

repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

872. Also, petition of Mrs. A. M. Stevenson and 23 others, of Sterling, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

873. Also, petition of Louise Egbert and 17 others, of Ness City, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

874. Also, petition of Martha E. Kenyon and 29 others, of Little River, Kans., favoring prohibition and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

875. By Mrs. KAHN: Petition of the board of supervisors, city and county of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif., urging the amendment of the Volstead Act to permit the sale, distribution, and consumption of beverages with an increased alcoholic content; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

876. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of W. T. Rockey, H. J. Lynch, Clarence Pfeiffer, and others, petitioning Congress to enact such legislation at this time as is necessary to curb the activities of the growing monopolistic organizations commonly known as the chain-store system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

877. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of residents of Kitzmiller, Md., regarding enforcement of the prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

878. By Mr. MAPES: Petition of Edith Walvoord, president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Holland, Mich., and 48 other members, all residents of Holland, Mich., in support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

879. By Mr. PARTRIDGE: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Norway, Me., supporting the prohibition laws and their enforcement and protesting against any measure looking toward the modification of the eighteenth amendment, its resubmission to the States, or its repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

880. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Franklin County and the union class of the Farmington Congregational Church Sunday School, Farmington, Me., supporting the prohibition laws and their enforcement and opposing the resubmission of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

881. By Mr. PEAVEY: Petition of various citizens of the city of Rhinelander, Oneida County, Wis., urging support and maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

882. By Mr. REID of Illinois: Petition of Elsie M. Mehnert and 458 other citizens of Naperville, Ill., favoring prohibition and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

883. By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Manchester, N. H., protesting against any change in the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

884. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Empire State Automobile Merchants Association, Albany, N. Y., and the Brooklyn Motor Vehicle Dealers Association, opposing a tax on automobiles, parts, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

885. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of Mrs. Joseph L. Kelley and 93 other residents of Bismarck, N. Dak., and vicinity, against any measure looking to the modification, resubmission, or repeal of the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

886. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of residents of Saranac Lake, N. Y., relative to the enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

887. By Mr. SNOW: Petition of Levi F. Johnson and other citizens of Brownsville, Me., requesting the enactment of appropriate legislation to place highway trucks and bus lines under regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

888. Also, petition of O. L. Keyes and other citizens of Caribou, Me., requesting the enactment of appropriate legislation to place highway trucks and bus lines under regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

889. Also, petition of W. R. Christie and many other citizens of Presque Isle, Me., requesting the enactment of appropriate legislation to place highway trucks and bus lines under regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

890. Also, petition of W. A. MacPherson and other citizens of Easton, Me., requesting the enactment of appropriate legislation to place highway trucks and bus lines under regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

891. By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition signed by H. P. Andrews and 28 other adult residents of Goldendale, Wash., protesting against the enactment of the compulsory Sunday observance bill, S. 1202; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

892. By Mr. SWICK: Petition of the Women's Missionary Society of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Mars, Butler County, Pa., opposing the resubmission of national prohibition to the States by a resolution to a State convention or State legislatures for ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

893. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of Florence E. Bouchane and 40 other residents of Pittsfield, Mass., in support of the prohibition law and its enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

894. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Theodore W. Noyes and others, petitioning Congress to urge the rejection of House bill 6285, etc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1932

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 26, 1932)

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 230) making an appropriation to enable the United States of America to make payments upon subscriptions to the capital stock of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Bratton	Coolidge	Fletcher
Austin	Brookhart	Copeland	Frazier
Bailey	Broussard	Costigan	George
Bankhead	Bulkley	Couzens	Glass
Barbour	Bulow	Cutting	Glenn
Barkley	Byrnes	Dale	Goldsborough
Bingham	Capper	Davis	Gore
Black	Caraway	Dickinson	Hale
Blaine	Carey	Dill	Harris
Borah	Connally	Fess	Harrison

Hatfield	Lewis	Oddie	Thomas, Okla.
Hawes	Logan	Patterson	Townsend
Hayden	Long	Pittman	Trammell
Hebert	McGill	Robinson, Ark.	Tydings
Howell	McKellar	Robinson, Ind.	Vandenberg
Hull	McNary	Schall	Wagner
Johnson	Metcalf	Sheppard	Walcott
Jones	Morrison	Shipstead	Walsh, Mass.
Kean	Moses	Smith	Walsh, Mont.
Kendrick	Neely	Smoot	Waterman
Keyes	Norbeck	Steiwer	Watson
King	Norris	Stephens	Wheeler
La Follette	Nye	Thomas, Idaho	White

Mr. FESS. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent to-day on official business. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. JOHNSON. I announce that my colleague [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] is still ill and confined to his bed. I ask that the announcement may stand for the day.

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

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from E. R. Hughes, of Oklahoma City, Okla., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 2449, to provide certain privileges to blind persons, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram from Dr. H. L. Green, of Quincy, Ill., relative to the nomination of Charles G. Dawes as director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram from the Orr Brown & Price Co., of Columbus, Ohio, in favor of the so-called Capper-Kelly fair trade bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of Otto Gresham, attorney at law, of Chicago, Ill., relative to the right of an individual to sue in the courts of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a memorial in the form of a resolution of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Walhalla, S. C., remonstrating against a proposed referendum on the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution and favoring adequate appropriations for law enforcement and education in law observance, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BARBOUR presented memorials of sundry citizens of Jersey City and Paterson, N. J., remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for the closing of barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia, or any other restrictive religious measures, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of members of the First Presbyterian Church of Hamburg, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bridgeton, and sundry citizens of Salem, Quinton, Alloway, and Hancock's Bridge, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and opposing a proposed referendum on the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorial of Rev. Milton T. Wells, pastor, and members of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Butler, N. J., remonstrating against a proposed referendum on the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COPELAND presented the petitions of sundry citizens of Riverhead, Moira, and Chateaugay, in the State of New York, praying for the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Elmira and vicinity, in the State of New York, remonstrating

against the passage of legislation providing for the closing of barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia, or other restrictive religious measures, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Buffalo and vicinity, in the State of New York, remonstrating against the burden of present and proposed Federal taxation and favoring a drastic reduction in the cost of maintaining the Government, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented the petition of the Lovejoy District Citizens' Association, of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the passage of legislation providing for the manufacture and sale of 4 per cent beer, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Syracuse and sundry citizens of Wallace and Friendship, all in the State of New York, praying for the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COOPERATIVE MARKETING

Mr. GEORGE. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter signed by J. R. Harris & Co., and numerous citizens of Georgia with reference to cooperative marketing, also a newspaper article taken from the Atlanta Constitution with reference to the same general subject, and an editorial that appeared in the Constitution of Sunday, January 17, with reference to the same matter. I ask that the letter and newspaper articles be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

The matter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WRENS COMMUNITY CENTER,
Wrens, Ga., January 25, 1932.

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: We notice in the paper that Senator NORRIS has introduced a resolution to investigate the Farm Board, the cooperative, and the traders. It looks very much like all of this has come about because of the cotton dealers objecting to the Government even trying to help farmers get organized in marketing their products cooperatively.

Cooperation is the thing that is going to be the solution of the farm problem. A lot of progress is being made by farmers in cooperative marketing and while they are making a lot of progress they are obliged to be making some mistakes especially in times like this. While the traders and opponents of the Federal Farm Board and the cooperatives are talking about what they have done in years past for the farmers and the mistakes of the Farm Board and the co-ops, as actual farmers we want to keep before you in our Congress some of the real facts about cooperation.

A short time ago the Atlanta Constitution wrote a fine editorial on how farmers in Denmark had improved their financial condition through cooperation. Some of us here wrote the Constitution a letter to express our appreciation for their editorial as well as to point out some of the things that the farmers of this community have done as members of the cotton cooperatives and by local cooperation. Last Sunday our letter was carried by the Constitution and was used as a basis for one of the strongest editorials we have ever read on the subject of cooperation. You will note that we have attached the editorial page of the Constitution and have marked the editorial.

We can not come to Washington, so we want facts like these to get before the committee that is going to investigate the Farm Board and the cooperatives. If it is proper on our part we would like to ask you to get the Constitution editorial printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of all the Senators and Congressmen. We do not want to ask you to do anything that is improper, but we would like for those Congressmen and Senators who are going to pass on cooperation and what is being done in a cooperative way to know what our farmers in this community are doing on account of cooperative marketing and cooperative organization.

It is true we may make some mistakes in running our business, but in time we will learn how to correct them, but there will never be a time as long as time lasts that the cotton shippers will do anything to help us get our cotton marketed better or many other things that ought to be done for farmers but which have got to be done by the farmers themselves and through cooperation.

We appreciate you as a representative of ours and the people of Georgia. We feel that you will be guided at all times by what is right for the farmers when any question comes up in Congress affecting agriculture.

Yours very truly,

J. R. HARRIS & Co.
C. C. MCCOLLUM.
J. L. WIMBURN.
A. L. SWANN.
J. H. SIMONS.
J. J. PILCHER.

T. C. ELLIS.
C. H. EVANS.
P. K. WREN.
G. W. ADAMS.
E. N. ADAMS.
O. G. FLORENCE.

[From the Constitution, Atlanta, Ga.]

SUCCESS OF WRENS COMMUNITY CENTER DEMONSTRATES PROBLEMS OF FARMERS CAN BE SOLVED BY COOPERATIVE EFFORT

EDITOR CONSTITUTION: We read your editorial on Wise Danish Farmers which appeared in the Constitution a few days ago. We want to congratulate you on this editorial. If every farmer in the State had the vision and the experience contained in your editorial our farm problem would be different from what it is and our farmers would be in much better financial condition, and think how this would help other people who are engaged in other lines of business that depend on the farmer.

We are not sure whether you have ever heard of the "Wrens Community Center" or not, or whether you know what we are doing along the line that you set out in your editorial, but we believe you will be interested in what we have accomplished. About four or five years ago the members of the Cotton Cooperative Association in this community decided that they would put up a cooperative gin for saving money and for getting their cotton ginned as it should be.

Farmers as a matter of human nature are more interested in their cotton being ginned right than anyone else. We did not have the money with which to pay for the gin, so we borrowed this money from the Cotton Cooperative Association on a low rate of interest and for a period of years in order that we could repay same without difficulty. We charged the regular price for ginning; in fact, the same price as charged by our then competitors. In about three years' time we had gotten our cotton ginned better than ever before and had paid for our gin, and we had paid for same out of the profits, and as stated above we had not charged anybody any more for ginning than they had always paid.

There was another gin in the town and we took it over on a satisfactory basis from the owner. We now own both gins and our town and community need them. By this time our cooperative gins owned by the farmers of this community and built and developed under the leadership of the Cotton Cooperative Association were as valuable property as we had in our town.

We have been diversifying and trying to make our farms self-sustaining. Of course, that called for growing a lot of grain—principally corn and wheat. Last year we put up one of the most modern flour mills that could be bought. We are operating this now and it is a part of our local cooperative enterprise. So you can see, being in the cotton cooperative, we have been able to get our cotton sold cooperatively and we have also been able by cooperation to have established the best gins we have ever had and to even own them ourselves, and we have also been able to establish other real service organizations like flour and corn mills.

We have just started, but we have accomplished things that we never would before we were organized. We have gotten better service in ginning and in getting our wheat and corn processed, and we have not paid any more in gradually getting possession of these facilities for ginning and for toll and in grinding wheat and corn than we did before we started to cooperate.

We thought you would be interested in knowing something of what is being done in cooperation in our section. There is a lot of education to be done and we want to say that the Atlanta Constitution has started on this question and we hope that it has started on it not to stop but to stay with it until farmers as a whole are doing in our State what they are doing in Denmark.

Another thing that you will find to be true with the community that has cooperative enterprises—its people for the most part believe in diversified farming. They believe in good roads; they believe in growing the best quality farm products; they believe in good schools; they believe in good churches; they are public spirited; and one of the reasons why such is true of them is that when they have their farming business on a cooperative basis they are in position to be better citizens from a financial standpoint. A lot of our educational and social problems are traceable to causes that are economic. The cooperative way or plan is one of the best methods for solving the farmer's economic problems.

We again want to thank you and we hope you will keep up your good work for cooperation and cooperative marketing.

WRENS COMMUNITY CENTER.

J. R. HARRIS & Co.
T. S. WREN.
G. W. ADAMS.
E. N. ADAMS.
O. G. FLORENCE.
G. W. BRINSON.
E. P. ROGERS.
E. J. YOUNG.
J. W. D. YOUNG.
J. W. CLARK.

JAMES L. NEWBURN.
C. C. MCCOLLUM.
P. K. WREN.
T. F. RHODES.
J. J. PIECHER.
T. C. ELLIS.
E. H. RIVERS.
F. F. RIVERS.
C. H. EVANS.
A. L. SWANN.

[From the Constitution, Atlanta, Ga., of Sunday, January 17, 1932]

WISE FARMERS

The successful solving of many of their problems by a group of Georgia farm owners through the formation of a local cooperative association is convincingly told in a communication from the Wrens Community Center.

Although their cooperative effort is comparatively new, these Georgia farmers, to use their own words, have "accomplished things that we never would have before we were organized."

They have gotten better service in ginning and in the processing of their wheat and corn, at no greater cost than they paid to privately owned gins, and have bought two gins, which they have paid for out of their profits. Now, these gins are as valuable business property as is to be found in the progressive little town of Wrens.

Although the Wrens Community Center was launched as a cotton cooperative movement, the advances in diversification and grain planting have been such that the erection of a flour mill became necessary. That is now also the property of the center, paid for out of its profits.

The 20 members of this community center who sign the communication to the Constitution point out that such cooperative organizations lead the people of the communities they serve to be more enthusiastic supporters of good roads, good churches, and good schools.

"There is a lot of education to be done," add these progressive Georgia farmers, "and we are glad the Constitution has started on this question, and we hope that it will not stop until our farmers as a whole are doing what those of Denmark have been doing for many years."

If every community in Georgia had an organization similar to the Wrens Community Center, rural conditions in the State would be revolutionized.

Each farmer would be the part owner of his own gin and flour mill. Canneries and cooperative ice and lighting plants would cut costs and furnish an outlet for surplus products.

Our farmers would become better business men, and with this increased knowledge of business affairs would insist upon better government.

Starting on borrowed capital, the members of the Wrens Community Center have shown the farmer of every county in the State how easy it is for them to accomplish their own salvation.

Other States have proven that only through cooperative effort can agriculture be put on a sound and profitable basis, and the sooner the farmers of Georgia realize that the day has passed when farm profits can be expected entirely through individual effort the better it will be for them.

FEDERAL HOME-LOAN BANK LEGISLATION

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a telegram from the Massachusetts Cooperative Bank League favoring enactment of the Federal home-loan bank bill.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., January 27, 1932.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH.

