels of industry moving and thereby preventing a long-drawn-out business depression. Unquestionably this conference and plan did some good. The predominant idea from the conference was that business should continue to spend money and the individual was made to believe that it was his patriotic duty to spend all of his income, "even if he had to borrow the money to do it." If the spending of money was advisable then to aid in checking the depression, is it not, by the same token, almost imperative at this time if we are to regain the lost ground and revive trade activities?

Now, let us look briefly at the human aspect of this proposition. In 1917 the Government called upon these men in a time of its emergency and to-day they call upon their Government in a time of their emergency. If our Government were being invaded to-day by foreign foes, those who are opposing this legislation would agree that the invader should be met and defeated regardless of the cost. Suppose those who were called in 1917 had responded by saying that they did not think that going to war was the opportune and prudent thing to do, but felt that the country should postpone its declaration 15 years, is there any doubt but that this country would be paying reparations to-day instead of enjoying the reputation of being the richest nation in the world, with credit responsibilities the envy of every other civilized nation? These men answered their Government differently, and these three and one-half million soldier creditors to-day were among those who made this country not only safe for democracy but also safe for the bondholders as well. While they were fighting the gruesome battles of death thousands of bondholders were clipping coupons and piling up profits as a direct result of the war. Since then this great Nation has rightfully undertaken to pay its other just obligations as rapidly as possible. It has refunded billions to the taxpayers with 6 per cent interest; it has loaned millions to the shipbuilders at low rates of interest; it has paid, under guaranties, millions to the railroads; and it has anticipated public debts by billions; it has also forgiven its debtors billions of dollars, all of which accomplishments these soldiers made possible.

To-day this country is invaded by a foe more insidious and more devastating than armies and navies. Hunger, poverty, and unemployment are destroying happiness and gnawing at the vitals of life itself. Does not an emergency exist to-day equal to the war emergency? During the war the Government went into every home in America and called for the strongest member of the household. This brought sorrow and suffering everywhere. Now, by the payment of these certificates the Government has an opportunity to go back to a large number of those homes and bring hope and cheer. Thousands of these same homes can be blessed now by the simple payment of a just debt. Prompt action may mean life to the man whose "tramp, tramp, tramp" brought peace and wealth to this Nation. It is safe to say that if we wait until 1945 more than a third of those who originally held these certificates will have joined the ranks of their comrades who sleep in Flanders Field. Has the lapse of 12 years made our memory so short and our gratefulness and patriotism so thin and vacillating that we can not be aroused to sense to-day the responsibility which is ours toward these defenders of our country? Is it true that the sale of these bonds would be entirely a cold-blooded proposition, as some of the opponents have testified, and that the impulses of patriotism so responsive in 1918 would no longer induce men to buy them? If these men, who are to-day appealing to

your sense of justice and practical wisdom in their demand for the payment of these debts, had been as cowardly back in those days as the bonded dollar is to-day, there would be no Victory or Liberty bonds.

This, my friends, is a debt of honor, and for reasons given here and many others which you yourself have long since realized should be anticipated and some practical plan worked out immediately whereby money will be provided to pay off these certificates to the large percentage of those who need the same to-day. The money to those who do not need it will help through the purchase of bonds to many who do need it. Notwithstanding some insinuations to the contrary which have crept into the discussion of this question, all of us know that a very, very large majority of the rank and file of the ex-service men throughout this country favor this plan. Individually and through their various organizations their feelings and wishes have been conveyed to each of us. They have not asked us to again compromise their claim; they have not asked us to extend their loan privileges. It is generally admitted that under the present plan of operation the loans obtainable from the certificates are so small that they do not serve as a real benefit to the soldier in his effort to provide for his family, fulfill the duties of good citizenship, maintain the payments on his home now under mortgage, and discharge other just obligations which he incurred when times were normal. All of us appreciate the fact that a continuation of this practice at the rates of interest of 6 and 7 per cent, which he has been forced to pay, is gradually destroying and impairing the equity of his certificate to such an extent that in 1945 he would have practically nothing left. Is it not the fact that 48 per cent are already borrowing on their certificates, together with the statement of General Hines that the number has been for the past two months increasing by leaps and bounds, a very splendid index of their needs?

Personally I can see little merit in the plan which seems to be favored by some of the leaders of this House and the Senate to compromise this legislation by increasing the loan value from 22½ per cent to 45 or 50 per cent. Do you think it is right to talk about making loans to a man to whom you already owe a debt? Why not call it what it will really be, viz, another advancement? If I remember correctly, General Hines said that only 1 per cent of the present borrowers—and he has made over 1,350,000 loans—have paid back their loans and a very small percentage have even paid the interest on them. Since the Government owes these men, can you rightfully expect them to repay these advances? Time and red tape are involved, and such a plan only means additional cost and expense to the Government in administration for the next 14 years. Extension of the loan privileges can not serve the twofold purpose of doing justice to the veteran by helping him in a substantial way in his day of distress and need and at the same time serve as a real stimulus to business. Notwithstanding the fact that some of the opposition claim that this plan would involve too large a bond issue to be sold at a reasonable rate under present conditions and might cause an inflation; others say that this amount of money is really not sufficient to stimulate business. Another argument against payment has taken this form: Some of those who have testified before this committee have, inadvertently and innocently, I know, left the impression that the average veteran would not know what to do with his money and would therefore throw it away. One would think from such statements that these men needed guardians, that they had no place or station of importance in life, no families to care for, and without responsibilities; and, in effect, their appeal might be likened to that of a child crying for candy. In 1917 they were our heroes, and regardless of the careless innuendoes thus directed toward them during these hearings I believe that every man and woman in this Congress and the great mass of the people still rightfully acclaim and regard them as heroes.

Since it is a known fact that our Government has anticipated the payment of other obligations amounting to billions, at times which I am sure were less favorable than now, why defer favorable action in this matter longer? Should we permit the talk of wreck and red ruin from those who speculate and trade in bonds, in their desperate effort to prevent the passage of this just and sound legislation, to control our judgment? Will our sense of justice, fair play, and our conscience allow us, in the knowledge of the great sacrifice which they made, to continue to express in compromise terms our appreciation and gratefulness for the noble service which they rendered without stint or reservation? Has any man, business, or government, when able, ever suffered permanently by paying just obligations? Can any sound reason be advanced why these certificates should not be paid before further public debts may be anticipated for payment? Should not our Government's financial obligation to soldiers who saved this Nation and civilization be given preference over all other debts. Should not the soldier creditor rank as the first creditor of this Nation?

Since uncertainty is usually the real disturbing factor in the business world, I most respectfully submit that we should proceed without further delay to work out the best and wisest plan to give effect immediately to the payment of these certificates. I know that each of you in your heart of hearts is as much concerned as I am in seeing this matter solved in a way to insure justice to all. The ominous forebodings of economic disruption on the part of officials and the witnesses who have appeared before the Ways and Means Committee have had and will continue to have a more harmful effect upon the business structure of this Nation than will the perfection of a practical, businesslike plan providing for the payment of these sacred obligations.

Of course, I would not presume to expect that my views regarding the economic and financial effect of the passage of this legislation upon bond securities could compare in weight and influence with the representatives of the bond houses, insurance companies, and captains of finance who have appeared before the committee. Their views are their views; my views are mine. Their conclusions are usually based upon cold figures and statistics; mine, in this instance, are based upon personal knowledge of the personal needs of the veterans in my district and the general economic condition of this country, together with general reliable information regarding the Government's present financial structure. If there were no differences of opinion and no divergence of view, what is right would never be known and our presence here to-day would be unnecessary. Of course, no sensible person would wittingly advocate legislation which would retard economic restoration or legislation which would be detrimental to the best interests of all business, and especially at a time like this when we can not afford to take any risks. Is not the soldier equally as interested as we are in the general welfare of the people for whose benefit the financial resources of this great Government are held in trust by the Treasury? Though hundreds of thousands of these men are to-day walking the streets in enforced idleness because of the unemployment situation, does their request for the payment of this debt indicate a lack of concern for their brothers and neighbors in a similar condition who did not see service? Do we not all know that the operative effect of payment in full would be beneficial to everybody, and especially the taxpayers?