United States Senate:

Massachusetts Cooperative Bank League, in convention January 11, 1932, representing 80 per cent total resources, voted unanimously favoring Federal home-loan bank plan. Personally favor inaugurating system. Would help in present Massachusetts situation. Request you favor bill before committee and Senate.

ERNEST A. HALE,

Treasurer Suffolk Cooperative Bank, Director
First District United States Building and Loan League.

SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask to have published in the RECORD and also printed as a public document an article addressed to the Committees on Naval Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the appropriate subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations by Oscar T. Crosby, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

To the Committees on Naval Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, United States of America, and to the appropriate subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations:

I have the honor to suggest the inclusion in any bill now pending in Congress affecting naval appropriations or authorizations of a paragraph taken from the naval appropriation bill, approved August 29, 1916, and reading as follows:

"That if at any time before the appropriations authorized by this act shall have been contracted for there shall have been established, with the cooperation of the United States of America, an international tribunal or tribunals competent to secure peaceful determinations of all international disputes, and which

shall render unnecessary the maintenance of competitive armaments, then and in that case such naval expenditures as may be inconsistent with the engagements made in the establishment of such tribunal or tribunals shall be suspended, if so ordered by the President of the United States."

In March of 1916 Senator Shafroth, of Colorado, introduced this provision as an amendment to the naval bill then under consideration.

In advocacy of its enactment I appeared before the House Committee on Naval Affairs. It was, without further urging, adopted by both Houses and appeared in the finished bill above mentioned.

As a declaration of national policy in 1916, it still stands; but, in strict terms, its application ceased when the constructions authorized in the naval bill of that year had been contracted for. Yet the importance of such a declaration is now as great, or greater, than in 1916.

Within eight months from the passage of the bill we entered the Great War. The treaty of Versailles did not bring into existence such a tribunal as was contemplated by Congress in the provision cited. In the absence of a tribunal backed by centralized force national navies remain as potential competitive fighting units even as in all time past. Nor can any mere limitation of armaments change that situation.

Some believe that the League of Nations, the World Court as now organized, and the Paris pact (Bryan-Kellogg) would constitute a defense against the occurrence of war. I do not share that belief. These ambitious peace mechanisms seem to me ineffective as real barriers against war. Even the most hopeful among their partisans must now entertain doubts and feel disappointment.

If the objective indicated in the provisions under consideration is still held in view, we should respect our declaration until that objective is gained. No committal is involved as to the merits of a big navy versus a little navy policy nor as to the merits of treaty limitations versus national freedom in preparedness.

Through the pronouncement in question we, the strongest nation in the world, say, in effect, to others: "We will stop our naval constructions if you will join with us in the organization of a reliable substitute for war, namely, in the establishment of a true international tribunal and of a centralized force as a sanction for its decrees. Thus we moralize our "militarism"; we sterilize our preparedness of all taint of "aggression."

In spite of all existing treaties or any that are likely to result from the conference soon to be held in Geneva, it remains that each nation looks to its own armaments for upholding its own views of its own interests—and the old order leading to war remains substantially unchanged.

I may add that as early as 1910 the Congress registered its approval of the idea involved in the legislation now proposed. This is shown in the appended copy of Public Resolution 47. It is not proposed to repeat this resolution, but it is instructive to read the record of legislative trend in the direction of that form of sanction which is the foundation of public order within every sovereign state.

I shall not endeavor to set forth all the cogent reasons which might be arrayed in favor of continuing to follow a road already marked by notable milestones set by congressional action. Eminent authorities—presidential and otherwise—might also be cited, but I know the great pressure upon your time must cause you to prefer short statements from restless reformers. I shall be glad to appear before any committee if desired.

Respectfully,

OSCAR T. CROSBY.

WARRENTON, VA., January 20, 1932.

P. S.—Some appropriate arguments are set forth in Senate Document 378, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, being copy of a letter addressed by me to Senator Shafroth, March 23, 1916.—O. T. C.

"Public Resolution 47—House Joint Resolution 223

"Joint resolution to authorize the appointment of a commission in relation to universal peace

"Resolved, etc., That a commission of five members be appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war: *Provided*, That the total expense authorized by this joint resolution shall not exceed the sum of \$10,000 and that the said commission shall be required to make final report within two years from the date of the passage of this resolution.

"Approved, June 25, 1910."

This enactment followed a hearing before the House Committee on Naval Affairs, May 7, 1910, shown in a print ordered by the committee. Mr. Crosby presented arguments favoring the resolution and introduced other speakers.

It was said that President Taft was much gratified by the enactment. Nevertheless, for reasons not made public, he went out of office without appointing the commission. A great opportunity was lost.

REPORTS OF THE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

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

S. 2985. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Connecticut River State Bridge Commission, a statutory commission of the State of Connecticut created and existing under the provisions of special act No. 496 of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, 1931 session, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Connecticut River (Rept. No. 143);

S. 3083. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of County Commissioners of Allegheny County, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River between the city of Pittsburgh and the borough of Homestead, Pa. (Rept. No. 144); and

S. 3113. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near The Dalles, Oreg. (Rept. No. 145).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. WATERMAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on January 26, 1932, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 573) granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across Clarks Fork River, near Ione, Pend Oreille County, in the State of Washington.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

Mr. BORAH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the nomination of Livingston Satterthwaite, of Pennsylvania, to be a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

Mr. NORBECK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported favorably the nomination of Charles G. Dawes, of Illinois, to be a member of the board of directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term of two years from January 22, 1932.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported favorably the nominations of the following-named persons to be members of the board of directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term of two years from January 22, 1932:

Harvey C. Couch, of Arkansas; and

Jesse H. Jones, of Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations reported will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3325) granting a pension to Florence A. Gilbert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A bill (S. 3326) for the relief of Homer N. Horine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3327) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Runnels;

A bill (S. 3328) granting a pension to John Winn;

A bill (S. 3329) granting an increase of pension to Frankie Dowdy; and

A bill (S. 3330) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Melton; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3331) for the relief of Buster Jones; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER (by request):

A bill (S. 3332) authorizing and directing the Treasurer of the United States to accept silver bullion, 950 fine, at the rate of 50 cents per troy ounce, in payment of any debt to the United States from any foreign government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 3333) for the relief of the estate of Oscar F. Lackey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 3334) for the relief of William M. Sherman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEBERT:

A bill (S. 3335) granting a pension to Raymond G. Gaudette; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 3336) to amend section 200 of Title II of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 3337) granting a pension to the regularly commissioned United States deputy marshals of the United States Districts Court for the Western District of Arkansas, including the Indian Territory, and the regularly commissioned United States deputy marshals of the United States District Court for the Territory of Oklahoma, and to their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 3338) granting an increase of pension to Marion B. Ridgate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3339) for the relief of C. E. Campbell, otherwise known as Ebin Campbell; and

A bill (S. 3340) providing for the advancement on the retired list of the Army of Robert Todd Oliver; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FESS:

A bill (S. 3341) to authorize the erection of a permanent occupational therapy building at the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Chillicothe, Ohio; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3342) to authorize the Secretary of War to secure for the United States title to certain private lands contiguous to and within the militia target range reservation, State of Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 3343) to require all exit doors of public buildings to open outwardly; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A bill (S. 3344) for the relief of Maggie Kirkland; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3345) for the relief of Frank L. Ragsdale; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 3346) to provide for the escheat to the United States of certain deposits in national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 3347) for the relief of certain Indians on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL:

A bill (S. 3348) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Flynn; to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENT OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. HARRISON submitted nine amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6662) to amend the tariff act of 1930, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ISABELLE FREEMAN BELL

Mr. SMITH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 148), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the appropriation for miscellaneous items, contingent fund of the Senate, fiscal year 1931, to Isabelle Freeman Bell, widow of Samuel A. Bell, late a skilled laborer of

the Senate under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

MARY A. CHAPLINE

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 149), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the appropriation for miscellaneous items, contingent fund of the Senate, fiscal year 1931, to Mary A. Chapline, widow of Charles B. Chapline, late an employee of the Senate folding room, under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, the sum of \$250, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

INFORMATION RELATIVE TO CERTAIN MILITARY POSTS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution of inquiry and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 150) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is requested to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date with respect to each of the forts or military posts herein specified, all information available in the records of the War Department as to (1) the amount of land owned by the Government at such fort or military post; (2) the value of all property including buildings, equipment, and improvements situated at or connected with such fort or military post; (3) the amounts heretofore appropriated by the Congress for the purchase, establishment, equipment, and improvement of such fort or military post and all appurtenances connected therewith; (4) the number of buildings and structures at each fort or military post; (5) the number of troops that can be accommodated at such fort or military post; and (6) the number of troops now quartered at such fort or military post:

Fort Brown, Brownsville, Tex.

Fort McIntosh, Laredo, Tex.

Fort Clark, Brackettville, Tex.

Fort D. A. Russell, Marfa, Tex.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas asks for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. McNARY. I think it had better go over under the rule. The Senator can call it up to-morrow.

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

FEES FOR GRAZING LANDS IN NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. On behalf of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] and myself, I submit a resolution, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolution (S. Res. 151) was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is requested to fix the fees to be charged during each of the years 1932 and 1933 for the grazing of sheep and cattle on lands within the boundaries of national forests at not more than 50 per cent of the fees charged during the year 1931.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CONDITIONS IN MANCHURIA (S. DOC. NO. 55)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate of the United States:

In response to Senate Resolution 87 of December 17, 1931, I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, inclosing copies of documents referred to therein.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 27, 1932.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6596) 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.

GEORGE WASHINGTON BICENTENNIAL—ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT CURTIS

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a notable short address on the appreciation of George Washington delivered last night in the city of Washington by the Vice President of the United States. The occasion was a meeting of the chamber of commerce of this city to view a picture of Washington, identifying him with the great celebration that is now coming on. The picture was made by a firm that contributed it to the commission without charge, and it will be seen throughout the United States and the world.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it gives me sincere pleasure to be with you this evening. I am honored that you invited me to address you. To-night we are celebrating two important events—the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Washington Chamber of Commerce and the bicentennial of the birth of that great man, George Washington.

As a member of the George Washington Bicentennial Commission I can assure you that your cooperation in promoting the success of this great nation-wide patriotic undertaking is deeply appreciated, and I congratulate you upon your sponsorship of the George Washington bicentennial talking picture, to be shown publicly for the first time to-night, the production of which was made possible through the public spirit of Warner Bros. (Inc.).

In the last 25 years the Washington Chamber of Commerce has justified fully its organization. Its usefulness and the ability of its members and officers are proved. It has contributed wisely, enduringly, and often to the civic betterment of the city of Washington and its people. This year it has a greater opportunity than ever to be of service. The bicentennial celebration of the birth of the Father of our Country will bring millions of visitors to the city. These visitors must be housed and fed, instructed, and entertained. The bicentennial commission, of which the President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, is the chairman, has arranged an excellent program throughout the nine months of the celebration.

This year represents the Nation's opportunity to become closely acquainted with Washington and its people. It represents Washington's opportunity to enhance the pride of all our citizens for the city, which is a fitting memorial to our greatest hero. Each resident will, I am sure, realize his position as host to these visitors. He will endeavor to please our guests and be ready in turn to be pleased with them.

I have never talked to a visitor to this city who has not voluntarily commented on its beauty and desirability as a place in which to live. There could be no better tribute. It is well deserved. Nowhere is there a finer collection of public buildings, hotels, apartment houses, and private homes; a more impressive array of schools, colleges, churches, hospitals, libraries, and museums; better facilities in the fields of art, literature, and science; more beautiful parks; wider, safer, and better paved and lighted streets and avenues. The transportation facilities are adequate and diverse. The climate, the food, and water supply are admirable. Here in Washington man and nature have worked well together to produce a city beautiful, a city worthy as a memorial to the man whose name it bears. Washington typifies truly the inspiration which comes to each citizen of the United States at the mention of the name of George Washington.

I shall not attempt more than a brief outline of his life and the effect he has had and still has on our destinies after the passage of 200 years. He was born February 22, 1732, in Westmoreland County, Va. At 16 he had charge of the survey of the Lord Fairfax estate in the Shenandoah Valley. So well did he do his work that Fairfax appointed him public surveyor. Thus commenced his public career. He was in turn frontiersman and soldier, legislator, soldier again, and finally statesman.

At the outbreak of the war between the Colonies and the mother country he was in the Virginia Legislature. Shortly thereafter he was elected Commander in Chief of the Army, and took command. During the desperate years which followed, his life was filled with dramatic moments which are known to all of us—Valley Forge; crossing the Delaware; rallying the troops at Monmouth; the surrender at Yorktown; and in 1783 his farewell to his officers.

The war was done. The Colonies were free. Henceforward we see George Washington, the statesman. Here again certain dramatic events stand forth in our minds—George Washington at the Constitutional Convention, his inauguration as our first President, his reelection, and his refusal of a third term, his Farewell Address, and his retirement. His great career closed with his death on December 14, 1799. One hundred and thirty-two years have passed. Yet he remains one of the greatest single influences in our lives. His words and deeds are with us yet, influencing and guiding us. As he was to the people then, so he is to us now—"first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

With Washington as their leader, our colonial forefathers cleared away the wilderness and laid the foundation of the Nation, which has become the most powerful in the world—the United States. The qualities of truth, courage, and devotion in the youthful Washington developed and are revealed to us in his manhood by

his words of wisdom and prophecy, by his acts of leadership and sacrifice. His words are as pertinent to our welfare now as they were then. It is as important that we heed him and follow his advice now as then.

It was never more necessary that, as Washington advised, the country be kept in a state of complete national defense. It would be wonderful if the strong nations of the earth would agree upon a plan of disarmament which would reduce their armies and navies to the smallest strength needed for defense. But the fear of offense keeps them from doing so. Unless all will disarm, none will. So we must keep both our Army and Navy strong enough for complete national defense; likewise that new branch of defense, the air force.

We have always heeded Washington's advice to observe good faith and justice toward all nations. To cultivate peace and harmony with all is still one of our principal aims. We hope for, have done, and are doing everything possible to bring about world peace. But it must be peace with honor. Peace not involving us in the quarrels of other nations. His advice of "no entangling alliances" might almost have been given with present-day conditions in mind. He was indeed clear thinking and far-seeing.

Now, as then, we should chart and follow our own course, not that of any other nation. Now, as then, should we be indignant at every attempt of a foreign power to establish an influence in our councils. To-day there are in our midst men of alien thought and race who would sow the seeds of discord and disunion among us, who would overthrow our cherished ideals and traditions. We must rid our beloved country of all alien criminals and racketeers. As I have said more than once, the sooner such aliens are deported the better it will be for all.

What George Washington had to say on the subject of the established Government might be of interest at this time:

"Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political system is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions and Government. But the Constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established Government."

I have cited some examples of the almost prophetic wisdom of this noble character. I think there could be no more fitting close to this address than to quote you Abraham Lincoln's estimate of George Washington. Its simple dignity and sincerity can not be enhanced.

Lincoln said:

"Washington is the mightiest name of earth—long since mightiest in the cause of civil liberty; still mightiest in moral reformation. On that name an eulogy is expected. It can not be. To add brightness to the sun or glory to the name of Washington is alike impossible. Let none attempt it. In solemn awe pronounce the name and in its naked, deathless splendor leave it shining on."

DEPORTATION OF ALIEN SEAMEN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 7) to provide for the deportation of certain alien seamen, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED].

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, on the desk of each Senator is a copy of the printed hearings on the bill now before us. When the committee considered the bill there were a number of members of the committee who were new to the subject. There was no debate in the committee in regard to it, and the bill was reported out without hearings being held. Later the committee granted hearings, and last week hearings were held. There were only two or three members of the committee who were able to be present. At some of the hearings there was only one Senator present. Consequently, it seems to me important to call attention to the hearings and to the material that appears in them.

Mr. President, the bill is one which will cause very serious dislocation of our merchant marine. It is opposed by every steamship operator and by the operators of merchant vessels operating under foreign flags. The State Department, in a very able statement presented by Assistant Secretary of State Carr on behalf of the Secretary of State, strongly opposes the measure, because it is believed it will lead to serious difficulties with foreign nations.

Mr. President, these are times when we are trying our best in various ways to avoid international complications. We believe in avoiding international treaties which limit our freedom of action, and with that I am in entire accord. There are many Senators who believe in limiting the amount spent on the national defense, because they fear that if we spend money on ships, cruisers, airplane carriers, and airplanes it will lead foreign nations to do the same. They

fear that it may lead to international complications if we strengthen our national defense. Personally, I do not believe that it would. I believe the national defense is the best way of securing peace.

But, Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of those Senators to the fact that in this bill we are sowing the dragon's teeth. They are the seeds of difficulties with foreign nations which make our relations with them unpleasant and which have in the past led to war. I do not say that they will lead to war in the future; I sincerely trust that they will not; but if we pass the bill and it becomes a law, it will so affect the carrying trade of at least 10 nations by interfering with their rights as to who shall serve on board their ships when those ships come into United States ports that it would be very strange if they did not impose similar reservations on our own ships and seek reprisals.

Mr. President, I am not drawing on my imagination when I say that the bill is very seriously regarded by foreign nations. In the hearings which are on the desks of Senators, on pages 3, 4, and 5, may be found selections from protests which have been made by foreign nations to the State Department. The Belgian Government in a communication stated that "the apparent aim" of this legislation to impose regulations in immigration matters is actually something which goes "contrary to certain customs generally accepted in international law." They state, very courteously, "that its application would create the most serious difficulties for Belgian ships frequenting United States ports."

Mr. President, it is generally held by the proponents of this legislation that it is intended to keep off the ships in the Pacific aliens from Asia who are not admissible to American citizenship, and that it will not affect our trade with Europe, yet we find the Belgian Embassy protesting that it will present "the most serious difficulties" for Belgian ships.

The Canadian Government objects and calls attention to the fact that "the proposals would result in drastic interference with the composition of crews of foreign vessels in United States ports. They would thus infringe on the accepted principle which provides against interference with the domestic economy of a foreign vessel."

Mr. President, may I call attention to the fact that every day there come into the ports of Puget Sound steamers from Canada, and under British practice there are probably in the crews of those steamers Chinese from Hong Kong and Indians from India, subjects of the British flag, serving properly, under the regulations of the Canadian merchant marine, on those ships; but under this proposed law it would be necessary for the authorities in Seattle to take those subjects of the British Crown off those ships, put them in jail until they could make certain inquiries, and then ship them back at the expense of the foreign government. This would interfere with the natural right of Canada to conduct her merchant marine in the way in which she desires to conduct it. Naturally she protests.

We find the Danish Government protesting that the bill, if passed, "would entail serious hardships * * * to Danish ships trading to ports of the United States," and that it would apply to aliens who are racially excluded and would seriously affect Danish ships using oriental crews.

Mr. President, what right have we to dictate to Denmark what kind of a crew she shall have in a ship flying the Danish flag that crosses the Pacific and comes into one of our ports?

If we should pass this bill and it should become a law, we would invite reprisals. We would invite foreign nations to tell us what kind of people we shall have on our ships when they go into foreign ports. It is more difficult to tell an American citizen by his speech or by his looks than perhaps the citizen of any other country, because our country has such a great mixture of races. We have millions of American citizens who speak Italian, millions who speak Polish and Russian, and millions who speak other foreign languages, and who speak English only imperfectly; yet some of those citizens on an American ship coming into a

foreign port might very well, under a reprisal act drawn precisely like this proposed act, be taken off those ships and put into jail at that foreign port until they were able to show that they were bona fide seamen and bona fide American citizens.

It was things similar to this, Mr. President, that led to the War of 1812, when our ships were held by British men-of-war and American seamen were taken off them on the theory that they were not American citizens but were British subjects. In other words, this is the kind of legislation that leads to international difficulties, to reprisals, and eventually to a state of mind which verges upon a willingness to break relations with us. Why should we, under the guise of protecting our shores against foreign undesirable immigrants, pass legislation which would interfere with the right of foreign nations to run their merchant marines in their own way just as we run ours in our own way?

The German Government has made various protests against this proposed legislation. The German Embassy in a note dated March 3, 1931, states:

The possibility of the enactment of these bills is causing the Government great concern, since that would not only deviate from international practice but would also seriously affect the rights of the German shipping companies * * * because the contracts concluded between the German shipping companies and their crews are governed entirely by German law.

While the bill does not affect our treaty rights with Germany, it actually does interfere with the right of the Germans to run their merchant marine in their own way.

The British Government has made several very strenuous and earnest objections to this measure.

Mr. President, I think most Senators know that the British ships operating across the Pacific have a considerable number of British subjects of Asiatic origin in their crews who would be prevented from serving on those ships by this legislation, if enacted. British ships coming from Hong Kong are quite likely to have in their crews a large number of Chinese from Hong Kong who are British subjects, and yet if such ships came into our ports with those British subjects, under this bill, if passed, the port authorities would be obliged to take those British subjects off the ships, lock them up, and send them back at the expense of the steamship company.

Similarly, Indian coolies are rightfully employed on British ships; they are British subjects, and why should they not be so employed? We can control their coming ashore, but what right have we to say to a British ship coming in, "You must surrender certain British subjects on your ship because we do not want them as immigrants; they will be locked up and deported on a separate vessel"?

Mr. President, I ask that the reading clerk may read the very brief but very strong presentation of its views made by the British Government only a few days ago. It covers the situation so fully and presents it so clearly that it is the best presentation I have seen of the views of those who are trying to prevent international complications from arising.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEBERT in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The avowed purpose of this bill is to reinforce the existing measures which exclude certain categories of aliens from the United States. In practice its effect would go much further. It is the general international understanding and practice and in accordance with international comity that when private ships of a foreign state are in port the territorial authorities refrain from interference with their internal economy. The bill in question, however, provides for interference with the composition of the crews of foreign vessels while in United States ports and is therefore in conflict with a well-established, well-recognized, and useful international practice. Moreover, it lays down that certain categories of aliens shall not be employed as seamen on foreign ships calling at United States ports. The British Embassy, under instructions from His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, have not failed to draw attention to this aspect of the bill in past years.

From the practical point of view also certain features of the bill would create many and grave difficulties for shipowners and masters. Section 6, for instance, provides that clearance shall be refused to vessels departing from United States ports unless they carry out a crew of at least the same number that they brought in. This provision, as again the British Embassy has pointed out

in the past, would be extremely difficult to comply with and might easily result in long and costly delays and make punctual fulfillment of sailing schedules impossible * * *

But it is section 7 of this bill which causes the gravest concern to His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom. This section of the bill lays down that no vessel shall bring into a United States port any alien seaman excluded on racial grounds from the right of immigration to the United States unless he be a citizen of the country under whose flag the ship sails. Thus in practice all vessels with Asiatic elements in their crews, save only the vessels of Asiatic countries with crews consisting of their own citizens and, it seems, United States ships with Filipinos, would be debarred from entry to United States ports unless at the cost of deliberately incurring the penalties which the bill provides for its violation. All other ships in which Chinese and lascars seamen were employed would be gravely embarrassed by such a provision; but the measure would bear particularly hard on British tramp steamers trading with American ports in the course of their world voyages. For these especially the technical difficulty of eliminating from their crews the Asiatic elements in question would be so great as possibly to result in the necessity of their omitting United States ports from their sailing schedules, for the bill would leave them with no alternative but to submit on arrival to the removal of the Asiatics in question to a United States immigration station for deportation in a ship other than that in which they were brought and at the cost of the vessel in which they came.

In effect it would dictate to other countries in what manner they shall man ships which convey passengers and goods to and from the United States. If other countries should adopt similar and, perhaps, even mutually conflicting measures, international shipping would be brought to a complete standstill * * *.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me just to make a comment?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. It is the purpose of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], as I understand, to eliminate from the bill section 7, which has just been commented upon in this letter. That is the purpose of the pending amendment. Am I correct in that?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is correct.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the reading, as follows:

There remains one aspect of the bill to which the British Embassy are instructed to draw particular attention. Operating as it does to debar British ships from employing as seamen even the natives of British colonies and dependencies, Indian lascars, for instance, and other British subjects who by reason of their race are debarred from the privilege of immigration to the United States, it conveys the impression of being specifically directed against the British Empire. As has been pointed out, it would involve a discrimination in favor of Japan, inasmuch as by specific exception from the general provisions of its article 7 it permits the ships of any sovereign nation to be manned with subjects of that nation but not with racially excluded citizens of its colonies or dependencies * * *.

In the circumstances above described it will be appreciated that this bill, if passed, would deal a grievous blow to British shipping and could not fail to cause very considerable feeling in British shipping and commercial circles who would naturally ask that steps be taken to protect their interests.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I came in while the clerk was reading, and did not hear the first of the reading. Whose testimony is that?

Mr. BINGHAM. It is a statement from the British ambassador to the Secretary of State in a letter dated January 5, 1932, explaining what they believe would be the effect of the bill. It is very well put. It is in the testimony which the Senator will find on his desk, inserted by the Assistant Secretary of State on pages 5 and 6 of the testimony.

Mr. President, under the immigration laws we keep out all Asiatics, because they are not admissible to citizenship. At the present time crossing the Pacific there are many steamers operated by Americans—not as many as I should like to see, but there are steamers of the Dollar Line and some other lines. There are many steamers operated by the British; there are steamers operated by the Norwegians, the French, and the Dutch that use Asiatics in their crews. When they come into port it is the custom of the captain to pay for an extra watchman to see that they do not escape, because he knows that they will get into difficulty and that he will get into difficulty. At any rate, I am in entire sympathy with any efforts made to see that these aliens do not escape.

However, under this bill these foreign nations, particularly the British, the French, and the Dutch, that have colonies in Asia and that use their subjects on their ships, would have to change all their practices in crossing the Pacific and coming into our ports. They would have probably to abandon a good deal of their trade, and we would have to abandon ours, and it would go into the hands of the Japanese and the Chinese.

Under the Chinese flag or under the Japanese flag a ship with 100 per cent Asiatics can come into port every day. They are all, of course, bona fide coolie seamen. None of them are admissible under any other flag into that port. They would have to be taken off the ship, locked up, and sent home in some other ship; but if they came in on a ship under the Japanese flag or if they came in on a ship under the Chinese flag, they can come in; 50 of them can jump overboard and swim ashore and disappear; nothing happens to the steamship company, and we get that number of alien seamen into our ports, which we all deplore. There is no way in which that could be prevented.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am sure the Senator wants to be entirely fair in his discussion.

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to call his attention to the fact that it would be necessary for the Japanese vessel he is describing in his example to depart with the same number of alien seamen with which she entered.

Mr. BINGHAM. Not under this bill, Mr. President. My reading of it is that they could take on board seamen of any country. They would not have to take the same number of aliens.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think the Senator will find that it must be the same number of alien seamen.

Mr. BINGHAM. And if they were unable to secure them, then they could not depart? Is that the provision?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I read the bill, it would provide that a ship entering with a certain number of aliens on board would be required to depart with the same number. She could not get her clearance papers unless she did have the same complement of aliens in departing that she had in entering.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does the Senator refer to section 6?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not see any reference to alien seamen there. In fact, an amendment embodying the sense of what the Senator says was suggested by the State Department as a way of meeting the difficulty.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. COPELAND. I fear that the Senator from Wisconsin is mistaken about the ship being required to take aliens. He will find, if he looks at page 3, line 15, that when departing, the ship must carry a crew of at least an equal number. It does not say that it shall be an equal number of aliens.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think the Senator is correct about that, and that I am mistaken. I was under the impression that it provided for departure with a crew that contained the same complement of aliens as those with which the vessel entered.

Mr. COPELAND. That is one of the complaints against the bill from the American standpoint—that a ship might come in and 15 aliens leave it, but in replacing those aliens they might take 15 Americans, so that we would have our number of unlawfully admitted aliens increased by 15, and our number of actual citizens decreased to the same extent.

Mr. BINGHAM. That was my understanding; and if the Senator will look at the testimony on page 20, he will find that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] refers to that very fact, and asks whether there would be any objection to this

provision which would permit American boys to take the place of the aliens on shipboard.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I am wondering if the objection the Senator makes would not be fully provided for if a simple amendment were added so that they would have to take out the same number of aliens that they brought in. Would not that meet the objection?

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; that would meet that objection, Mr. President; and I think that amendment was suggested by the State Department but has not been included in the bill. If the Senator will prepare it, I shall be very glad to vote for it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. The difficulty with the proposal made by the Senator from Nebraska is that if it were made mandatory that aliens only should be used to make up the deficiency by reason of desertion, the ship might be held up a long time in an effort to find those aliens. It might well happen that on West Street, in New York, the seamen waiting for work would be all Americans, as many of them are; but I think there would be the same objection on the part of foreign critics if the ships were required to take aliens only, because of the difficulty of locating them.

Mr. NORRIS. On the other hand, if the Senator will permit me, if we are trying to keep out aliens who are not entitled to be here, we shall have to resort to something of that kind. Otherwise foreign shipping could completely nullify our immigration laws. Probably it would mean a hardship. They would have to exercise greater care in preventing these men from getting away if they are not entitled to.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will bear with me a moment in replying—

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. We are in conflict in this bill with the splendid La Follette Act, the seamen's act of 1915, because that act permits any seaman on the ship, by giving notice to his captain of his intention to leave the ship, to leave it; and there is a proviso in the act that that shall apply to foreign ships as well as to ours.

If the quick turnover were interfered with—and that is a very important thing in shipping, as I understand, that they shall come and make their call and go away again as quickly as possible—if they were under the necessity of actually examining microscopically every prospective seaman to make sure that he was an alien, it would very seriously interfere with shipping and undoubtedly would lead to reprisals which would embarrass us in other countries.