May I remind you that whether this debt is paid now or in 1945, ultimately a bond issue for the full amount will be necessary. It is quite true that by waiting 14 years the Treasury Department would have more time in which to make preparation. No sane person could expect arrangements to be worked out over the week-end. It is also true that during this time other public debts could very likely be anticipated for payment and that some refinancing could be effected at lower rates of interest. Since payment of these certificates would necessarily involve a considerable length of time, could not the funds be provided as the certificates come in for redemption by the sale of short-term securities, which can be sold at as low a rate as has been witnessed in 40 years? All factors considered, can you possibly imagine a more favorable background for this just governmental undertaking? Under these conditions, can we justify going in a roundabout way half the mile for these men when they

went straight the whole mile for us? Is it not a fact that if we had invested their basic credit without the 25 per cent additional as of the date of their discharge, at the rate of 6 per cent, the interest rate which our Government pays on tax refunds and other similar indebtedness, and the average rate which the Government has charged them on their loans against the certificates, these certificates would to-day be worth around 80 per cent of their face value? How can we, with full knowledge of this situation, further countenance such unjust discrimination? Can it be possible that, notwithstanding the wish of a large number of this body to see these certificates paid off in full, parliamentary procedure will be invoked to prevent a free expression "of the people, by the people, and for the people"? To-day we celebrate the birth of him who first enunciated and championed this principle.

To recapitulate, I firmly believe that if Congress is given an opportunity to express itself, it will pass this legislation by an overwhelming majority, and the following desired effects will result therefrom:

First. An act of simple justice will be done the saviors of our civilization, sealing forever their faith in the gratitude of their country.

Second. Thousands of this Nation's most deserving class of citizens will be saved from their present suffering and distress.

Third. General business and economic conditions will be stimulated instantly, with far-reaching and permanent good effect.

Fourth. A substantial saving in taxes would accrue by the substitution of bonds at a lower rate of interest than the present 4 per cent premium requirements on the certificates, together with the probable saving in administrative expense which would be necessary in the handling of these certificates for a further period of 14 years.

Fifth. Salvation will come to many small town country banks and country merchants whose business is stagnant for lack of cash money.

Sixth. Human rights will have triumphed over the rights of property without injury thereto.

If I did not honestly hold these views I would not be here advocating this legislation. I would champion the right of any man to differ in these views and accord them the highest respect. In having taken issue with those who hold contrary views I have said nothing which was intended to reflect upon the character of the maker or upon the integrity of his statements. Believing in the merits of this legislation, and holding the view that its effect would be as I have indicated, I would not feel that I had discharged my duty in this Congress if I did not advocate this legislation with all the energy, power, and resourcefulness which I have and which I can command. With these two lines from Kipling I leave this matter in the keeping of your own individual conscience:

Lord, God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget.

OUTDOOR ADVERTISING SIGNS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4022), to regulate the erection, hanging, placing, painting, display, and maintenance of outdoor signs and other forms of exterior advertising within the District of Columbia, with House amendments, insist upon the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALL]?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, this is from the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Has the gentleman consulted the lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] concerning the conference?

Mr. HALL of Indiana. The lady has not been consulted. I do this at the request of the chairman of the committee, who could not be here at this time. The lady from New Jersey is to be one of the conferees.

Mr. GARNER. I know she is to be one of the conferees, but I think it is fair to this side, when the gentleman asks unanimous consent to agree to a conference, that he consult the ranking Member on this side who is going to serve in the conference with him. I think that is a fair request. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request until he can get in touch with the lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mr. HALL of Indiana. I have no objection to withdrawing the request. I withdraw the request, Mr. Speaker.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PACIFIC COAST SHIPBUILDERS

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a statement in reference to the shipbuilding industry in the United States.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his own remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Speaker and Members of Congress, on January 26, when the independent offices appropriation bill was under consideration by this House, I called your attention to the activities of a self-centered, self-satisfied group of shipowners and shipbuilders in one small section of our country who believe that the merchant marine law of 1928 was enacted for their special benefit.

I have secured from the Shipping Board a table showing to which shipyards contracts have been awarded for the building or reconditioning of vessels with the help of loans provided for by the act of 1928. Though contracts amounting to $113,215,500 have been let on 26 vessels, totaling 329,910 gross tons, not one of these awards was made to the Pacific Coast builder, as may be seen from the report which follows:

Vessels being constructed or reconditioned with aid from construction loan fund, M. M. A. 1928

Name	Owner	Builder and address	Type	Gross tons	Number of passengers		Approximate cost
					First class	Other	
VESSELS UNDER CONSTRUCTION							
President Hoover	Dollar Steamship Line	Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va.	Combination passenger and cargo	23,000	316	930	$7,500,000
Hull 340	do	do	do	23,000	316	930	7,500,000
Hull 1440	Oceanic Steamship Co	Bethlehem (Fore River), Quincy, Mass	do	20,000	505	247	7,800,000
Hull 1441	do	do	do	20,000	505	247	7,800,000
Hull 1447	do	do	do	20,000	505	247	7,850,000
Hull 131	Motor Tankship Corporation	Sun Ship Building Co., Chester, Pa	Tanker	9,085			1,681,250
Hull 132	do	do	do	9,085			1,681,250
Hull 133	do	do	do	9,085			1,681,250
Hull 134	do	do	do	9,085			1,681,250
Hull 135	do	do	do	9,085			1,681,250
Hull 136	do	do	do	9,085			1,681,250
Exeter	Export Steamship Corporation	New York Ship Building Co., Camden, N. J	Combination passenger and cargo	8,200	152		2,300,000

Vessels being constructed or reconditioned with aid from construction loan fund, M. M. A. 1928—Continued

Name	Owner	Builder and address	Type	Gross tons	Number of passengers		Approximate cost
					First class	Other	
VESSELS UNDER CONSTRUCTION—continued.							
Excambion	Export Steamship Corporation	New York Ship Building Co., Camden, N. J.	Combination passenger and cargo.	8,200	152		$2,300,000
Borinquen	Coamo Steamship Co	Bethlehem (Fore River), Quincy, Mass	do	7,000	261	96	2,528,000
Hull 405	United States Lines	New York Ship Building Co., Camden, N. J	do	30,500	600	690	10,500,000
Hull 406	do	do	do	30,500	600	690	10,500,000
Hull 1444	United Mail Steamship Co	Bethlehem (Fore River) Quincy, Mass	do	7,500	98		3,425,000
Hull 1445	do	do	do	7,500	98		3,425,000
Hull 1446	do	do	do	7,500	98		3,425,000
Hull 344	do	Newport News Ship Building & Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va.	do	7,500	98		3,445,000
Hull 345	do	do	do	7,500	98		3,425,000
Hull 346	do	do	do	7,500	98		3,425,000
Hull 121	Panama Mail Steamship Co	Federal Ship Building & Dry Dock Co., Kearny, N. J.	do	10,000	222	64	4,000,000
Hull 122	do	do	do	10,000	222	64	4,000,000
Hull 123	Grace Steamship Co	do	do	10,000	222	64	4,000,000
Hull 124	do	do	do	10,000	222	64	4,000,000
Total (26 vessels).				329,910	5,388	4,333	113,215,500
VESSELS BEING RECONDITIONED							
Steadfast	Baltimore Mail Steamship Co	Federal Ship Building & Dry Dock Co., Kearney, N. J.	Combination passenger and cargo.	7,589	81		1,767,770
Independence	do	do	do	7,589	81		1,767,770
Eclipse	do	do	do	7,589	81		1,767,770
Victorious	do	do	do	7,589	81		1,767,770
Archer	do	do	do	7,589	81		1,767,770
Total (5 vessels).				37,945	405		8,838,850

Any of these vessels could be built or reconditioned on the Pacific Coast. Our shipyards have the facilities and personnel necessary for any and all kinds of ship construction and repair. You may see for yourselves in the following table:

Shipyards on the Pacific Coast available for general ship construction and repair

Name and location	Owner	Investment in plant on Pacific coast	Facilities
Todd Drydocks (Inc.), C. W. Wiley, president, Seattle, Wash.	Todd Shipyards Corporation, New York (has Atlantic coast yard also).	$3,500,000	3 floating dry docks, capacity, 3,000-15,000 tons; complete repair slips; no building slips at present.
Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation (Ltd.), A. S. Gunn, General Manager, San Francisco, Calif. Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation (Ltd.), Los Angeles Harbor, San Pedro, Calif.	Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation (Ltd.), Bethlehem, Pa. (has Atlantic coast yard also).	25,000,000	Complete shops and ways for ship construction. Present building slips will now accommodate ships up to 600 feet and may be expanded; dry docks to accommodate largest ship afloat—largest private dry docks in world. Alameda yard has slips and shops to construct ships to 600 feet in length. Los Angeles yard has dry-dock capacity 15,000 tons and building slips.
Moore Drydock Co., Oakland, Calif	Moore Drydock Co., Jos. A. Moore, president, San Francisco, Calif.	6,000,000	5 dry docks, capacity 7,000 to 20,000 tons; building slips and shops for construction and repair of ships to 500 feet in length and can be enlarged.
General Engineering & Drydock Co., Oakland, Calif.	General Engineering & Drydock Co., George A. Armes, president San Francisco, Calif.	2,000,000	3 dry docks, capacity 2,500 to 10,000 tons; building slips and shops for construction of ships to 400 feet in length and can be extended.
Los Angeles Shipbuilding & Drydock Corporation, Los Angeles Harbor, San Pedro, Calif.	Los Angeles Shipbuilding & Drydock Corporation, George A. Armes, president San Francisco, Calif.	3,500,000	Dry-dock capacity 12,000 tons; building slips and shops for constructing ships to 600 feet in length and can be extended to accommodate larger vessels.