Mr. BINGHAM. May I call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the testimony on page 16 of the hearings, in which Mr. Hodgdon, representing the State Department, said:

If the provision of the bill read that they should take out as many aliens as deserted here of like kind, that is, aliens who are not entitled to permanent residence, then you would have a real immigration bill. This appears to be a seamen's bill and not an immigration bill. But the popular opinion of the bill is that it is going to stop the illegal increase in the alien population in the United States by immigration as the result of alien seamen deserting. So what have we gained? We are in statu quo.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. KING. I do not want to interrupt the Senator. Apropos of the statement just read by my friend, one of the leading opponents of the bill has been for several years the attorney for the shipping interests—the international shipping interests as well as the local shipping interests, if we can differentiate. The testimony does not indicate that we can. He has appeared upon several occasions; and when

that suggestion was made two or three years ago when he testified he said it was a futile thing; that you could not go out when a boat was ready to start and, if there were a lot of deserters, find aliens to take their place. It might take you a month, it might take you weeks; and in the meantime the vessel would be held up, and it would constitute a complete embargo. He said the protests would be so great that that plan is absolutely unfeasible, notwithstanding it might be desirable to have the vessels take aliens.

Mr. BINGHAM. I wish the Senator from Utah had been as anxious to please the steamship companies in other matters in this bill as he was in this particular. It has been shown that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] was under a misapprehension in regard to my statement that the bill permits a Chinese ship to come in under the Chinese flag with a crew of bona fide seamen composed 100 per cent of Chinese, and 50 of them might jump overboard and swim ashore, and then the ship would have to take whatever seamen it could get to take their places to take the ship back to China. The point I am trying to make is this: We are by this bill driving our own ships off the Pacific, interfering with the entrance into our ports of the ships of foreign nations like England and Holland and France that have colonies in Asia who use their subjects on board their ships, and playing into the hands of two other friendly countries, Japan and China, by making it easier for them to secure business, because they can bring crews 100 per cent Asiatic into the ports, and we are not really protecting our ports against the entrance of aliens. We are promoting the commerce of two Asiatic nations at the expense of the commerce of our own Nation and of European nations.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I apologize for interrupting my learned friend in his, no doubt, very able discussion. I do not agree at all with the conclusion just drawn by my friend.

The Senator knows that within a very few weeks now, under existing laws, American steamship companies will be compelled to man their ships with at least 66 per cent American seamen. They may not employ Chinese or Japanese—that is, those who are excluded—but they can employ any other seamen that they may desire, other than those that are excluded. Under the present law, if we do not amend it, an English ship or a ship of any other nation may come into our shores with excluded seamen—with Chinese, with Japanese, with Malays, or lascars. If we do not pass this bill, our American shipping will be at a disadvantage.

Mr. BINGHAM. And if we do pass it our shipping will disappear from the Pacific.

Mr. KING. I do not agree with the Senator at all. In the first place, the wages now paid to Japanese are greater than the wages paid in many of the European countries, and are fast approaching the level paid to American seamen. The Japanese do not desert. The Japanese will stay on their own ships. The Chinese are not at all a factor in the shipping in the Pacific.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator will make them a factor in the shipping of the Pacific.

Mr. KING. One American upon our ships is doing the work of two Japanese, and we can operate our ships as cheaply as the Japanese can operate theirs. As I say, the Chinese are no factors at all in the Pacific trade or elsewhere.

Mr. BINGHAM. But the Senator would make them a factor. Everyone knows that there are large Chinese shipping companies operating ships flying the Chinese flag going up and down the coast of China, and away into the interior. Everyone knows that the Chinese were a seagoing race, with a mariner's compass, long before our ancestors ever ventured out of sight of land. Everyone knows that many of the most daring seamen in the world are on ships flying the Chinese flag. To be sure, they are known as "pirates." To be sure, they have made certain parts of the southeastern Asiatic

waters unsafe for the ordinary tramp steamer. But the fact remains that those ships are operated by adventurous Chinese seamen, born and brought up on the water. The fact that Chinese ships do not cross the Pacific to-day is due to other causes. If this bill shall be enacted, it will not be long before we shall see steamship companies operating ships flying the Chinese flag operating across the Pacific. To be sure, they may have on board, as many Chinese steamers do to-day, a Scotch chief engineer to keep the engines running, engines being a little difficult for Chinese chief engineers. They may have a British or a Norwegian captain, as many Chinese steamers have to-day. But the crew will be composed entirely of Chinese, and we shall have irritated and interfered with the legitimate commerce of our friends of Europe, who have colonies in Asia, and we shall have driven our own ships off the sea.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. It seems to me that this whole matter may be boiled down to this, and the Senator's argument carried to its conclusion leads to this, and I am prompted to ask him a simple question. Does the Senator favor the use of aliens in crews on American ships or shall we exclude them. That is the whole problem.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, that is not involved in the argument I am making. May I ask the Senator a question? Is the Senator in favor of telling foreign nations what kind of crews they shall have on their ships?

Mr. FLETCHER. Not at all.

Mr. BINGHAM. Then the Senator is opposed to this bill. That is what this bill does. It does not simply say to American ships, "You can not have aliens on board"; it says to foreign nations—for instance, it says to England—"You can not have in the crew of your ship that comes from Hong Kong to San Francisco any British subject of the Chinese race who came from Hong Kong." It says to Holland, "You can not have on board any Javanese who are Dutch subjects on your ships. They can not come into our ports, even though they are Dutch subjects who originate in Java." It says to France, "You can not have on your ships crossing the Pacific and coming into our ports from French Indo-China those Chinese who are subjects of the Republic of France."

That is why I am objecting to the bill. If the Senator will draft an amendment to provide merely that American ships shall not carry aliens, he will remove the chief objection to this bill I am urging at present, which is that it attempts to instruct foreign nations how to do their business and invites them to make reprisals on us, which may lead to very serious international complications.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. If I may be permitted by the Senator from Connecticut to say a word to the Senator from Florida, it seems to me that the Senator from Florida could accomplish what he has in mind by an amendment to the shipping act. I suppose it is perfectly competent for us to say that any American ship, whether it receives Government subsidies or not, must have a crew composed entirely of Americans. But the trouble with this bill, if I may be permitted to say it, is that it does not relate to our shipping but places such restrictions upon foreign ships that there are sure to be reprisals which will affect adversely the American merchant marine. I commend to the Senator what seems to me to be the seriousness of the pending bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I can see the force of that position, but I gather from the argument of the Senator from Connecticut that he is stating that the American merchant marine would be driven off the sea because we would have to compete with foreign ships carrying crews paid very much lower wages, and so forth, which led me to ask whether or not the Senator intended that American ships ought to be permitted to have crews composed of aliens.

Mr. COPELAND. I did not get that impression from what the Senator from Connecticut said, and he will correct me if

I am wrong. I thought he was bringing out the point that if we were to pass this bill it might, for instance, drive into the Atlantic trade Japanese ships, because they could come into that trade under this bill, if it shall be enacted, without the slightest restriction upon their activity, and with their lower standards of living and their cheaper wages they could drive our trans-Atlantic ships off the ocean. That is what I think the Senator from Connecticut had in mind, as I understood him.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, may I say in reply to the question of the Senator from Florida that I think he and I are agreed in our desire to promote the American merchant marine? We want to see the American flag on the high seas. We want to see American ships manned by Americans. To accomplish that and to enable our ships to compete with foreign ships paying the wages paid by foreigners it is necessary to grant increased subsidies. I do not know the position of the Senator on subsidies, but personally I would be willing to vote increased subsidies to ships in order to enable American ships to meet competition on the Pacific.

This bill goes much further than that, however. It involves us in difficulties with foreign nations. It places a preference, it gives a bonus, to two Asiatic nations, and says, "You can operate across the Pacific with Asiatics, and your competitors in Europe—the Norwegians, the French, the Dutch, the British—can not do so. They can not operate across the Pacific even with their own subjects, if they come from British, French, or Dutch possessions in Asia."

It does not seem to me that that is fair. It is interfering with their business. It is not minding our own business. It is not building up the American merchant marine. It is building up the Chinese merchant marine and it is building up the Japanese merchant marine, so far as the Pacific is concerned.

For the reasons I have stated, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED].

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the pending amendment, as just indicated, is the amendment offered by the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], who is unavoidably absent to-day. I think the position of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania should be briefly restated before a vote is taken.

Certainly no one in this Chamber could remotely suspect the senior Senator from Pennsylvania of any interest inimical to the most rigid, drastic immigration limitation that can be applied. If there is one man more than another who has stood upon this floor for the protection of our American shores against immigration it is the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. Therefore it must be obvious to all of us that his proposal, this pending motion, does not arise out of any desire to break down any new limitations that can be applied successfully to immigration. That certainly is my own position also. We would join in drawing the immigration ban against every possible jeopardy from alien seamen.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania is seeking to reach a totally different objective. It is an objective which this pending bill does not presume, upon its face, to touch at all, yet which inherently this bill does affect most seriously. It is the life of the American merchant marine.

Let us come back to the real question which is submitted to the Senate by my able friend the senior Senator from Pennsylvania in the pending proposal, to wit, that entirely aside from the question of immigration the pending measure is a threat to a continuing merchant marine, particularly upon the Pacific Ocean, under the American flag. I emphatically associate myself with his position.

He is not without credentials when he presents that point of view, and when I echo it I call the Senate's attention to the fact that the United States Shipping Board, the official adviser of the United States Government in respect to matters of this technical character, has passed a resolution reading as follows:

Resolved, That the United States Shipping Board does not approve the passage of S. 202 in its present form and at the present time, because the board believes the bill to be inimical to the best interests of the American merchant marine.

Mr. President, any such positive warning from such an authoritative source can not be safely ignored by a Senate contemplating judicial determination. Surely we can consider, set off by itself, the question of whether or not this bill is inimical to the American merchant marine without being accused, directly or indirectly, of having an interest in breaking down new immigration restrictions. The question raised by the pending motion, submitted by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, relates exclusively to the question of whether or not we shall do something which probably is inimical to the American merchant marine. It specifically relates to employment because there is no maritime employment whatsoever unless we keep our ships upon the sea.

Mr. President, this bill never went to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, where matters relating to the merchant marine are supposed to be canvassed. It has never had one moment's consideration by that branch of the Senate which has primary jurisdiction over a phase of the pending measure which, we are deliberately and officially advised, is inimical to the American merchant marine. If we destroy the possibility of competitive operation of American ships by putting them at a competitive disadvantage, we render profound disservice to the country and all its seamen and all its people. Even an immigration measure must not be permitted to do more harm than good. The inimical element, when identified in the proposed legislation, should be removed.

Why is it inimical? The Senator from Pennsylvania presented the unanswerable proofs on yesterday. The Senator from Connecticut has made it perfectly obvious why it is inimical, and I rise only to add emphasis to what he has said, and to observe that if the American merchant marine upon the Pacific must be forced precipitously to be manned 100 per cent with American crews, including the steward's departments, it is next to a physical impossibility for it to hope successfully to compete with its Asiatic competitors for the Pacific trade, when these same competitors can come over these same lanes and into these same American ports without these same strictures.

It must be remembered that we have set up in our merchant marine law a deliberate, progressive schedule, under which we are supposed ultimately to reach the climax of American personnel upon our ships—a climax which we certainly all want ultimately to reach. Whether meditated or not, here is an effort to amend, if not to destroy, the deliberate schedule which thus has been set up in the regular fashion in our regular merchant-marine legislation covering this fundamental point. I submit it is the wrong way to approach a question of such far-reaching implication, and I submit that we trend in an exceedingly dangerous direction.

Mr. President, next to the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] the man upon this floor, who, perhaps, has the best information respecting a problem of this character, is the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who for many years was chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, and whose name is connected with that of the senior Senator from Washington in the authorship of the great merchant marine act, under which we are proudly developing our maritime commerce under the American flag. I want to ask the attention of the junior Senator from Maine to a question, if he will permit me to submit it.

I should like to ask the Senator whether it is not a fact that in the development of our merchant-marine legislation a careful schedule was prepared and created by statute under which there is a progressive program to control the American element in the crews of American ships. I ask the Senator to give me his view upon this question and whether he thinks it wise for us to depart from the basic law as is proposed in the pending measure.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I did not intend to project myself into this debate, but I can not resist the urging of the question.

What the Senator has said is true. The whole matter of percentage of Americans which should be in crews of American vessels has been under consideration at various times in the past and was specifically under consideration when the 1928 act was passed.

I do not know how fully the Senator from Michigan desires me to answer his question; but if I am not trespassing, may I give a little of the history of past legislation on this subject?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish the Senator would proceed.

Mr. WHITE. There never has been in this country and so far as I know there never has been upon the statute books of any marine nation of the world a provision requiring that all the crews of the vessels of those nations should be of the nationals of those nations. When we passed the ocean mail act of 1891 there was written into it a provision with respect to the percentage of the crews which should be American. It provided in the first instance in the first year one-fourth part only of those crews should be American. It then provided that for the next two years one-third only should be American, and that after the third year one-half only should be American. I have not taken the opportunity to look it up, but my recollection is that those figures were exclusive of the steward's department, though I may be in error as to that.

When the seamen's act of 1915 was enacted, sponsored by one of America's great, the father of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], there was written into it no provision with respect to the citizenship of our crews, although there was carried in the law a requirement that a certain percentage of the crews should be able to understand the language of the master of the vessel.

When we came to the 1928 act, we undertook to raise higher the standards for our ships. After long consideration, after debate on the floor of the House of Representatives, we provided that in the first four years of the operation of that law one-half of the crew should be American. The general provisions of laws have been for many years that all officers must be American. Then there was provided in the 1928 act that at the expiration of four years two-thirds of the crews, including the deck and engineer's and steward's departments, should be American citizens. That four years ends this coming May.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I interrupt the Senator to inquire why it was thought inadvisable to require a complete and sudden Americanizing of the crews and why those particular percentages were chosen?

Mr. WHITE. The percentages themselves were somewhat arbitrary. They were based upon the best judgment of the committees drafting the legislation that that was all we could reasonably hope for and that it was all we ought to exact.

I have said that there is no maritime nation of the world which undertakes to require that all its crews shall be exclusively of its nationals. Neither Great Britain nor Germany nor France nor the Scandinavian countries nor Japan require that. The trouble with this piece of legislation, as I see it, is that it applies not only to that limited number of vessels receiving aid from the Government of the United States under the 1928 act but to all vessels of all nations, and it applies to all vessels of the United States, whether engaged in foreign trade, in the intercoastal trade, or in the coastwise trade.

Mr. President, out of more than 25,000 vessels of the United States documented under our laws only approximately 265 or 270 are receiving aid under the merchant marine act of 1928, and yet here is a proposal to place immediately upon the vessels sailing in the Pacific a requirement that 100 per cent of their crews shall be American citizens.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. KING. I dislike to interrupt the Senator from Maine, but the Senator is in error if he assumes that the bill requires the United States or any other nation to have 100 per cent of their nationals as crews.

Mr. WHITE. It does not so provide in terms, but in practical effect it does, because upon the Pacific the crews of American vessels are made up of Americans or they are made up of Asiatics. The alternatives are a mixed crew of that character or a crew of 100 per cent Americans. That is the practical effect of the bill, whatever the letter of its provisions may be.

Now, if the Senator from Michigan will permit me further—

Mr. VANDENBERG. With pleasure.

Mr. WHITE. The vessels sailing upon the Pacific are three-quarters of their time in tropical climes. Experience has demonstrated that we can not take a white man and put him into the holds of the steamers, put him into the steward's department of those steamers, and require him to serve there three-quarters of the time in those torrid areas.

So far as I am concerned I am quite willing to pass by the commercial aspects of the matter, but I am against the proposal because of social considerations. I am not myself willing, Mr. President, to give assent to a proposal which means that an American boy or an American seaman must go down in the stokehold of one of those steamers in the Far East and work in these veritable "black holes of Calcutta." In my view that is not a dignifying of American labor, but is a degradation of American labor.

Mr. President, these steamers, as they move about in the Far East stopping at eastern ports, have passenger lists made up of Filipinos, Chinese, Malays, and lascars, and Asiatics of all characters and of all nationalities. I am not myself willing to support a measure which means that an American boy must go into the steward's department on one of those boats, whether in the first class, the second, or third class or stowage of those vessels, and wait upon those Asiatics, shining their shoes, doing the menial tasks of a steward. That is not my conception of the dignity of American labor. I am not for any measure that takes Asiatics out of the stokehold and out of the steward's department of vessels in these eastern trades and puts in their places American citizens and American boys.

I hope I have answered the Senator's question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I realize the interruption has been proceeding out of order, but it has been proceeding very responsively to my request. I confess to the Senate and the Chair that I have now accomplished the purpose for which I originally rose. The junior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] has been sitting here quietly and modestly, armed with perhaps greater information respecting this subject than most of the rest of us put together. He has been sensitive—I think supersensitive—to the feeling that his comparative youth in this body should hold him quiet in his seat, perhaps due to a particularly acute and inherited esteem for this body which comes down from his grandfather, the distinguished former Senator Frye, of Maine. I did want him to testify. He has made all the speech I wish to submit to the Senate on my own account in respect to this problem.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill desires to be heard.

Mr. McNARY. I think we should have a quorum under the circumstances. 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	Brookhart	Costigan	Glass
Austin	Broussard	Couzens	Glenn
Bailey	Bulkley	Cutting	Goldsborough
Bankhead	Bulow	Dale	Gore
Barbour	Byrnes	Davis	Hale
Barkley	Capper	Dickinson	Harris
Bingham	Caraway	Dill	Harrison
Black	Carey	Fess	Hatfield
Blaine	Connally	Fletcher	Hawes
Borah	Coolidge	Frazier	Hayden
Bratton	Copeland	George	Hebert

Howell	McGill	Pittman	Townsend
Hull	McKellar	Robinson, Ark.	Trammell
Johnson	McNary	Robinson, Ind.	Tydings
Jones	Metcalf	Schall	Vandenberg
Kean	Morrison	Sheppard	Wagner
Kendrick	Moses	Shipstead	Walcott
Keyes	Neely	Smith	Walsh, Mass.
King	Norbeck	Smoot	Walsh, Mont.
La Follette	Norris	Steiwer	Waterman
Lewis	Nye	Stephens	Watson
Logan	Oddie	Thomas, Idaho	Wheeler
Long	Patterson	Thomas, Okla.	White

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], which will be stated by the Secretary.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Pennsylvania proposes to strike out all of section 7, as follows:

SEC. 7. No vessel shall, unless such vessel is in distress, bring into a port of the United States as a member of her crew any alien who if he were applying for admission to the United States as an immigrant would be subject to exclusion under subdivision (c) of section 13 of the immigration act of 1924, except that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring any excluded citizen or subject of such nation or any person not racially excluded who is a bona fide seaman as a member of the vessel's crew, exclusive, however, of any citizen, subject, or inhabitant of any colony, dependency, or mandate who is racially excluded from coming to the United States as an immigrant. Any alien seaman brought into a port of the United States in violation of this provision shall be excluded from admission or temporary landing and shall be deported, either to the place of shipment or to the country of his nativity, as a passenger, on a vessel other than that on which brought, at the expense of the vessel by which brought, and the vessel by which brought shall not be granted clearance until such expenses are paid or their payment satisfactorily guaranteed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the bill under consideration is not new; it has been before the Senate for a number of years and in substantially the same form it was considered in the House of Representatives in 1924. The same objections now urged against the bill were urged when it was being considered in the House, and they have been vigorously asserted in the Senate during the past six or eight years.

The bill has been considered by the Senate Committee on Immigration four or five times, and extensive hearings have been conducted. There was no necessity, Mr. President, for further hearings by the Senate Committee on Immigration because all possible objections to its provisions had been presented and its merits and demerits, if any, had been fully considered. Notwithstanding the lack of need for additional information, those in charge of the bill agreed that the Senate committee might receive any statement for or against the bill and report the same to this body. That has been done, and there is before us the testimony given before the committee on the 22d and 23d of this month.

I understood that the chairman of the committee [Mr. HATFIELD] was to address the Senate at this time, but I am advised that he will be detained for a short time. Pending his return I shall occupy the floor and discuss briefly some questions raised by opponents of this bill.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] complains because the bill was not referred to the Committee on Commerce. I am not able to follow his argument. This bill is supplemental to the immigration laws; it is essentially and primarily an immigration measure, dealing with immigration problems. The inadequacy of the present immigration laws has been referred to by officials of the Government charged with their enforcement and recommendations made looking to the strengthening of their provisions. The claim is often made that our immigration laws have been fairly effective in closing the "front doors" to undesirable or inadmissible aliens, but they have left open the "side doors," through which more than 500,000 persons have illegally entered the United States during the past 8 or 10 years.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Surely the Senator from Utah does not contend that those persons came as alien seamen?

Mr. KING. The testimony given before the Senate Committee on Immigration and statements emanating from Government officials attribute most of these illegal entries to persons who entered our ports as seamen but who were not seamen in the true sense, and evaded the immigration laws, in order to enter the United States. They were mala fide seamen and not entitled to come to our shores.

When the immigration laws of 1917, supplemented by other laws culminating in the act of 1924, placed restrictions upon immigration and limited the number of immigrants who might annually enter the United States, many persons sought to evade the laws and discovered that they might or could reach our shores by pretending to be seamen and shipping as such upon vessels sailing to our ports. So tens of thousands of aliens who were not seamen, who did not intend to become seamen, were accepted by masters of vessels and were brought to the United States, where they were admitted upon the claim by them and the officers of the vessels upon which they were shipped that they were bona fide seamen and as such were entitled to be admitted upon the same grounds as persons are admitted who are bona fide seamen.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Did not the official representatives of American and foreign shipping companies publicly testify before the Immigration Committee last Saturday, as shown on pages 42 and 63 of the hearings, that it was the established policy of the shipping companies to detain persons racially excluded on board their ships and prevent their leaving such ships in American ports? In other words, do they not forbid seamen of excluded races from coming ashore who, under the La Follette Seamen's Act, are given the right of 60 days' entrance into the country?

Mr. KING. There was testimony such as indicated by the Senator, but there is an abundance of evidence showing that excluded aliens do enter the United States in derogation of the immigration laws, and that aliens racially excluded ship as seamen who are not seamen, and thus reach the shores of our country. The evidence also establishes that many aliens are smuggled into the United States, that they come in ships from beyond the seas and by devious means effect entrance.

Mr. DAVIS. Is there not a fine of \$1,000 under the immigration law imposed on foreign seamen coming ashore without permission of the captain of their ship?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. They keep oriental seamen on board the ships, or, in other words, make the ship a sort of prison to prevent them from coming ashore. Does not such a practice constitute involuntary servitude?

Mr. KING. The law imposes a fine, as stated by the Senator, when our inspectors require the captain to detain persons not legally admissible and he is derelict in his duty. But thousands of persons brought to our shores in foreign and American ships leave the ships and mingle with our population. As stated, many are mala fide seamen and are not entitled to the privileges of seamen. Some are racially excluded from our shores; others have no proper visas, or for various reasons are not of right entitled to entrance and should be deported. It is contended that ships are not prisons and may not hold even mala fide seamen against their will.

There are decisions of courts that do so hold individuals upon ships is illegal and in contravention of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which prohibits involuntary servitude. I have received a letter since coming into the Chamber a few minutes ago—which may not be quite germane to the question propounded, but I shall be glad to read a few lines, as indicating the treatment accorded seamen in the ports of many other countries. Before doing so, however, let me say that when the La

Follette Seaman's Act was under consideration, it was made plain that these ships in our ports could not be converted into prisons, and that there should be no involuntary servitude even upon foreign ships while in American ports. So our laws have not prevented bona fide seamen from leaving their ships and having shore leave for 60 days.

Under the pending bill bona fide seamen may enter the United States; mala fide seamen are denied the right, but they are not held upon the vessels carrying them. They are taken in charge by the Government and detained on shore until they are returned to the port from which they came or to the country of which they are subjects. However, they have their day in court; they may appeal to the Secretary of Labor to determine whether they are illegally held. If the decision is favorable to them, they are released. I call the attention of Senators to the fact that there are maritime nations that erect almost impossible barriers against alien seamen who enter their ports, regardless of their race or color. For reasons or without reason they capriciously act and refuse to permit alien bona fide seamen to enter their ports.

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

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Under the La Follette Seaman's Act, section 4530, the shipmaster is obligated to let a seaman come ashore whether he is an alien or a noncitizen or ineligible to our citizenship. Is not that the case?

Mr. KING. That is true, generally speaking, of bona fide seamen.

Mr. COPELAND. Under this bill if a ship came into one of our ports and there were a seaman on board who did not care to go ashore, who did not care to become an applicant for citizenship, yet under this proposed act he could be taken from the ship. Is not that correct?

Mr. KING. I do not agree with the Senator's construction of the bill. If the person is a mala fide seaman, then he is subject to detention and will be taken to the detention camp to be held for deportation.

Mr. COPELAND. I think that is in the language of the bill.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator from New York asked a question with reference to a subject in which I am interested in my consideration of section 7. Line 9 on page 4 says that—

Any alien seaman brought into a port of the United States in violation of this provision shall be excluded from admission or temporary landing and shall be deported, either to the place of shipment or to the country of his nativity, as a passenger, on a vessel other than that on which brought.

The question I have in mind is this:

Suppose a Chinaman, for instance, had been employed on a Swedish boat and the boat came into a port of America. Under this law, as I have construed this sentence from not a very extended study, it seems to me that the authorities would be compelled to take him from that boat and to have him shipped back on a boat other than the one on which he came. Is that contrary to the Senator's construction?

Mr. KING. Under the present immigration laws such alien could not legally enter the United States, and under this bill, as I understand it, the alien, whose status is that of a person recently excluded from the United States, would be subject to detention and deportation by the United States at the expense of the vessel bringing him to our ports. It would be the duty of the Government inspector when he discovered the alien to take him to a detention camp, as it would be his duty to remove a person who had a contagious disease or who was not admissible as an immigrant and hold him until he could be deported upon some other vessel than that upon which he came to the United States, and at the expense of the vessels that brought him to the United States.

The Senator understands that for many years in the United States, whether morally right or otherwise—I shall

not enter into the ethical question—the American people decided that persons of certain oriental races should be excluded from the United States, and our immigration laws were enacted to secure that result. This bill is not intended to abrogate existing immigration laws, but, rather, to supplement them.

Mr. BLACK. May I say this to the Senator with reference to this section as thus construed:

The Senator probably knows my views on immigration. In so far as I am concerned, if I could, I would strengthen the laws and reduce the number of immigrants into this country, particularly during times of depression. I am in sympathy with the object of the Senator in the passage of this bill. It is true that we do say that Chinese and persons of certain other Asiatic races can not become citizens; but I am wondering if the Senator thinks we should go to the extent indirectly of legislating in such a way that a Chinaman would be prohibited from being employed on a boat of any other country if that boat intended to come to a port of this country.

If it is merely a question of prohibiting the immigration into this country of the Chinese or any other group, I am strongly for the idea; but, somehow, I can not believe that it would be morally justifiable on our part to pass a law which would say to a Chinaman, because he is a Chinaman, that he could not be employed on a Swedish boat which might land in America, and yet an Englishman or a Frenchman or a native of some other country could be employed on that boat. I am wondering if it would not invite, and justly invite, some kind of retaliatory legislation which would prevent an American from getting a job on some other boat.

Personally, I should be very glad if the Senator would consent to some kind of amendment to the measure, if it is at all in line with his idea, which would not place us in the attitude of putting up an impassible barrier against a Chinaman or an Asiatic who wants to work getting a job on some foreign boat. If it gets down to the question of his landing, that is a different proposition; but, as strongly as I am opposed to foreign immigration, I do not believe I could get my consent to vote for a bill containing a stipulation that might prevent a man, simply because he belongs to a particular race, from working under the sovereignty of another nation on boats which are under the sovereignty of another nation.

I have not understood from the Senator's remarks heretofore that he wanted his bill to go to that extent. That was the idea I had in mind.

I beg the Senator's pardon for the long explanation; but in order to have the issue clearly drawn I did not find it possible to state my views in any briefer way.

Mr. KING. I think I understand the Senator. I can understand that there might be, in the minds of some Senators—

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator knows, of course, that nationals sailing under their own country's flag have a perfect right to land in American ports. He also knows that Asiatics sailing upon a foreign ship or upon an American ship have no right of entry into an American port. Notwithstanding this, we find in the record of the recent hearings that those who are not admitted to American ports were detained upon ships in the ocean, not permitted to land in American ports. The Senator is aware of that fact?

Mr. KING. Yes; that is, racially excluded aliens have been held on board of ships by the officers of such ships during the period they were in our ports.

Mr. HATFIELD. That is an answer to the interrogation of the Senator from Alabama, I believe. This proposed law does not change the existing conditions at all. The law that now controls still prevails in case of the enactment of Senate bill No. 7.

Mr. BLACK. I beg the Senator's pardon, but will he allow me to make just one statement in reply?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Not in reply, because my questions are not asked with any antagonism to the purpose of this bill. I favor the purpose of it. I understand, however, that the bill, if enacted, would bring about this result: That a Chinaman could enter into the ports of this country on ships of his own country.

Mr. HATFIELD. That is true.

Mr. BLACK. That a Japanese could enter into the ports of this country on a boat of his own country.

Mr. HATFIELD. That is true; and have the same consideration and treatment that others have.

Mr. BLACK. That a Frenchman could enter into the ports of this country on the boats of his nation, just as anyone else could.

Mr. HATFIELD. And those of other nations as well.