Unless the Pacific Coast receives its just share of shipbuilding, these splendid yards will remain idle and our national defense will suffer.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 17. An act to amend section 12 of the act entitled "An act to readjust the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service," approved June 10, 1922, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 116. An act to add certain lands to the Idaho National Forest, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 293. An act for the relief of Margaret Crotty; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 407. An act for the relief of Little Rock College, Little Rock, Ark.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 454. An act to establish a commission to be known as a Commission on a National Museum of Engineering and Industry; to the Committee on the Library.

S. 541. An act to limit the time for bringing suit on the bonds of clerks of United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1793. An act for the relief of Jeff Davis Caperton and Lucy Virginia Caperton; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1876. An act for the relief of the Columbia Casualty Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2008. An act for the relief of National Ben Franklin Fire Insurance Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2296. An act for the relief of Nellie McMullen; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2614. An act for the relief of the Macon, Dublin & Savannah Railroad Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2817. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved

February 28, 1929, as amended, by including Roger P. Ames among those honored by the act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2832. An act to amend section 319 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3199. An act 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; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3523. An act for the relief of Denton L. Sims; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3611. An act for the relief of Sarah Ann Coe; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3793. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4068. An act for the relief of William J. Ryan, chaplain, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4306. An act for the relief of Clarence G. Young; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4328. An act granting an increase of pension to Helen K. Snowden; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4444. An act for the relief of Guy Clatterbuck; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4510. An act for the relief of H. E. Hurley; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4696. An act granting to the Butte Anglers' Club, of Butte, Mont., a patent to lot 1, section 5, township 2 south, range 9 west, and a patent to the Northern Pacific Railway Co. of lot 2 in said section 5; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 4761. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Historical Society of Montana, for preservation and exhibition, the silver service which was in use on the gunboat, No. 9, *Helena;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 4837. An act for the relief of the Copper Ridge Mining Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4851. An act for the relief of Maj. O. S. McCleary, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4910. An act granting a pension to Eleanora Emma Bliss; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 5019. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes,' approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes," approved June 24, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

S. 5117. An act for the relief of W. Stanley Gorsuch; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5120. An act to provide for the payment of traveling expenses of attorneys of record out of the tribal funds of the Spokane Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 5138. An act to amend the organic act of Porto Rico, approved March 2, 1917; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

S. 5141. An act for the relief of Clarence R. Killion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 5183. An act for the relief of Herman Ingman; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5192. An act for the relief of Donald K. Warner; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5194. An act for the relief of the Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5196. An act for the relief of the B. & O. Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5197. An act for the relief of the David Gordon Building & Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5209. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes,' approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes," approved May 21, 1928; to the Committee on Roads.

S. 5248. An act to extend the boundaries of Wind Cave National Park, S. Dak.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 5465. An act to amend section 586c of the act entitled "An act to amend subchapter 1 of chapter 18 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia relating to degree-conferring institutions, approved March 2, 1929; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 5481. An act to authorize the presentation of a medal of honor, posthumously, to the late Henry Clay Drexler and to the late George Robert Cholister, boatswain's mate, first class, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 5499. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

S. 5514. An act to authorize the posthumous award of a distinguished-flying cross to Eugene B. Ely; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 5516. An act for the relief of E. G. Mason; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5555. An act for the relief of Alexander M. Proctor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 5557. An act to amend the act of May 23, 1930 (46 Stat. 378); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 5588. An act to add certain public lands to the Washakie National Forest, Wyo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 5746. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Baltimore County, Md., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Deep Creek at or near Marlyn Avenue, Baltimore County, Md.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5765. An act for the relief of the Potomac Electric Power Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5813. An act to provide for the consideration of wildlife conservation in connection with the construction of public works or improvement projects; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 5863. An act granting a pension to Mary R. Dickman; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 5920. An act authorizing the attendance of the Army Band at the annual encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held at Des Moines, Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 5984. An act to authorize the construction of a sanatorium for adult tuberculosis patients on the tract of land acquired by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia by authority of an act of Congress approved March 1, 1929, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a children's tuberculosis sanatorium," as amended by an act of Congress approved April 18, 1930; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 6023. An act 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.

S. 6032. An act amending section 1 of Public Resolution No. 89, Seventy-first Congress, approved June 17, 1930, entitled "Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the siege of Yorktown, Va., and the surrender of Lord Cornwallis on October 19, 1781, and authorizing an appropriation to be used in connection with such celebration, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Library.

S. 6041. An act to authorize an appropriation of funds in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia for the use of the District of Columbia Commission for the George Washington Bicentennial; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 6046. An act to authorize advances to the reclamation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. 6050. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant a right of way for street purposes upon and across the San Antonio Arsenal, in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 6077. An act providing for the closing of barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 6092. An act to transfer certain forest lands to the State of South Dakota for public-park purposes and creating the Mount Rushmore Reservation; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 6103. An act to authorize a change in the design of the quarter dollar to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

S. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution authorizing the placing in the Capitol of a statue in honor of the American mother; to the Committee on the Library.

S. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution creating a commission to study proposals for a national system of express motor ways and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 101. An act for the award of the air mail flyer's medal of honor;

H. R. 252. An act to facilitate work of the Department of Agriculture in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 397. An act for the relief of Lowell G. Fuller;

H. R. 465. An act for the relief of John H. Lawler;

H. R. 474. An act for the relief of Samuel B. Faulkner;

H. R. 477. An act for the relief of Harry Hamlin;

H. R. 542. An act for the relief of Chancy L. McIntyre;

H. R. 1408. An act to provide for the study, investigation, and survey, for commemorative purposes, of the Bull Run and Second Manassas Battlefields in the State of Virginia;

H. R. 1594. An act for the relief of John W. Leich, alias John Leach;

H. R. 1612. An act for the relief of Angenora Hines;

H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Robert E. Beck, otherwise known as Rudolph E. Beck and Harry J. Brown;

H. R. 1884. An act for the relief of Charles F. Reilly;

H. R. 1966. An act for the relief of Martha J. Tonguet;

H. R. 2312. An act for the relief of Arthur W. Taylor;

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Leo B. Thome;

H. R. 2458. An act for the relief of Darold Brundige;

H. R. 2887. An act for the relief of Mildred L. Williams;

H. R. 3428. An act for the relief of Rebecca E. Olmsted;

H. R. 3935. An act for the relief of Eugenia A. Helston;

H. R. 5787. An act for the relief of Carlton Olin, otherwise known as Stephen Cebra;

H. R. 5902. An act for the relief of S. W. Greer;

H. R. 6193. An act for the relief of Sidney Morris Hopkins;

H. R. 6194. An act granting six months' pay to Arthur G. Caswell;

H. R. 6197. An act for the relief of William Befuhs (deceased), otherwise known as Charles Cameron;

H. R. 6544. An act for the relief of Francis J. Moore;

H. R. 6586. An act providing for the confirmation of the title of certain purchasers from the State of Louisiana of lands formerly included in the Live Oak naval reserve on Navy Commissioners Islands, in St. Mary Parish, La., now abandoned;

H. R. 6603. An act to provide a shorter work week for postal employees, and for other purposes;

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. 6997. An act to confer to certain persons who served in the Quartermaster Corps or under the jurisdiction of the quartermaster general during the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition the benefits of hospitalization and the privileges of the Soldiers' Homes;

H. R. 8253. An act for the relief of Sterling S. Ball;

H. R. 8290. An act to authorize and direct a preliminary examination of the Mohican River ditch from Lake Fork, Ohio, south a distance of 8 miles;