Mr. BLACK. That is correct. But, going further, if I correctly construe this bill, it would prevent and absolutely prohibit any Chinaman or any Japanese or a member of any other of the so-called excluded races from securing a job on a boat of any country except his own if it intended to come into an American port, but it would permit a Frenchman or an Englishman to come into this country on the boats not only of his own country but of any other country in the world.

Mr. HATFIELD. That is not my understanding as to the Asiatics.

Mr. BLACK. Section 7, I think—and I have asked the Senator and he agreed with my construction—is very clear to that effect. The point I make is this: Being as strong an opponent of foreign immigration into this country, I believe, as any Member of the Senate, having offered on several different occasions a bill to put up the bars absolutely for a period of years, to prevent any foreign immigration, at the same time I am not content to vote for any measure which, in my judgment, is not fair to the people of any other country. I can not see any justice in excluding a Chinaman from getting a job on a Swedish boat, and at the same time announcing to the world that we would approve the idea of a Frenchman getting a job on a boat of another country. It would seem to me to be a barrier which could not be justified, either in morals or in good faith between nations.

If section 7 has been improperly construed by me, and means no more than protecting the rights of Americans to jobs on boats, I am for it. I agree 100 per cent with the statement of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] yesterday; and I know from personal experience that out of the 7,000,000 unemployed there is not the slightest difficulty in obtaining men for every capacity on boats. I know from my own knowledge that college men from excellent institutions in this country are to-day riding the high seas as ordinary seamen at \$45 per month, less than is paid to good cooks, in an occupation that has been mentioned as such menial employment that it is impossible to secure them. But with that belief, with the idea of fairness and justice to all peoples and all races, which I think we should always have uppermost in our legislation, if I am correct in my interpretation of section 7 I can not vote for a provision which puts the strong arm of the United States all over the high seas of the world and tells a Chinaman that because he is a Chinaman this Government objects to his securing a job on the boats of a foreign nation.

That is the total extent of the criticism I personally have of this section, if I have correctly construed it. In the main objectives of the distinguished Senator from Utah, who has long been a leader in this fight, I thoroughly concur. I applaud him for the fight he has made; but, knowing his usually most liberal sentiments and his broad and tolerant viewpoint of the people from all the nations of the world, I am sure he has never intended and does not intend to bring about a situation which would place us in the attitude of putting the back of our hand against the employment of the humblest Chinese ever born upon boats flying the flag of a foreign country.

I will state to the Senator from West Virginia that that is my position; and in my judgment the statement he

made does not answer it. If I am wrong in my construction, or if an amendment is offered so as to meet that objection, I shall be delighted to vote for it; but personally I can not bring myself to the position where I will consent to vote for any provision in a law which makes it absolutely impossible for a member of the Chinese race to secure a job on a boat of another country in which we have not the slightest concern.

Mr. KING. Because of the questions propounded and the discussions by Senators in my time, and I have no objection, it is impossible for me to submit any connected statement or to complete any argument attempted. However, the course pursued enables Senators to ascertain the implications of the bill and to present their views upon its provisions. A word in answer to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK]. If a Chinese or Japanese or Frenchman, who is a mala fide seaman, takes service upon any ship for the purpose of evading our immigration laws, he is subject to deportation when he enters the ports of the United States.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. If section 7 shall be amended so as clearly to express that purpose, then I will be in hearty accord with the Senator; but, in my judgment, at present it would serve to bar a member of the Chinese race, even if a bona fide seaman, from coming on any boat into any of our ports. I did not believe in the beginning that the Senator from Utah intended any such effect, but I do believe that section 7 as written would have that effect.

Mr. KING. I shall give that matter further attention.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The individuals to whom the Senator from Alabama has been referring can not come in now under existing law. They would be racially excluded. The Senator is talking about immigrants who are racially excluded, or immigrants who come into our country under the guise of being seamen. Under the circumstances the Senator supposes, if they did not come in under the flag of their own country, as I am informed, under the law as it now exists they could not land in this country.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, if that is true, then this bill would be wholly and completely unnecessary. But as to any Chinaman or the member of any other race who comes mala fide, not because he wants a job to earn his daily bread, but in order surreptitiously to come into this country and live, I am in hearty accord with the method which is here proposed to be followed. But I insist that a fair reading of this section leads one to the irresistible conclusion that we are asked to legislate so that a Chinaman, or the members of certain other races, will be prohibited by the strong arm of the American Government from getting jobs on a Swedish boat, or a Danish boat, on an English boat, or the boat of some other country with which we have no concern. I do not believe it is fair or just or honorable on our part to attempt to use indirectly this influence to prevent a Chinaman from getting a job wherever people want to hire him, so long as he is not evading the laws of our country.

With the idea of the Senator I am in accord, that if he is not a bona fide seaman, and comes here, either by connivance with the shipping company or otherwise, for the purpose of disguising himself as a seaman when he is not, he should be excluded. I do not believe the Senator is in favor of that. Knowing the views of the Senator, I do not believe he would favor going to the extent to which I believe this measure would take us. It would go to this extent, that if a Chinaman—and I mention a Chinaman because the Chinese are one of the excluded races—gets a job on a Danish boat, which he has a perfect right to do, which I would not want to prevent, and I feel sure the Senator from Minnesota would not, and that boat happens to have as its destination an American port, that our inspectors must go on that boat, seize that Chinaman, who has been rightfully employed on the Danish boat, take him off, and

send him back on some other boat to his native land. I claim that would be inhuman.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I would like to ask the Senator from Alabama a question. Suppose a Danish boat with a Chinaman on board left France and stopped at Jacksonville, Fla., but its ultimate destination was Caracas, for example. Would the law cover that situation, where the ship was here just in transit to some definite port?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will permit me, as I construe this section, it would absolutely prohibit any foreign boat from landing at any port in this country if it had a Chinaman on it, even if the seaman did not take his departure from the boat. Thereafter, if it did come into a port of this country, the inspectors would be compelled to go on to the boat and take the Chinaman off by force and send him back home on some other boat.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then, as I understand the Senator, the net effect of it would be that Chinamen would be excluded from all ships all over the world, because if a ship employing a Chinaman even incidentally on any tour touched an American port, there would be complications so great that the ship would not want to take the risk of having that Chinaman on board.

Mr. BLACK. They would be denied a clearance from this country, and the position I take is that we have gone certainly as far as any nation should with reference to the Chinese.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, to what language does the Senator from Alabama have reference?

Mr. BLACK. I have reference to the language of section 7. The Senator will note that the first part of the section is very clear, to the effect that "except that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring any excluded citizen or subject of such nation or any person not racially excluded who is a bona fide seaman as a member of the vessel's crew."

Now note:

Exclusive, however, of any citizen, subject, or inhabitant of any colony, dependency, or mandate who is racially excluded from coming to the United States as an immigrant.

In other words, that simply means that no boat carrying the members of races which have been racially excluded from the United States as immigrants can land at any port of the United States.

Going on to the next paragraph, it is noted that any seaman brought in in violation of this provision—that is, one who is racially excluded—"shall be excluded from admission or temporary landing."

Look at the next:

And shall be deported, either to the place of shipment or to the country of his nativity, as a passenger, on a vessel other than that on which brought.

In other words, it does not even permit the boat which brought the Chinaman to take him back to the place from which they started, although he may have been a bona fide seaman.

My judgment is that it would not be fair or just legislation, and that this country should not attempt by legislation in the Congress of the United States, to prohibit a Chinaman from getting a job on a boat of a foreign country, unless he went on there with the corrupt intention of coming into this country contrary to our laws to become an immigrant.

With reference to any law which will prohibit such a thing from occurring I am in hearty accord, but I am very much opposed to this country taking this position, which I think might bar Chinese all over the world from obtaining jobs and work such as honest men ought to have whatever their nationality.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator from Utah is very generous in yielding. I want to call attention, in addition to what the Senator from Alabama has said, to the fact that section 2, on the first page, provides for machinery to be set up so that when a ship comes in, except a ship in distress—and I suppose even then—an examination shall be made to determine the nationality of the seamen.

Then, as the Senator has pointed out, section 7 makes it mandatory, if a person is found who is not eligible for admission to our country, that he shall be taken bodily and deported at the expense of the ship that brought him into the country.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator knows that under existing laws certain aliens are excluded from the United States.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator will permit me, I know that; but let us assume a ship in with an alien aboard who does not seek to land. He knows he is excluded. He is a bona fide seaman. He stays on the ship. But it is the duty of our inspectors to find out what sort of a person he is, and if he is not among the acceptable class he shall be deported. That is the language of the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been trying to understand the phraseology used in section 7, assuming that it were to pass as now written, and it strikes me that it is at least ambiguous, if not contradictory. Let me read it and see if the Senator from Utah does not agree in all seriousness that the section contradicts itself. Section 7 provides:

SEC. 7. No vessel shall, unless such vessel is in distress, bring into a port of the United States as a member of her crew any alien who if he were applying for admission to the United States as an immigrant would be subject to exclusion under subdivision (c) of section 13 of the immigration act of 1924.

That lets a Chinaman out of the picture, does it not?

Mr. KING. If I understand the Senator, the present law would not be modified.

Mr. TYDINGS. The measure goes on, after a comma—

Except that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring any excluded citizen—

That brings in the Chinaman, does it not?

Mr. KING. We do not desire to declare or enforce an embargo against any nation. In this age of trade and commerce it would be unwise and wrong to prohibit the vessels of other nations from entering our ports. We may, however, subject them to reasonable regulations and restrictions. Britain imposed many restrictions upon foreign ships visiting her shores and Australia prohibits certain aliens from leaving their ships when in her ports.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me continue:

Except that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring any excluded citizen or subject of such nation or any person not racially excluded.

He may be brought in under the first phrase and excluded under the last phrase of the three phrases, because it provides—

Except that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring any excluded citizen—

But in the next line it provides—
or any person not racially excluded.

It strikes me that in the first phrase, on line 3, an exception is made, and then the exception is contradicted in the same sentence on line 5.

Then it goes on further to contradict itself by saying, in line 6, "exclusive, however, of any citizen, subject, or inhabitant of any colony, dependency, or mandate who is racially excluded from coming to the United States as an immigrant."

I say to the Senator that as I read this, even if it projects the thought which the author of the bill has in mind, it strikes me as being so contradictory that a wrong interpretation would be placed upon it, because, first, it excludes,

then it makes an exception, then it lets the foreigner come in, and then finally says, "exclusive, however, of any citizen, subject, or inhabitant of any colony, dependency, or mandate who is racially excluded from coming to the United States as an immigrant."

If I may have the attention of those who are interested in this bill, let me read the whole section through, so that the whole thing can be followed, and see if it does not contradict itself in several places. Section 7 reads:

SEC. 7. No vessel shall, unless such vessel is in distress, bring into a port of the United States as a member of her crew any alien who if he were applying for admission to the United States as an immigrant would be subject to exclusion under subdivision (c) of section 13 of the immigration act of 1924, except that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring any excluded citizen or subject of such nation or any person not racially excluded who is a bona fide seaman as a member of the vessel's crew, exclusive, however, of any citizen, subject, or inhabitant of any colony, dependency, or mandate who is racially excluded from coming to the United States as an immigrant. Any alien seaman brought into a port of the United States in violation of this provision shall be excluded from admission or temporary landing and shall be deported, either to the place of shipment or to the country of his nativity, as a passenger, on a vessel other than that on which brought, at the expense of the vessel by which brought, and the vessel by which brought shall not be granted clearance until such expenses are paid or their payment satisfactorily guaranteed.

The Senator lets him in, then he bars him, then he lets him in again, and then takes him out again. That is exactly what the bill provides, it seems to me. For example, if I may analyze it a moment further, the last four lines on page 3 and the first line on page 4 exclude any alien from coming into the United States who would be denied the right to become a citizen.

Mr. KING. As the law at present does. It does not change the law. It is merely confirmatory of existing law.

Mr. TYDINGS. No vessel can come in here with such a man upon it. Is that correct?

Mr. KING. Under the present law there are racial exclusions.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; and the bill as written prevents a vessel from coming here which has a Chinaman upon it as a member of the crew. That is what the first five lines of section 7 say if they say anything. Then the bill provides:

Except that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring any excluded citizen or subject of such nation.

The Senator says he can not come in and then he inserts in the bill an exception and provides that a ship can bring in such excluded person. Then the bill goes on to provide:

Who is a bona fide seaman as a member of the vessel's crew.

Now we have him in. The bill has said that we could not bring him in under the immigration act even as a seaman. Then the Senator's bill says he can come in as a member of a vessel's crew.

Mr. KING. If he is a bona fide seaman.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the Senator says in line 6 of his bill, page 4:

Exclusive, however, of any citizen, subject, or inhabitant of any colony, dependency, or mandate who is racially excluded from coming to the United States as an immigrant.

I believe I see the object at which the Senator is driving, and my purpose in rising is merely to say that I do not believe the selection of words and phrases is clear and that it makes the section contradictory of each one of its separate provisions. It ought to be rewritten so that the judge or the customs official who interprets it will not find that each three lines contradict the three lines which have gone before.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator knows we are confronted with a rather delicate situation in dealing with immigration where the immigration laws exclude certain races. The bill recognizes existing law, but proposes to make some modification by providing that bona fide seamen upon vessels of a nation whose nationals are excluded may enter if they are bona fide seamen, and enjoy the same privileges as are granted to bona fide seamen of nations outside of the exclusion category.

As I understand the bill, it goes further and declares that dependencies of nations, where those dependencies contain races which are excluded, come within the provisions of the bill and their seamen may not be brought in even by the nation of which they are subjects. That is to say, to give a concrete illustration under the bill as I interpret it, a Chinese national may enter the United States if he is a bona fide seaman upon a Chinese ship; Japanese may enter the United States if bona fide seamen upon a Japanese vessel. A Chinese would be subject to the provisions of the bill for deportation if he should come to the United States on a vessel other than that which belongs to the nation of which he is a national.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Is it the Senator's interpretation of section 7 that if a Chinaman should come here upon a Danish ship and the ship should land, he could be taken off of that ship and be deported and would not be permitted to return to his ship and go with it?

Mr. KING. I think that is a correct interpretation of the bill.

Mr. BORAH. That would prevent a Chinaman from having a position upon any ship which might want to touch at a port of the United States.

Mr. KING. Persons racially excluded may not have the benefits of individuals who are not excluded under the operations of the bill. The bill does not extend to races now excluded the privileges extended to the nationals of other nations; but it does legalize the entrance of persons racially excluded if they are bona fide seamen and enter our ports under the flag of their own nation. To that extent this bill enlarges or expands the present immigration law and grants rights and privileges to racially excluded nationals who under the present law might not be permitted to enter.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will give his attention to the first five lines of section 7, he will see that they read—

No vessel shall, unless such vessel is in distress, bring into a port of the United States as a member of her crew any alien who if he were applying for admission to the United States as an immigrant would be subject to exclusion under subdivision (c) of section 13 of the immigration act of 1924.

Let us suppose a Chinaman comes to the port of Baltimore upon a Danish ship. The ship comes up the Chesapeake Bay to the immigration station. Before the ship can land at all it has to be inspected, of course, and go through the various steps preliminary to docking. It is found that a Chinaman is on that ship. What happens?

Mr. KING. Would he be admitted to the United States now?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; but the Senator says the vessel shall not bring in such a person. Would the Senator send the vessel out to sea?

Mr. KING. The penalty would be that the person referred to would be deported.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the bill says no vessel shall bring any such person here.

Mr. KING. In such a case the inspector would challenge the person and take him ashore as he would take any person seeking entrance as an immigrant who was ineligible to enter. If a person should be upon a ship without a proper visa, the inspector would cause him to be removed from the vessel to a detention camp, there to remain until deported. If a person racially excluded under the present law were to be found upon the same vessel, he would be subject to the same treatment and the vessel under the present law would be subject to a fine of \$1,000. Under this bill, instead of a penalty of \$1,000, the vessel is required to pay all costs incident to the detention of the person as well as the costs of deportation.

Mr. TYDINGS. The immigration officer says to the captain of the Danish steamer, "You have a Chinaman on board and we will have to take that Chinaman off the boat." The captain of the Danish steamer reads to the immigration officer the bill, which would then be the law, which goes on to say—

Except that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring any excluded citizen or subject of such nation or any person not racially excluded who is a bona fide seaman as a member of the vessel's crew.

But before we get down to "any person not racially excluded," the Senator's bill provides, notwithstanding the Chinaman may not be brought in, that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring any excluded citizen or subject of such nation. The Danish ship is a ship of a sovereign nation and is a member of her merchant marine.

The point I am trying to make is that I am not taking issue with what the Senator is seeking to obtain, but it did occur to me that this section is so contradictory that without some one reading it in the light in which the Senator from Utah is reading it, an entirely different interpretation would be placed upon it than the intended interpretation.

Mr. KING. I do not think it is contradictory in the sense the Senator intends. It merely strengthens existing immigration laws and declares that notwithstanding certain races may not come to the United States, nevertheless in the interest of trade and commerce and in pursuance of that rule or spirit of comity existing among nations, the immigration law will be relaxed or modified in order that bona fide seamen may enter the United States even though they are racially excluded, provided they are serving upon vessels of their own nation. While there is an apparent contradiction, I submit that a proper reading and interpretation of the entire bill make reasonably certain the object to be attained.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield further to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let us suppose the ship belongs to the Danish merchant marine, the Danish nation being a sovereign nation. It comes up the Chesapeake Bay with a Chinese seaman on it. Then the Danish ship has a perfect right to bring the Chinaman into the port of Baltimore as a seaman, because he is within the exception which provides:

Except that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring any excluded citizen or subject of such nation or any person who is not racially excluded who is a bona fide seaman as a member of the vessel's crew.

Mr. KING. The Senator places the wrong interpretation upon it.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point I make, and I have made it all along, is that I see exactly what is in the Senator's mind, but I do not believe the bill clearly sets forth that idea. I may be dense about it myself.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator is in error.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not looked up the present immigration law to determine whether anywhere there is a legal definition of a bona fide seaman. What is meant by that expression? How long does a man have to be a seaman before he becomes a bona fide seaman? Are there any regulations as to what shall constitute a bona fide seaman?

Mr. KING. I think the seamen's act attempts a definition of the words "bona fide seaman," but there is no difference of opinion among the courts as to seamen or those engaged in ocean commerce as to what they mean. A seaman is not necessarily one who handles spars and sails. An engineer is a seaman. A person who in good faith accepts employment upon a vessel to perform any work in connection with the operation of the ship is a bona fide seaman.

Mr. BARKLEY. Regardless of the length of time he has occupied that position?

Mr. KING. I believe that is true. A cabin boy on his first trip, if he is there in good faith and seeks employment and discharges his duty in good faith as a cabin boy, would be a bona fide seaman.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. I wish the Senator would consider adding to the definition, which he has correctly given, this one phrase:

And intends to return to the port whence he departs.

Mr. KING. Yes; that is assumed. I thank the Senator. Of course, if a person enters upon the discharge of the duties of a seaman for the purpose of coming to our shores and then abandoning the ship, he is not a bona fide seaman.

Mr. BARKLEY. That involves the question of intent. After entering on the job he might change his mind and desire to stay in the country at the first port where he landed.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows that in the administration of our criminal statutes the question of intent is sometimes very difficult to determine.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose there would be no way to determine it.

Mr. KING. It would be difficult to determine in advance; we are not clairvoyants; and those who administer the law find difficulty in reaching just and fair conclusions when the ascertainment of one's intent is involved.

But it is a question for the inspectors to determine. They have to use their best judgment. They may make mistakes; they make many mistakes now in determining many questions calling for their decisions.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

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

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I myself am very clear as to what this amendment will do, and I may state that I do not agree with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYPINGS] that there is any doubt about it, because the word "exclusive" is a restriction on the preceding language. However, I understood the Senator from Utah to say that it was his judgment that this provision really expanded the rights of Chinamen. I am not familiar with shipping, but is it true that to-day vessels from foreign countries are not permitted to have Chinese remain upon them in our ports?

Mr. KING. They are not permitted to land them, and they are held there, as I might say, as prisoners. Guards are put over them, as was stated by a Senator on the other side of the Chamber, and they are detained on board the ship. It is the view of many, notwithstanding the exclusion act, that writs of habeas corpus would, upon application, be granted which would release excluded seamen who are held against their will by those in control of vessels. I am inclined to think that a writ of habeas corpus would release them and enable them to land. However, if they secured their freedom, they would be subject to arrest by the Government and to be detained until deported. I might add that the testimony before the committee indicated that large sums were derived annually from fines imposed upon vessels for bringing Chinese and other nationals to the United States in violation of the immigration laws.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield further to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. May I ask the Senator if there is any doubt at all but that if this law shall be passed, it will be an effectual bar, in so far as the Chinese and Japanese are concerned to their securing jobs on any ships in the world which intend to land at ports in the United States?

Mr. KING. There is nothing to prevent their employment, but if they come to the United States they will be subject to deportation, as I interpret this bill.

Mr. BLACK. Then, as a matter of fact, the practical effect of this bill is that, in so far as the racially excluded nationals are concerned, it will be an effective barrier against their obtaining jobs on any vessel in the world that intends to land at a port of the United States. That would be a fair interpretation of it, would it not?

Mr. KING. This bill seeks to prevent the illegal entrance into the United States of persons claiming to be seamen when they are not, whether they be Chinese, Japanese, English, or nationals of any other country. It does not supersede the existing exclusion laws, although it may be deemed a modification in so far as it permits bona fide seamen belonging to races that are excluded to come to our shores as bona fide seamen on ships flying the flag of the nations of which they are citizens. It also requires departing vessels to take away as many seamen as they brought to our shores. For years vessels have entered our ports with full crews, and often with an excess number of persons in their crews, and have departed leaving behind many who entered and with no substitutes to take their places.

Mr. BLACK. I may say to the Senator I can see no possible benefit to these people who are now permitted to come into our ports so long as they do not enter our territory, but since there are two purposes in view, and many of us are thoroughly in sympathy with one purpose but feel that the other purpose is too harsh, is there not some way of dividing section 7?

In so far as the amendment proposing to strike out section 7 altogether is concerned, I am not favorable to it, because I desire to vote with the Senator on the question of preventing the mal-use, if I may use that term, of a job as a seaman, unlawfully to gain admission into this country; but personally I can not bring myself to the point of believing that it is right to put up a barrier against a Chinaman or a Japanese getting a job on any boat in the world and leave it open to a Frenchman or an Englishman or to the nationals of other foreign countries.

Mr. KING. May I say to the Senator that in some countries alien seamen have difficulty in going ashore, because of imposed restrictions. In Australia persons of certain races are not permitted to land. There are restrictions against orientals. Italy has restrictions applied to alien seamen.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. Just a moment. According to a letter which I have just received from an American seaman, in Italy some nationals, including Americans, are not allowed to go ashore. It is a sovereign right of nations to determine who may enter their borders.

Mr. BLACK. I agree with the Senator that it is a matter for each nation to decide in accordance with the established principles of comity existing between them and in consonance with humanitarian principles.

In so far as the racial exclusion law is concerned, I do not consider that that enters into this discussion, because I am not favorable to any movement which will permit a breaking down of our present immigration laws. I have not had a letter either for or against this bill, so far as I know, nor has anyone said anything about any particular section of it to me. My conception of it has come wholly from a study of it here; and, in the respect I have indicated, it runs contrary to the conception I have of fairness and justice to people all over the world, for I can not see, after we exclude a Chinaman from admission into our country, that it is correct for us to pass a law which reaches out the strong arm of the Federal Government and says, "You can not get a job on any boat in the world." I do not believe it is right for us to use our vast power by reason of our superior place in commerce and trade to tell a member of the Chinese race that he shall not get a job on a Danish boat or a Swedish boat. It seems to me to be contrary to the first principles of humanity.

Mr. KING. We do not say that he can not get a job there. The master of a vessel knows, however, that certain races are excluded under the immigration policies of the United States. He knows that if he brings such excluded person into the United States, the latter, under the decisions of courts, may prevail in habeas proceedings, brought to liberate him from enforced control over his person by the master of the vessel upon which he came to the United States. It may be true that after securing his release, he will be taken into custody by an immigration official and deported. The measure before us has the support of organized labor and the seaman's union of the United States. This is their bill, and they have given it serious consideration. In weighing the problems and factors involved in the provisions of this bill, those proposing it believed that under the thirteenth amendment, which forbids involuntary servitude, persons severally excluded from the United States can not legally be held on board any vessel entering our ports.

The master of a vessel under the New Zealand flag or the English flag who ships a person racially excluded from the United States knows, if he brings him here, that the latter may not enter the United States; he knows that that man may not be held on board against his will and that habeas corpus proceedings may be instituted for his liberation. He knows that his vessel may be penalized and compelled to pay a considerable sum to meet the costs of detention and deportation.

What shall we do? We modify the existing law and say to the Japanese and the Chinese and to those who are racially excluded, "You may come, because we do not want to create embargoes against any country, but you must come on a ship of your own nation; you must come under the flag of the country to which you owe allegiance. We will modify existing laws so that if you are a bona fide seaman you may enter the United States and remain 60 days, enjoying the same privileges accorded to bona fide seamen of other nations, but you must then depart; but if you are a mala fide seaman, then you may not come to our shores."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will allow me to proceed a moment further, I will say to the Senator from Utah that, in so far as involuntary servitude is concerned, so far as I know, there has been no complaint, there have been no habeas corpus proceedings; but if we are going to use the great power of the United States to keep people from getting jobs, why should we "jump on" the Chinese, a weak race, that is now having its territory threatened with invasion?

Mr. KING. The Senator has no greater concern for the Chinese than have I. I regret the troubles and sorrows to which they have been subjected. I should like to aid and help them in all proper ways, as I should like to extend help to all afflicted peoples. As I have said, the question before us can not be dissociated from prior legislation. That legislation sought to exclude certain races. This bill recognizes the condition thus created and only seeks to make effective the general purpose of such legislation.

Mr. BLACK. I think that is an entirely different question. That is a question with reference to the blending of races. We took the position in this country that it was not for the good of our people, and was contrary to our public policy, to permit people to come in and bring about a blending of races in a way which might be injurious to both. But here no such question is involved. I will join the Senator 100 per cent in any effort to prevent them coming into this country contrary to our laws. I have not the slightest sympathy with the shipowners, subsidized with millions of dollars, who make complaint that it will cost them more to hire American laborers than it will Chinese laborers. I think that suggestion should be discarded; I do not even like to hear it raised in this body; I do not even like to hear the plea made here that the shipowners of this country, who are drawing millions of dollars from the Federal Treasury, are afraid they will have to raise salaries.

But we are considering the proposition of enacting a law which will permit Frenchmen to come here, to have jobs on any vessel in the world which will accord like permission to Englishmen and to Swedes.

The sum total of the effect of this proposed law is that we place another barrier against a race which has been struggling over a period of hundreds of years, living in surroundings because of which, perhaps, they are delighted to get jobs as seamen, even if they are held here in subjection for 30 days or 60 days and not permitted to leave the vessel, in order that they may earn a livelihood as seamen. I hope that the Senator will find some way to divide the proposition so that those of us who favor prohibiting their coming here when they are not bona fide seamen can vote for that part of the section but not vote to bar a Chinaman from getting a job on any boat in the world.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator from Utah will permit me, it occurred to me that he had not addressed himself particularly to the point raised by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYNDINGS], who, as I understood, did not, as does the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK], question the wisdom of the policy expressed in section 7, but questioned the language employed in order to carry out that policy.

I am inclined myself to think that the language ought to be modified. It reads:

No vessel shall, unless such vessel is in distress, bring into a port of the United States as a member of her crew any alien who, if he were applying for admission to the United States as an immigrant, would be subject to exclusion under subdivision (c) of section 13 of the immigration act of 1924.

I am of the view that that is all that need be said, and that the subsequent language embarrasses the operation of the act to carry out that policy. That would exclude the Chinaman or the Japanese under the provisions of subdivision (c) of section 13, because they would not be subject to admission under that section, which reads:

No alien ineligible to citizenship shall be admitted to the United States unless such alien—

And then it gives the excepted clause. So that under this no vessel can bring into a port of the United States one who is ineligible to admission under this provision.

The bill goes on in the next sentence:

Any alien seaman brought into a port of the United States in violation—

Bear in mind that the first part of the section, so far as I have read, down to the figures "1924" on line 2, operates to exclude those racially barred, and to exclude no one else. The bill continues:

Except that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring any excluded citizen or subject of such nation or any person not racially excluded—

That is just exactly the case. These are racially excluded by the provisions of subdivision (c) of section 13.

There is a great deal of confusion there as to whether the words "not racially excluded" modify both "citizen or subject" or whether they modify only the word "person." Then, that having been done, from that are excluded those who are racially excluded from coming into the United States, which is nothing more nor less than a repetition of the first part of the section. So that the prosecutor who is going to prosecute the proceedings, instead of simply contenting himself by making a charge that the person was excluded under this provision, would be obliged also to demonstrate that the ship was a merchant ship of some foreign nation and that the person was not racially excluded. In other words, we throw an added burden upon the prosecutor without attaining any end at all by any of the language after "1924," on line 2. In other words, what I mean is that the language after "1924," in line 2, down to and including the word "immigrant," on line 9, is utterly superfluous.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am very much interested in the interpretation of the language by the Senator from Montana. It was my understanding, however, that that language permitted a vessel flying the flag of a nation racially excluded, to land in ports of the United States; and if that were stricken out, it would debar, for instance, a Japanese vessel, flying the Japanese flag, from landing in the ports of the United States.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; not at all. Section 7 reads:

No vessel shall, unless such vessel is in distress, bring into a port of the United States as a member of her crew any alien—

So, if the vessel has on board any alien not eligible to admission under the immigration act, that vessel can not bring in that seaman.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. KING. I yield first to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is true. The exception is that—

Any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring any excluded citizen or subject of such nation or any person not racially excluded who is a bona fide seaman as a member of the vessel's crew.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And under this provision, as I read it, vessels flying the Japanese flag could land in the United States, although their nationals or their crews are not permitted to come in as immigrants.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly. A Japanese ship has a crew composed of people not absolutely excluded on racial grounds from admission to the United States.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am supposing that the vessel has a crew of citizens of Japan, who are racially excluded.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. This exception would permit that vessel to land in a port of the United States.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But how, when it says?—

Except that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring any excluded citizen or subject of such nation or any person not racially excluded?