H. R. 8583. An act for the relief of the State of Maine and the city of Portsmouth, N. H.;

H. R. 8936. An act authorizing the promotion on the retired list of the Navy of Stuart L. Johnson, ensign;

H. R. 9205. An act for the relief of Julian E. Gillespie;

H. R. 9934. An act providing for the sale of timberland in four townships in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 9987. An act to provide for the relinquishment by the United States of certain lands to the city of Rupert in the county of Minidoka, in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 10365. An act for the relief of Tracy Lee Phillips;

H. R. 10380. An act adjusting the salaries of the Naval Academy Band;

H. R. 11132. An act for the relief of Edward Knight;

H. R. 11281. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 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;

H. R. 11285. An act to amend the Alaska game law;

H. R. 11564. An act to reimburse William Whitright for expenses incurred as an authorized delegate of the Fort Peck Indians;

H. R. 11565. An act to reimburse Charles Thompson for expenses incurred as an authorized delegate of the Fort Peck Indians;

H. R. 11675. An act to authorize the issuance of a patent in fee for certain land and buildings within the Colville Reservation, Wash., for public-school use;

H. R. 11967. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Illinois;

H. R. 12014. An act to permit payments for the operation of motor cycles and automobiles used for necessary travel on official business on a mileage basis in lieu of actual operating expenses;

H. R. 12023. An act to repeal the provision of law granting a pension to Lois Cramton;

H. R. 12037. An act authorizing the payment of a claim presented by the Polish Government for the reimbursement of certain expenditures incurred by the community authorities of Rzeczyczany, Poland, to which place an insane alien was erroneously deported;

H. R. 12067. An act for compensation to the owners of the Danish motor ship *Indien* for damages sustained as the result of a collision with the United States Coast Guard cutter *Shawnee* at San Francisco on April 5, 1925;

H. R. 12350. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Michigan;

H. R. 12697. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the United States and the State of Utah;

H. R. 12835. An act authorizing the use of tribal funds of Indians belonging on the Klamath Reservation, Oreg., to pay expenses connected with suits pending in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12871. An act providing for the sale of isolated tracts in the former Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.;

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. 13053. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept donations to or in behalf of institutions conducted for the benefit of Indians;

H. R. 13160. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Rosenberg Library, in the city of Galveston, Tex., the silver service presented to the United States for the cruiser *Galveston;*

H. R. 13249. An act to authorize the acceptance of a tract of land adjoining Hot Springs National Park, Ark., and for other purposes;

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. 13293. An act 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;

H. R. 13528. An act providing for payment of $25 to each enrolled Chippewa Indian of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 13547. An act to safeguard the validity of permits to use recreational areas in the San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests;

H. R. 13584. An act to amend an act approved May 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 555), entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

H. R. 13587. An act to amend the act of April 25, 1922, as amended, entitled "An act authorizing extensions of time for the payment of purchase money due under certain homestead entries and Government-land purchases within the former Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations, N. Dak. and S. Dak.";

H. R. 14056. An act to amend the act approved March 2, 1929, entitled "An act to authorize the disposition of unplatted portions of Government town sites on irrigation projects under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902, and for other purposes";

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. 15590. An act providing for the sale of Chippewa Indian land to the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 15601. An act 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;

H. R. 15766. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to maintain and operate, as constructed, a free highway bridge across Saline River near Kingsland, Ark., on State Highway No. 3, from Pine Bluff to Fordyce, Ark.;

H. R. 15772. An act to amend section 3 of the act approved May 10, 1928, entitled "An act to extend the period of restriction in lands of certain members of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes";

H. R. 15867. An act to provide for the retention by the United States of a site within the Hot Springs National Park formerly occupied by the Arlington Hotel and Bathhouse for park and landscape purposes;

H. R. 15876. An act to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes;

H. R. 15987. An act to authorize the President of the United States to establish the Canyon de Chelly National Monument within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.;

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. 16479. An act to authorize the widening of Piney Branch Road NW., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 299. Joint resolution to provide an annual appropriation to meet the quota of the United States toward the expenses of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 5768. An act authorizing the cities of Omaha, Nebr.; Council Bluffs, Iowa; and the counties of Douglas, Nebr., and Pottawattamie, Iowa, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll or free bridge across the Missouri River at or near O'Hern Street, South Omaha, Nebr.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 101. An act for the award of the air mail flyer's medal of honor;

H. R. 252. An act to facilitate work of the Department of Agriculture in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 397. An act for the relief of Lowell G. Fuller.

H. R. 465. An act for the relief of John H. Lawler;

H. R. 474. An act for the relief of Samuel B. Faulkner.

H. R. 477. An act for the relief of Harry Hamlin.

H. R. 542. An act for the relief of Chancy L. McIntyre.

H. R. 1408. To provide for the study, investigation, and survey, for commemorative purposes, of the Bull Run and Second Manassas battlefields in the State of Virginia;

H. R. 1594. An act for the relief of John W. Leich, alias John Leach;

H. R. 1612. An act for the relief of Angenora Hines.

H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Robert E. Beck, otherwise known as Rudolph E. Beck, and Harry J. Brown;

H. R. 1884. An act for the relief of Charles F. Reilly;

H. R. 1966. An act for the relief of Martha J. Tonguet;

H. R. 2312. An act for the relief of Arthur W. Taylor;

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Leo B. Thome;

H. R. 2458. An act for the relief of Daroid Brundige;

H. R. 2887. An act for the relief of Mildred L. Williams;

H. R. 3428. An act for the relief of Rebecca E. Olmsted.

H. R. 3935. An act for the relief of Eugenia A. Helston;

H. R. 5787. An act for the relief of Carlton Olin, otherwise known as Stephen Cebra;

H. R. 5902. An act for the relief of S. W. Greer;

H. R. 6193. An act for the relief of Sidney Morris Hopkins;

H. R. 6194. An act granting six months' pay to Arthur G. Caswell;

H. R. 6197. An act for the relief of William Befuhs (deceased), otherwise known as Charles Cameron;

H. R. 6544. An act for the relief of Francis J. Moore;

H. R. 6586. An act providing for the confirmation of the title of certain purchasers from the State of Louisiana of lands formerly included in the Live Oak naval reserve on Navy Commissioners Island, in St. Mary Parish, La., now abandoned;

H. R. 6603. An act to provide a shorter work week for postal employees, and for other purposes;

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. 6997. An act to confer to certain persons who served in the Quartermaster Corps or under the jurisdiction of the quartermaster general during the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition the benefits of hospitalization and the privileges of the soldiers' homes;

H. R. 8253. An act for the relief of Sterling S. Ball;

H. R. 8290. An act to authorize and direct a preliminary examination of the Mohican River ditch from Lake Fork, Ohio, south a distance of 8 miles;

H. R. 8583. An act for the relief of the State of Maine and the city of Portsmouth, N. H.;

H. R. 8936. An act authorizing the promotion on the retired list of the Navy of Stuart L. Johnson, ensign;

H. R. 9205. An act for the relief of Julian E. Gillespie;

H. R. 9934. An act providing for the sale of timberland in four townships in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 9987. An act to provide for the relinquishment by the United States of certain lands to the city of Rupert in the county of Minidoka, in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 10365. An act for the relief of Tracy Lee Phillips;

H. R. 10380. An act adjusting the salaries of the Naval Academy Band;

H. R. 11132. An act for the relief of Edward Knight;

H. R. 11281. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 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;

H. R. 11285. An act to amend the Alaska game law;

H. R. 11564. An act to reimburse William Whitright for expenses incurred as an authorized delegate of the Fort Peck Indians;

H. R. 11565. An act to reimburse Charles Thompson for expenses incurred as an authorized delegate of the Fort Peck Indians;

H. R. 11967. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Illinois;

H. R. 12014. An act to permit payments for the operation of motor cycles and automobiles used for necessary travel on official business, on a mileage basis in lieu of actual operating expenses;

H. R. 12023. An act to repeal the provision of law granting a pension to Lois Cramton;

H. R. 12037. An act authorizing the payment of a claim presented by the Polish Government for the reimbursement of certain expenditures incurred by the community authorities of Rzeczyczany, Poland, to which place an insane alien was erroneously deported;

H. R. 12067. An act for compensation to the owners of the Danish motor ship *Indien* for damages sustained as the result of a collision with the United States Coast Guard cutter *Shawnee* at San Francisco on April 5, 1925;

H. R. 12350. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Michigan;

H. R. 12697. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the United States and the State of Utah;

H. R. 12835. An act authorizing the use of tribal funds of Indians belonging on the Klamath Reservation, Oreg., to pay expenses connected with suits pending in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12871. An act providing for the sale of isolated tracts in the former Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.;

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. 13053. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept donations to or in behalf of institutions conducted for the benefit of Indians;

H. R. 13160. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Rosenberg Library, in the city of Galveston, Tex., the silver service presented to the United States for the cruiser *Galveston*;

H. R. 13249. An act to authorize the acceptance of a tract of land adjoining Hot Springs National Park, Ark., and for other purposes;

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. 13293. An act 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;

H. R. 13528. An act providing for payment of $25 to each enrolled Chippewa Indian of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 13547. An act to safeguard the validity of permits to use recreational areas in the San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests;

H. R. 13584. An act to amend an act approved May 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 555), entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims";

H. R. 13587. An act to amend the act of April 25, 1922, as amended, entitled "An act authorizing extensions of time for the payment of purchase money due under certain homestead entries and Government land purchases within the former Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations, N. Dak. and S. Dak.";

H. R. 14056. An act to amend the act approved March 2, 1929, entitled "An act to authorize the disposition of unplatted portions of Government town sites on irrigation projects under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902, and for other purposes";

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. 15590. An act providing for the sale of Chippewa Indian land to the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 15601. An act 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;

H. R. 15766. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to maintain and operate, as constructed, a free highway bridge across Saline River near Kingsland, Ark., on State Highway No. 3, from Fine Bluff to Fordyce, Ark.;

H. R. 15772. An act to amend section 3 of the act approved May 10, 1928, entitled "An act to extend the period of restriction in lands of certain members of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes";

H. R. 15867. An act to provide for the retention by the United States of a site within the Hot Springs National Park formerly occupied by the Arlington Hotel and Bathhouse for park and landscape purposes;

H. R. 15876. An act to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes;

H. R. 15987. An act to authorize the President of the United States to establish the Canyon de Chelly National Monument within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.;

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. 16479. An act to authorize the widening of Piney Branch Road NW., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 299. Joint resolution to provide an annual appropriation to meet the quota of the United States toward the expenses of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 13, 1931, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Friday, February 13, 1931, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON COINAGE, WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES

(10.30 a. m.)

To authorize a change in the design of the quarter dollar to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington (H. R. 16973).

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS—SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

(10.30 a. m.)

To authorize appropriations for construction at Plattsburg Barracks, Plattsburg, N. Y. (H. R. 15071).

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10 a. m.)

Second deficiency bill.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

829. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriations for the District of Columbia, for the National Zoological Park, for the fiscal year 1931, to remain available until June 30, 1932, $4,500; for the Public Employment Service, for the fiscal year 1932, $4,500; amounting in all to $9,000 (H. Doc. No. 751); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

830. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for labor-saving devices, Post Office Department, fiscal years 1931 and 1932 (H. Doc. No. 752); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

831. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, for the War Department for cemeterial expenses (Arlington Cemetery, Va.), amounting to $175,000 (H. Doc. No. 753); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

832. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1931, for the enforcement of the United States cotton-futures act and United States cotton-standards act, in the sum of $75,000 (H. Doc. No. 754); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

833. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, for the Treasury Department for general expenses of public buildings, Office of the Supervising Architect, amounting to $15,000; also a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, under the same heads, amounting to $623,060, in substitution of an estimate for the same purposes, amounting to $590,060, transmitted with letter of February 2, 1931 (H. Doc. No. 730, 71st Cong., 3d sess.); in all, $638,060 (H. Doc. No. 755); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

834. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1931 for public works, Navy Department, in the sum of $2,200,000 (H. Doc. No. 756); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

835. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1932, in the sum of $3,379,000 (H. Doc. No. 757); 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. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 355. A resolution providing for the consideration of S. 3614, S. 4425, H. R. 11199, H. R. 14055, H. R. 12059, H. R. 12032, and S. 3060, all bills from the Committee on the Judiciary; without amendment (Rept. No. 2600). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 356. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. J. Res. 292, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2601). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 5825. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of California to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Bay of San Francisco from the Rincon Hill district in San Francisco by way of Goat Island to Oakland; with amendment (Rept. No. 2602). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1025. A bill granting the consent of Congress to construct, maintain, own, manage, and operate a tunnel or tunnels and approaches thereto under the Delaware River; with amendment (Rept. No. 2603). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 16862. A bill relating to the adoption of minors by the Crow Indians of Montana; with amendment (Rept. No. 2604). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 16213. A bill to provide for distribution of tribal funds of Puyallup Indians of the State of Washington; without amendment (Rept. No. 2605). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PARKER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16341. A bill to authorize 24-hour quarantine-inspection service in certain ports of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2606). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 16863. A bill authorizing the classification of the Crow Indians of Montana; with amendment (Rept. No. 2607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 16983. A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds for the payment of the claims of certain foreign governments under the circumstances hereinafter enumerated; with amendment (Rept. No. 2608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. J. Res. 454. A joint resolution authorizing the distribution of the judgment rendered by the Court of Claims to the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, N. Dak.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WASON: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Commerce (Rept. No. 2611). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WASON: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the Treasury Department (Rept. No. 2612). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WASON: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the War Department (Rept. No. 2613). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HALE: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4856. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of February 14, 1927, entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept on behalf of the United States title in fee simple to a certain strip of land and the construction of a bridge across Archers Creek in South Carolina"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COYLE: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 14270. A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1911 (ch. 239, 36 Stat. L. 1267), as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MERRITT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 15361. A bill to provide for conveyance of a certain strip of land on Fenwick Island, Sussex County, State of Delaware, for roadway purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EATON of Colorado: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 16156. A bill for the exchange of lands adjacent to national forests in Colorado; with amendment (Rept. No. 2627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 16218. A bill 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 2628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 5313. An act to cancel certain reimbursable charges against certain lands within the Gila River Indian Reservation, Ariz.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DENISON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16852. A bill authorizing D. S. Prentiss, R. A. Salladay, Syl F. Histed, William M. Turner, and John H. Rahilly, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the town of New Boston, Ill.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2630). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16907. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2631). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ARENTZ: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. S. J. Res. 222. A joint resolution relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a contract with the Rio Grande project; without amendment (Rept. No. 2632). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 5110. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1924, providing for a final disposition of the affairs of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians in North Carolina; without amendment (Rept. No. 2633). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. S. 5625. An act providing for the participation of the United States in A Century of Progress (the Chicago World's Fair Centennial Celebration) to be held at Chicago, Ill., in 1933, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. S. 5724. An act authorizing the George Washington Bicentennial Commission to print and distribute additional sets of the writings of George Washington; with amendment (Rept. No. 2636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 5571. An act to provide for the entertainment of members and delegates to the Fourteenth Annual Convention of the French Veterans of the World War, to be held in the District of Columbia in September, 1932; without amendment (Rept. No. 2637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. R. 14262. A bill to amend section 2 of Public Resolution No. 89, Seventy-first Congress, approved June 17, 1930, entitled "Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the siege of Yorktown, Va., and the surrender of Lord Cornwallis on October 19, 1781, and authorizing an appropriation to be used in connection with such celebration, and for other purposes"; with amendment (Rept. No. 2638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. J. Res. 467. A joint resolution to provide for the erection of a suitable Memorial to the Second Division of the American Expeditionary Forces; with amendment (Rept. No. 2639). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. R. 16520. A bill authorizing amendments to section 1 of Public Resolution No. 89, Seventy-first Congress, approved June 17, 1930, entitled "Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the siege of Yorktown, Va., and the surrender of Lord Cornwallis on October 19, 1781, and authorizing an appropriation to be used in connection with such celebration, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2640). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 15821. A bill for the relief of Ben Spotted Horse; with amendment (Rept. No. 2610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOX: Committee on Claims. S. 1640. An act for the relief of John E. Ross; without amendment (Rept. No. 2614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRADDOCK: Committee on War Claims. S. 2035. An act for the relief of the Public Service Coordinated Transport, of Newark, N. J.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2615). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WOODRUFF: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 3951. An act for the relief of Walter Harrell Allen; without amendment (Rept. No. 2616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DRANE: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 4800. An act to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps to accept such decorations, orders, and medals as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered; without amendment (Rept. No. 2617). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DARROW: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 4907. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Princeton Club of Philadelphia the bowl and ladle formerly in use on the U. S. S. *Princeton;* without amendment (Rept. No. 2618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 10259. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Eaton; without amendment (Rept. No. 2619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 14358. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 2620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HALE: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 14527. A bill for the relief of Joe G. McInerney; with amendment (Rept. No. 2621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HESS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 16417. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Campus Martius Memorial Museum, of the city of Marietta, Ohio, the silver service presented to the United States for the gunboat *Marietta*; without amendment (Rept. No. 2622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 16987. A bill for the relief of Royal W. Robertson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Committee in Claims. H. R. 13710. A bill for the relief of John O'Toole; without amendment (Rept. No. 2634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 14987. A bill authorizing the President to order William H. Sage, jr., before a retiring board for a hearing of his case and upon the findings of such board determine whether or not he be placed on the retired list with the rank and pay held by him at the time of his resignation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2641). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16902) granting a pension to Julia A. S. Richardson, and the same was 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. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 17051) to incorporate the Disabled American Veterans of the World War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 17052) to allow the Menominee Tribe of Indians to incorporate; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 17053) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Moundsville, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 17054) to increase the loan basis of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 17055) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, such additional land in the city of Florence, S. C., as may be necessary for the extension and remodeling of the Federal courthouse and post-office building of said city, to cause said building to be extended and remodeled, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Resolution (H. Res. 357) providing for the consideration of S. 6046, a bill to authorize advances to the reclamation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JENKINS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 500) further restricting for a period of two years immigration into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRIGGS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, urging the payment of the adjusted-service compensation certificates at the earliest possible time; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARNER: Memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Texas, favoring payment of veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates in cash; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Texas, urging legislation for the payment of cash of adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Texas, urging legislation for the payment in cash of adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Texas, requesting that Federal legislation be obtained for the construction of a dam across the Red River near Denison, Tex.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, memorial of the State Senate of the Legislature of the State of Texas, urging that a national park be established within the State of Texas; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the Congress of the United States for the immediate payment of adjusted-compensation certificates at full face value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: Memorial of the Fifty-seventh General Assembly, State of Illinois, memorializing the Congress of the United States for the immediate payment of adjusted-compensation certificates at full face value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EATON of New Jersey: Memorial of the Legislature of New Jersey, urging Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to carry out the training of the Organized Reserves for the fiscal year 1932; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 17056) granting a pension to Sarah B. Cordell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 17057) for the relief of the widow of Morris J. Lovey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17058) renewing and extending patent No. 1175657; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CULKIN: A bill (H. R. 17059) granting a pension to Dorothy King; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 17060) for the relief of Ida M. Mathison; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 17061) granting a pension to Elizabeth Benedict; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 17062) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Stephenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 17063) to authorize the city of Anadarko, Okla., to use for hospital purposes certain lands granted to said city as a park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 17064) granting a pension to Estella Unger Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17065) granting a pension to Martha A. Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 17066) granting a pension to Delilah E. Bear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TURPIN: A bill (H. R. 17067) for the relief of Leo Riley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 17068) granting a pension to Anna M. Steiner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17069) granting a pension to Patience Witherow; 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:

9430. Petition of the American Legion, Department of Nebraska, urging Congress to immediately provide for the retirement and payment of the adjusted-compensation certificates in full; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9431. By Mr. ADKINS: Petition of citizens of Decatur, Ill., requesting the immediate cash payment at full face value of adjusted-compensation certificates as created by section 702 of the World War adjusted compensation act of 1924; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9432. Also, petition of citizens of Urbana, Ill., in behalf of the immediate cash payment at full face value of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9433. By Mr. BACHMANN: Petition of the St. Joseph's Academy Alumnæ Association, protesting against the passing of Senate bill 4582 to amend tariff act (1930) and Penal Code to permit importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9434. By Mr. BACON: Petition of sundry citizens of Long Island, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 7884 for the exemption of dogs from vivisection; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9435. Also, petition transmitted by Halsey W. Hallock, of Mattituck, N. Y., favoring enactment of resolution proposing constitutional amendment to exclude unnaturalized aliens when making apportionment for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9436. By Mr. BLANTON: Petition of the Woodrow Wilson Post, No. 399, American Legion, of South San Antonio, Tex., recommending that the adjusted-service certificates should be paid in full; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9437. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution adopted at a meeting of the board of directors of the Eighth Avenue Association (Inc.), New York City, opposing payment of adjusted-service certificates, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9438. Also, resolution adopted at the annual convention of Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations, opposing any legislation further restricting immigration, etc.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

9439. By Mr. BRUNNER: Petition of Richard Heller, 66–55, Sixtieth Place, Ridgewood, Long Island, N. Y., and other residents of the second Queens Borough, New York, district, favoring House bill 7884, the dog exemption bill, and urging early and favorable enactment by Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9440. By Mr. BUCKBEE: Petition of Ernest Beach and 20 other citizens of Rockford, Ill., asking for immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates at their face value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9441. Also, petition of Burton Hassinger, 527 West State Street, Rockford, Ill., and 37 other citizens of Rockford, asking for immediate cash payment at full face value of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9442. By Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa: Petition of 28 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Sac City, Iowa, urging support of proposed Sparks-Capper stop-alien representation amendment to the Constitution, excluding unnaturalized aliens from the count of the population for apportionment of congressional districts among the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9443. Also, petition of Womans' Club of Sheldon, Iowa, urging Congress to enact a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures, establishing higher moral standards before production for films that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9444. By Mr. CHALMERS: Letter from the president of Toledo Diocesan Council of the National Council of Catholic Women, Toledo, Ohio, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 4582 to amend the tariff act of 1930 and Penal Code to permit the importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9445. By Mr. CHINDBLOM: Petition of R. T. Navigato and 37 other citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9446. By Mr. CHRISTGAU: Petition of citizens of Wabasha, Minn., submitted by Walter Burkhardt, in behalf of the immediate cash payment at full face value of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9447. Also, resolution adopted by the New Richland Creamery Association, of New Richland, Minn., in opposition to the ruling of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue regarding the use of palm oil in the manufacture of oleomargarine, and favoring legislation by Congress subjecting oleomargarine, colored in any manner whatsoever, to the imposition of a tax of 10 cents per pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9448. Also, petition of citizens of Lake City, Minn., submitted by William Harp, favoring the immediate cash payment at full face value of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9449. Also, petition of citizens of Austin, Minn., submitted by Walter Anderson, favoring the immediate cash payment at full face value of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9450. Also, petition of citizens of Austin, Minn., submitted by E. L. Lucas, favoring the immediate cash pay-

ment at full face value of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9451. Also, petition of citizens of Winona, Minn., submitted by John Jereczek, favoring the immediate cash payment at full face value of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9452. By Mr. CLARKE of New York: Petition of the members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Laurens, 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.

9453. Also, petition of the members of the Ladies' Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Bainbridge, 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 international and interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9454. By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Petition of Abe T. Thompson, quartermaster, Post No. 1835, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other residents of Franklin, Pa., and vicinity, favoring cash payment of adjusted-compensation certificates of World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9455. Also, petition of Rev. J. A. Galbraith, D. D., and members of the Men's Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Ridgway, Pa., indorsing the Sparks-Capper resolution proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution so as to exclude unnaturalized aliens from the count to determine the number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9456. Also, petition of J. T. Young and other residents of Sharpsville, Pa., and vicinity, favoring cash payment of adjusted-compensation certificates for World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9457. Also, petition of E. L. Reese and other citizens of Reno, Pa., and vicinity, favoring cash payment of adjusted-compensation certificates for World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9458. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Kenosha, Wis., urging the enactment of legislation to make immediate payment to veterans of the World War the face value of their adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9459. By Mr. CORNING: Petition of Statia H. Freel, St. Peter's Alumnæ Nurses' Association, Albany, N. Y., protesting against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9460. Also, petition of Clara A. Kirsch, grand regent, Court Mary Regis, Albany, N. Y., protesting against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9461. Also, petition of Sara Burgess, St. Monica's Circle, Albany, N. Y., protesting against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9462. Also, petition of Elizabeth B. Carey, Newman Club Auxiliary, Albany, N. Y., protesting against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9463. Also, petition of Anna M. Dugan, president Guild of the Little Flower, Albany, N. Y., protesting against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9464. Also, petition of Anna L. Hayfred, grand regent president, Catholic Daughters Court San Salvador, No. 146, Albany, N. Y., protesting against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9465. Also, petition of Mary B. Carey, president Albany Women's Unit Catholic Parishes, Albany, N. Y., protesting against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9466. Also, petition of Mrs. Robert Coughlin, president Children of Mary, Sacred Heart Convent, Albany, N. Y., protesting against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9467. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles M. L. Mart, Kenwood Alumnæ, Albany, N. Y., protesting against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9468. Also, petition of Mrs. Elmer Neumann, president executive committee of the Catholic Women's Service League, Albany, N. Y., protesting against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9469. Also, petition of Margaret M. Ryan, chairman New York State legislative committee, Catholic Daughters of America, Albany, N. Y., protesting against Senate bill 4582, permitting importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9470. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of the members of the Los Angeles City Hall Post, No. 387, the American Legion, of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the immediate payment of the adjusted-compensation certificates at matured face value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9471. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of 38 citizens of Theresa, N. Y., praying for legislation providing for immediate cash payment at full face value of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9472. By Mr. ELLIS: Petition of H. E. Kelly, R. L. Oran, John Ingram, Delbert Fisher, Paul Stonebrake, and others, petitioning the President and Congress of the United States in behalf of immediate cash payment at full face value of adjusted-compensation certificates as created by section 702 of the World War adjusted compensation act of 1914; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9473. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of Anthony Harbolick, of 142 South Broadway, and 38 other residents of Yonkers, N. Y., urging the immediate cash payment of the World War veterans' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9474. Also, petition signed by Harry J. Hart, of 76 Caryl Avenue, and 38 other residents of Yonkers, N. Y., urging the immediate cash payment of the World War veterans' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9475. Also, petition signed by Michael Trotta, of 25 Clarendon Avenue, and 38 other residents of Yonkers, N. Y., urging the immediate cash payment of the World War veterans' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9476. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of L. M. Carlson and 93 other ex-service men of the World War and citizens of Anoka and Hennepin Counties in Minnesota, urging the enactment of House bill 3493 providing for payment of the adjusted-service compensation certificates at the full face value of such certificates, at the instigation of Post No. 1043 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Anoka, Minn.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9477. By Mr. GREEN: Petition of World War veterans of Olochua County, Fla., and other World War veterans, urging payment in cash now of bonus certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9478. Also, petition of patients of United States Veterans' Hospital No. 63, Lake City, Fla., urging payment in cash now of bonus certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9479. By Mr. GREENWOOD: Resolution of Central Labor Union, of Bicknell, Ind., indorsing move of independent oil

operators for an embargo on crude oil and its by-products, and urging remedies to relieve the unemployment situation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9480. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of Indiana, urging the immediate cash payment in full of adjusted-compensation certificates to World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9481. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of Ladies' Auxiliary of Ancient Order of Hibernians, St. Rita's Court, No. 957, Catholic Daughters of America, and Altar Society of the Immaculate Conception, Catholic Church, Everett, Wash., protesting against Senate bill 4582; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9482. Also, petition of a number of citizens of Anacortes, Wash., urging enactment of House Joint Resolution No. 356; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9483. By Mr. HALE: Petition of J. L. Martin and 37 additional citizens of Portsmouth, in the first congressional district of New Hampshire, in behalf of immediate cash payment at full face value of adjusted-compensation certificates as created by section 702 of the World War adjusted compensation act of 1924; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9484. Also, petition of Joseph G. Gallien and 37 additional veterans of Derry, the first congressional district of New Hampshire, in behalf of immediate cash payment at full face value of adjusted-compensation certificates as created by section 702 of the World War adjusted compensation act of 1924; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9485. By Mr. HALL of Mississippi: Petition of George D. McInnis and other citizens for immediate cash payment at full face value of the adjusted-compensation (bonus) certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9486. By Mr. HALL of North Dakota: Petition of 27 residents of Dickey, N. Dak., urging support of the Sparks-Capper alien amendment, House Joint Resolution 356; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9487. By Mr. HOOPER: Resolution of the Emma Grange Nutrition Class of the third district of Michigan, urging Congress to enact a new law taxing all yellow oleomargarine at least 10 cents a pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9488. Also, resolution of the Triangle Nutrition Class of the third district of Michigan, urging Congress to enact a new law taxing all yellow oleomargarine at least 10 cents a pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9489. Also, resolution of Eaton Rapids Rural Group of third district of Michigan, urging Congress to enact a new law taxing all yellow oleomargarine at least 10 cents a pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9490. Also, petition of various citizens of Charlotte, Mich., for immediate cash payment at full face value of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9491. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Lloyd E. Brown and 37 others of Dodge City, Kans., favoring the payment of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9492. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of citizens of Detroit, Mich., urging the enactment of legislation for Federal supervision of the motion-picture industry and the establishing of higher moral standards of pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9493. Also, petition of the Michigan Holstein-Friesian Association, adopted February 2, 1931, urging that the ruling of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue be set aside and rescinded in the matter of the use of unbleached palm oil when used in substantial quantities in relation to other ingredients in the manufacture of oleomargarine otherwise free from artificial coloration without subjecting the finished product to a tax at the rate of 10 cents per pound, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9494. Also, petition of citizens of Lansing, Mich., petitioning for immediate cash payment at full face value of the adjusted-compensation certificates as created by section 702 of the World War adjusted-compensation act of 1924; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9495. By Mr. HULL of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Pine Valley local of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union, Neillsville, Wis., protesting against the ruling of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue regarding palm oil and asking for a higher tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9496. Also, resolution of the La Valle Chapter of the American Society of Equity, La Valle, Wis., protesting against the ruling of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue regarding the use of palm oil in oleomargarine and favoring a higher tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9497. By Mr. IGOE: Petition of citizens of the city of Chicago, urging immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates to the veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9498. By Mr. IRWIN: Petition of Rev. and Mrs. A. A. Wylie, and other residents of Oakdale, Ill., urging Congress to submit an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens in counting the whole number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives among the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9499. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Stephen A. Graves Post, American Legion, Kerens, Tex., urging support of Wright Patman bill for cash payment of adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9500. By Mr. KADING: Petition signed by residents of Columbia and Green Lake Counties, Wis., urging the enactment of the so-called Brigham bill providing for a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, and exportation of oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9501. Also, petition signed by 19 citizens of Wyocena, Wis., urging the enactment of the Sparks-Capper bill providing for an amendment to the Constitution excluding the 7,500,000 aliens from the count of the population of the Nation for apportionment of congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9502. Also, resolution adopted by the Catholic Woman's Club of Sheboygan, Wis., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 4582 to amend the tariff act of 1930 providing for the importation, distribution, and sale of contraceptive literature and instruments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9503. Also, petition signed by 38 citizens of Fox Lake, Wis., urging the enactment of the Sparks-Capper bill, providing for an amendment to the Constitution excluding 7,500,000 aliens from the count of the population of the Nation for apportionment of congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9504. By Mr. KURTZ: Petition of citizens of Bedford County, Pa., urging support of the Sparks-Capper bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9505. Also, petition of citizens of Bedford and Blair Counties, Pa., for cash payment of adjusted-compensation certificates; to Committee on Ways and Means.

9506. By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of the Newark Dioceses Council, Newark, N. J., protesting the passage of Senate bill 4528; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9507. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Annie D. Starr, president Woman's Christian Temperance Union; Mabel Latham; Martha W. Haynes, secretary; Emma B. Hamner; Mrs. A. N. Warner; and Ethel L. Stewart, all of Baltimore, Md., favoring Sparks-Capper amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out the approximately 7,500,000 unnaturalized aliens and count only citizens when making apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9508. Also, petition of Union Trust Co. of Maryland, John Redwood, jr., and F. F. Symington, of Symington, Wright & Galligher, all of Baltimore, Md., registering opposition to the cash conversion of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9509. Also, petition of William A. Harrison, 2827 West Mulberry Street, Baltimore, urging cash payment of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9510. By Mr. McCLINTOCK of Ohio: Petition of Charles Gampa and 37 citizens of Alliance, Ohio, favoring immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates at the full face value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9511. By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: Petition of citizens of Scottsville, Ky., in behalf of immediate cash payment at full face value of adjusted-service certificates, as created by section 702 of the World War adjusted compensation act of 1924; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9512. By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: Petition of the Council of Catholic Women of St. Peters Parish, Jefferson City, Mo., protesting against Gillett bill proposing amendment to the tariff act permitting certain literature to be imported and distributed throughout the country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9513. By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: Petition of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., favoring legislation to make immediate cash payment at the full face value of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9514. By Mr. PALMER: Petition of veterans of Springfield, Mo., favoring cash payment on adjusted-compensation (bonus) certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9515. By Mr. REILLY: Petition signed by veterans of the recent World War and residents of the sixth congressional district of Wisconsin, urging legislation looking toward the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9516. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Bland J. Rossman Post, No. 1630, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Lock Haven, Pa., favoring cash payment on adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9517. Also, petition of citizens of Tioga County, Pa., favoring the Sparks-Capper bill, House Joint Resolution 356; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9518. By Mr. ROBINSON: Petition of Mrs. William Briden, president, and Mrs. John Theimer, secretary, of Oak Ridge Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Cedar Falls, Iowa, urging passage of the Hudson bill for the supervision of movie pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9519. By Mr. SEIBERLING: Petition of Altar and Rosary, St. Joseph's Church, and St. Monica Guild, St. Mary's Church, of Akron, Ohio, protesting against passage of Senate bill 4582; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9520. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association, opposing the Burnet ruling permitting yellow oleomargarine, and supporting the Brigham bill, H. R. 15934, to levy a 10-cent tax on colored oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9521. Also, petition of Minnesota Jersey Cattle Club, favoring enactment of the Brigham bill taxing all yellow oleomargarine 10 cents a pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9522. Also, petition of George Mork, Skime, Minn., urging enactment of legislation to pay in full the face value of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9523. Also, petition of St. Paul Painters Union, favoring immediate cash settlement of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9524. Also, petition of American Legion Post of Detroit Lakes, Minn., favoring immediate and full payment of the United States veterans' compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9525. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of 38 citizens of Crosby, N. Dak., and resolution by the Johnson-Melary Post of the American Legion, Hettinger, N. Dak., favoring immediate payment in full of all adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9526. Also, petition of E. M. Bothun and 103 other citizens of Crosby, N. Dak., favoring immediate payment in full of adjusted-compensation certificates to veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9527. By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of Ezra N. Whittaker and 75 others of Milford, Nebr., favoring cash payment of adjusted-compensation (bonus) certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9528. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Dunbar, W. Va., urging Congress to enact a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9529. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Stockton, Kans., for the Federal supervision of motion pictures as provided in the Grant Hudson motion picture bill, H. R. 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9530. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Natoma, Kans., for the Federal supervision of motion pictures as provided in the Grant Hudson motion picture bill, H. R. 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9531. Also, petition of 23 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Kanorado, Kans., for the Federal supervision of motion pictures as provided in the Grant Hudson motion picture bill, H. R. 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9532. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Clarksburg, Indiana County, Pa., favoring the proposed amendment to the United States Constitution to exclude unnaturalized aliens from the count of population for congressional apportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9533. Also, petition of citizens of Indiana, Pa., favoring the proposed amendment to the United States Constitution to exclude unnaturalized aliens from the count of population for congressional apportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9534. Also, petition of citizens of Soldier, Jefferson County, Pa., favoring the immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9535. Also, petition of citizens of Punxsutawney, Pa., favoring the immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9536. By Mr. SWANSON: Petition of W. C. McCurdy and others of Massena, Iowa, favoring the exclusion of aliens in the apportionment of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9537. Also, petition of Ella Boyd and others of Woodbine, Iowa, favoring the adoption of a constitutional amendment for the exclusion of aliens in the apportionment of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9538. Also, petition of Mrs. C. W. Huff and others, of Woodbine, Iowa, favoring the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution for the exclusion of aliens in congressional apportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9539. By Mr. SWICK: Petition of Anthony Rubert and 38 residents of New Castle, Pa., and vicinity in behalf of immediate cash payment at full face value of adjusted-service certificates as created by section 702 of the World War adusted-compensation act of 1924; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9540. By Mr. SWING: Petition of Mary A. Burns, against the passage of bill to amend section 305 of the tariff act and sections 211, 245, and 312 of the penal code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9541. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. W. T. Pyle, Mr. and Mrs. James G. Lowe, and Emma Ruth, all of Donora, Pa., in support of the Sparks-Capper amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which would permit the omission of unnaturalized aliens and count only citizens as a basis for apportionment of Congressmen to the various States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9542. By Mr. TURPIN: Petition of members of Men's Bible Class, Methodist Episcopal Church, of Kingston, Pa., urging support of House Joint Resolution 356, known as the Sparks-Capper stop alien representation amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9543. Also, petition of citizens of Luzerne County, Pa., in behalf of immediate cash payment at full face value of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9544. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of 38 residents of Montgomery County, Pa., urging cash payment of soldiers' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9545. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition of Harry J. Lewis and 36 other citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the cash payment of adjusted-compensation certificates at full face value as created by section 702 of the World War adjusted compensation act of 1924; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9546. Also, petition of A. Matiah and 38 other citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the cash payment at full face value of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9547. Also, petition of James E. Lewis and 36 other citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the cash payment at full face value of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9548. Also, petition of Frank A. Powers and 37 other citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the cash payment at full face value of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9549. Also, petition of Rex E. Gilliam and 37 other citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the cash payment at full face value of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9550. By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: Petition of the American Legion Auxiliary of the Roy E. Parrish Post, American Legion, Clarksburg, W. Va., urging Congress to take favorable action on legislation proposing pensions to dependent widows and orphans of veterans of the World War, and to service connect all disabled veterans suffering from chronic constitutional diseases on January 1, 1925; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9551. Also, petition of Leo S. Lyon and 37 other veterans of the World War of Clarksburg, W. Va.; Bellaire, Ohio; Mount Claire, W. Va., and Baltimore, Md., urging Congress to take favorable action on providing for the immediate cash payment of veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9552. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of citizens of New Alexandria, Westmoreland County, Pa., urging passage of Sparks-Capper amendment eliminating approximately 7,500,000 aliens from count in proposed congressional reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9553. Also, petition of M. H. Pancoast, Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against cash payment of World War veterans' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9554. Also, petition of Tradesmens National Bank & Trust Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against cash payment of World War veterans' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9555. Also, petition of M. S. Morgan, Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against cash payment of World War veterans' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 26, 1931)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has the floor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable me to make just a brief statement before suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma continues to hold the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

HISTORY OF CITY OF WASHINGTON, BY H. P. CAEMMERER

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, about four years ago the secretary of the Fine Arts Commission, under the suggestion of the commission, began the preparation of a history of the city of Washington. I have in my possession now the manuscript. It comprises 254 pages of typewritten matter. It has 250 illustrations. It will make a book that would be sold by private institutions for not less than $5. Mr. Caemmerer does not ask any credit for it and does not want any revenue from it. He is ready to pass it over to the Government for publication without any return to him. I have made a careful examination of it. I think it is one of the most meritorious undertakings of which I have any knowledge. It gives a history of Washington up to the time of L'Enfant. Then it proceeds from that on to 1900 and from 1900 up to the present time under the McMillan Commission. It gives rather an accurate history of the development of the Capital as the Capital. I think it is a very important piece of work. I am only now wondering what would be the better method of procedure in order to get it published by the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair make a suggestion?

Mr. FESS. The Senator from Ohio would be glad to have the Chair do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would suggest that the manuscript be referred to the Senate Committee on Printing to prepare a proper concurrent resolution in whatever form it may deem fitting.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I was about to suggest the same thing. I would like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question, however. There are illustrations accompanying the manuscript?

Mr. FESS. Yes; 250 of them.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, the Committee on Printing will take note as to whether we must have legislation to cover that matter.

Mr. FESS. I assume we would have to have legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Chair may make a further suggestion, it occurs to the Chair that the proper method of dealing with the subject now is for the Senator from Ohio to present the manuscript and have it referred to the Committee on Printing, with a view to having it printed. Without objection, that order will be entered.

Mr. FESS subsequently submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39), which, with the manuscript and the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Printing, the concurrent resolution and accompanying statement being as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed with illustrations and bound, as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, 4,000 copies of the manuscript entitled "Washington, the National Capital," prepared by H. P. Caemmerer, of which —— hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and —— hundred copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining copies shall be available for distribution as the Joint Committee on Printing may direct.

Mr. FESS's statement (to accompany Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 39):

For several years there has been demand for a book on Washington, the National Capital, that would in a comprehensive way describe the development of the National Capital from the time of its origin to the present and set forth the plans that have been adopted for its future development. Washington is the one city of the Nation in which all the people are interested and in which, by virtue of the Constitution of the United States, each citizen has a share. Washington is a city of tremendous interest historically, a city that has grown with the Nation. Washington is also a city of standards. Here the Government has built great buildings that uphold the traditions of good architecture. Here, too, are more monuments for a city of its size than in any other city in the United States. Many of these monuments and memorials are a tribute of a grateful people to their country. Washington also has had a plan from the very beginning, the L'Enfant plan, which though long neglected is now, as a result of the enactments of