We assume, if the crew are Japanese, that they are all racially excluded; so that everybody aboard that ship with a Japanese crew is racially excluded and those can not be brought in. In other words, we simply repeat, in that language, the language which we have in the first part of the section.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does not the second clause refer to those who may be excluded for other reasons than racial reasons?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; it does not, because it provides—

May . . . bring . . . any citizen or subject—

Which might include those that are excluded upon quota grounds; but that is qualified by the language "not racially excluded"—

Any excluded citizen or subject of such nation or any person not racially excluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. It eliminates those not racially excluded. The ship may bring in those not racially excluded, but at the same time who might be excluded for some other reason.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes; but they are not shut out by the first part of the section.

Mr. BARKLEY. But if the Senator's suggestion is followed and only the first part of that section remains, it seems to me it would be impossible for any ship flying the Japanese flag to land. It could not come into port unless it had a crew that was alien to Japan.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. So it would, if this provision were left in the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the whole section is so involved that it meets itself coming back.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The same situation would exist if we left in the language "except," and so forth.

A Japanese ship comes in with a Japanese crew. Why are they not all excluded? They are excluded, obviously, under the first provision of the section; and then the bill says:

Except that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring any excluded citizen or subject of such nation or any person not racially excluded—

Her entire crew are racially excluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. If a Japanese ship comes into one of our ports, why is there any objection to allowing it to come in, assuming that it has a crew of its own nationals?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am not arguing the policy of this thing at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am just devoting myself to the language.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not very clear what the policy of this section is. I am frank to say it is very confusing to me. I do not know what it means; but if the Senator's suggestion is followed, and all of it is stricken out except the first clause, that would make it impossible for a Japanese ship to come into port unless it had a crew made up of aliens to its own country.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Quite right; and if it stands as it is—

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator does not want that to happen, does he?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should not think so, but that is the effect of it if the language is left. The point I am making is that the thing is not changed at all by any language after "1924," in line 2. It is left exactly the same as it would be if that language were not there at all.

Mr. KING. I am not convinced that the Senator's interpretation of this section is correct, but I ask the Senator if he has any suggestion to make with reference to it?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should want first to know what the policy is. Who is it that it is desired to admit? That is to say, what persons are we willing should come in? Apparently we are willing that a Japanese crew should come in on a Japanese ship, or that a Chinese crew should come in on a Chinese ship.

Mr. KING. Yes; if the seamen are bona fide seamen.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It would not be at all difficult to express that; but this language does not do it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am not quite able to follow the Senator from Montana. I think the language of section 7 means this, stating it in a paraphrased form:

That the nationals of any country except those who are racially excluded may enter our ports if they are bona fide seamen, not mala fide seamen; that nationals racially excluded under present immigration laws may enter our ports if they are bona fide seamen and are members of crews of vessels of the nation to which they owe allegiance.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If that is the purpose, it can be expressed very easily.

Mr. KING. Let me amplify that, if the Senator will pardon me. It also means that the nationals of any country, if they are living in colonies or dominions, and those colonies or dominions do not have a flag or a merchant marine of their own, are subject to the same exclusion as are the nationals of the excluded races.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I would suggest that the Senator just put it in this way:

Except that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring as a member of the vessel's crew any excluded citizen or subject of such nation who is a bona fide seaman thereof.

That is all that is needed.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I agree with the suggestion of the Senator from Montana that the language as em-

braced in the bill, in section 7, does not permit the bringing in of any seaman, however bona fide he may be, who is racially excluded, because the language is:

Any person not racially excluded who is a bona fide seaman.

If he is racially excluded and is a bona fide seaman, he still can not come in.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Then, according to that, a Japanese ship can not come in, and a Chinese ship can not come in. That just closes the ports of the United States to the Far East. Why does it not?

In other words, suppose, as the Senator from Montana says, we take section 7 and after the figures "1924" put a period and stop. It reads in this way:

No vessel shall, unless such vessel is in distress, bring into a port of the United States as a member of her crew any alien who if he were applying for admission to the United States as an immigrant would be subject to exclusion under subdivision (c) of section 13 of the immigration act of 1924.

That means that no vessel can bring in a Chinese or a Japanese—no vessel. Now, as the Senator from Montana suggests, an amendment can be drawn which will permit a Japanese ship to bring in Japanese and permit a Chinese ship to bring in Chinese; but—

Mr. KING. May I say to the Senator that we do not need that? That is already in section 7. It is clear that Japanese upon a Japanese vessel or Chinese upon a Chinese vessel may enter the United States if they are bona fide seamen.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I ask the Senator a question? I am seeking information.

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Where is the language which assures that conclusion?

Mr. KING (reading):

Except that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation—

Mr. HATFIELD. Where is the Senator reading from?

Mr. KING. The top of page 4.

Except that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring any excluded citizen—

Japan would be a sovereign nation. China would be a sovereign nation. Returning to the bill:

Except that any ship of the merchant marine of any sovereign nation may freely bring any excluded citizen or subject of such nation or any person not racially excluded—

There may be some ambiguity if the entire section is not considered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is where I think the difficulty arises in connection with the Senator's interpretation.

Mr. KING. It reads:

Who is a bona fide seaman as a member of the vessel's crew, exclusive, however, of any citizen, subject, or inhabitant of any colony, dependency, or mandate who is racially excluded from coming to the United States as an immigrant.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I heard the remarks of the Senator from Montana, and also those of the Senator from Maryland, to the effect that this language is so involved that the concluding clause is not clear enough to permit the admission of anyone. Anyone would be excluded unless there is a clear enough clause to admit him.

Mr. KING. Undoubtedly.

Mr. LONG. It makes no difference if he is excluded, you have given a privilege to a Chinese ship and to a Japanese ship to admit him, which you deny to the American ship. It makes no difference; it is as objectionable one way as the other.

I take it the Senator means that he would not undertake to say that Japanese should not come in here as sailors, and he would not undertake to say that Chinese should not come in here as sailors. I take it that is the Senator's position.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have stated repeatedly that the purpose of the bill, as it is interpreted by those who drafted it, is to exclude from coming into the United States those who are racially excluded under the law from entering the United States, except that if they are upon a ship of their own nation, and are bona fide seamen, they may come and enjoy the privileges of bona fide seamen, but that notwithstanding they may come upon a vessel of their own nationality, they may not come on the vessel of some other nation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to one more question?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Therefore the Senator gets back to the same proposition, that an American ship with a thousand sailors and one Chinese cook can not bring in what the Chinese ship with a thousand Chinese sailors can bring in?

Mr. KING. The Senator made the same statement yesterday, and I stated then, and repeat now, that under the exclusion laws, whether they were wisely enacted or otherwise I am not considering now, a Chinese may not come to our shores now upon an American ship or upon a Chinese ship. He is excluded. We are not willing to go so far as to say to China, or to Japan, or to any other nation whose nationals are excluded under the immigration laws from coming into the United States, "We will have no commerce with you; we are not willing to go so far as to say that you may not come into our ports under your own flag, with your own nationals, but you may not have your nationals come into our ports under the flag of some other country."

The Senator obviously, if I understand the deductions to be drawn from his question, means that it is unfair for us to deny the right of Chinese to come into our ports on American ships, even though we permit them to enter our ports on Chinese ships when they are bona fide seamen. I am unwilling to say that the vessels of Japan or China shall not come into our ports, or that the ships of those nations shall not come into our ports, if their crews are bona fide.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BLAINE. At first glance the language of the section appears somewhat confusing, and if that confusion is permitted to remain in one's mind very long, it would appear that it was contradictory. But I think it is perfectly clear.

I want the Senator's opinion of what I conceive to be the purpose of the section, and I will try to state it very briefly. The purpose of section 7 is to exclude all sailors who are racially excluded or mentioned in subdivision (c) of section 13 of the immigration act of 1924, except that they may come in on a vessel of the merchant marine of the sovereignty of which they are citizens.

Mr. KING. Exactly.

Mr. BLAINE. There seems to be no confusion about the matter if that is clearly kept in mind. If Great Britain, for instance, has upon one of her ships of the merchant marine a crew made up of subjects of the British Empire, in that case none of that crew may be a citizen or subject, for instance, of India.

Mr. KING. That is right.

Mr. BLAINE. The East Indian being excluded under the immigration act, the British vessel could not bring in a subject of India, because India is under mandate, or a colony, or a dependency of Great Britain.

Mr. KING. Exactly.

Mr. BLAINE. As the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] suggests to me, the same applies to the Dutch ships. The whole purpose of the measure is to prevent the coming to America of those persons who are racially excluded, and we recognize the right of nations whose nationals are excluded to engage in commerce with America, and thus we permit them to use a full crew of their own nationality in perfect freedom.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, that is the interpretation I place upon the section. I ask the Senator whether he followed the suggestions made by the Senator from Montana and agrees with the views which that Senator expressed?

Mr. BLAINE. I came into the Chamber just as the Senator from Montana was concluding, I am sorry to say.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if there are no other questions to be propounded I shall proceed and attempt to discuss the various sections of the bill and answer some of the objections urged against it. I have been so interrupted that it has been impossible to speak with any continuity.

First, let me address myself very briefly to one or two suggestions which have been made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM]. He seems to be solicitous for American shipping. When he was speaking I called his attention to the fact that within a few weeks many American vessels will be required to carry in their crews at least two-thirds who are Americans.

On the Pacific coast we are employing, I am advised, a number of racially excluded persons upon our ships. If this bill shall not be passed, many American ships, indeed most of those engaged in foreign trade, will be at a disadvantage when the law referred to becomes operative. When they are compelled to employ American citizens to the number of two-thirds of their crews, and other nations are permitted to employ all orientals they desire to employ—and the contention was that the employment of orientals gave an advantage to the ships carrying orientals—then it would seem, according to the Senator's own argument, that he was seeking the disadvantage of American ships.

Mr. WHITE rose.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator from Maine wish to ask a question?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, the fact of the matter is that the law requiring a two-thirds percentage of American crews applies only to those ships which receive benefits under the merchant marine act of 1928, and out of some 25,000 ships documented in the United States only 266 ships, or about that number, are receiving such benefits.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I identified the matter about which I was talking with the vessels the Senator refers to. I did not mean to make the statement so broad as to comprehend all American ships; but upon the Pacific coast, as the Senator knows, a considerable number of Chinese are being employed, and the principal cargo and passenger ships are those receiving subsidies from the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Upon the Pacific coast, if the Senator will permit me, we have documented approximately 6,500 American vessels. Almost 3,000 of those are registered for the foreign trade, and of that 3,000, only 81 are drawing aid from the Government. Only 81 ships going to the East, or down the west coast of South America out of 3,000 are drawing any governmental aid whatsoever.

Mr. KING. I submit that most of the vessels referred to by the Senator are engaged in coastwise trade or in voyages from coast to coast. My understanding is that most of our ocean trade—cargo and passenger—at the present time is carried by vessels that receive governmental aid. That is particularly true, as I am advised, of the American ships engaged in Pacific Ocean trade.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. How many of those 3,000 are flying the American flag?

Mr. WHITE. Those are all American ships, registered for the foreign trade. There are approximately 3,000; I do not know the exact number.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine must know that this international shipping organization is composed very largely of foreign ships, and that they have so far impregnated—if I may use that expression—our merchant marine as to almost dominate it. It fixes rates, calls conferences, and determines shipping policies. The representative of the international shipping interests has appeared in most if not all of the hearings and has objected to this legislation. One of their attorneys, who has appeared heretofore, came before the committee a few days ago and opposed this bill and stated that the international shipping organization was opposed to it.

To return to the point I was making, the American ships which are receiving a subsidy from the United States will, within a very short time—as I recall, in May—be required, in filling their crews, to employ American citizens to the extent of two-thirds.

On the Pacific coast, as was stated by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], if I understood him correctly, ships which are not under the American flag employ very largely Chinese and Japanese crews, and he contended that that gave them an advantage. Obviously, if that be true, then, if we are denied the opportunity to employ orientals upon American ships, and other nations are permitted to employ orientals upon their ships, the disadvantage to American shipping becomes accentuated, according to the argument made by the Senator from Connecticut.

If the bill passes, vessels which employ orientals may not bring them into our ports except they are under the flag of their own nation. There is evidence that the wages paid by the Japanese are not very much less than the wages paid to American seamen. They are greater than the wages paid to Chinese seamen and seamen of some European and South American countries. Moreover, the evidence is, as I obtain it from seamen, that upon Japanese ships there are employed nearly double the number of seamen that are employed upon American ships. I make no invidious comparisons. I do not wish any criticism to be drawn from the observation I am making, but it is a fact that one American seaman does do as much as two Japanese or two Chinese seamen.

The Japanese, accepting the policy of Americans in raising wages, have increased wages upon their vessels and are constantly increasing them. There have been two increases in Japanese wages during the past two or three years. Japanese sailors, learning of the high wages paid in the Pacific to American seamen, have demanded increases and are receiving increases, so that the expenses resulting from those higher wages are constantly being augmented.

May I say that we have not suffered very much in the matter of violation of the immigration laws from mala fide Japanese seamen coming to the United States. The Japanese seem to be attached to their ships, and very few, as I am told, Japanese seamen have deserted in our ports. There have been large numbers of Chinese who have deserted, who have come surreptitiously to our shores as mala fide seamen or have been smuggled in.

Returning now to the Chinese. Contrary to the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], if I understood him correctly, there are but few Chinese ships which are carrying trade and commerce throughout the world. My friend referred to the fact that the Chinese 4,000 years ago knew of the compass. When American ships appeared in Chinese ports upon American naval craft in the 1850's, there were few, if any, Chinese ships. They had a few junks and small boats of limited tonnage that performed but little service. China is not a maritime nation, and we need have no apprehension as to competition from her in Pacific Ocean transportation.

So that the contention of the Senator from Connecticut that we were going to build up the Chinese marine and commerce and that China will drive our ships from the ocean, it seems to me, has no foundation in fact. As a matter of fact the expense of operating American ships with the seamen we have employed, taking it by and large, is but little, if any, greater than that resulting from the operation of ships under other flags.

The junior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] expressed great solicitude for American boys and spoke about the tropical climes to which our ships go, and in the interest of humanity he protested against American boys working upon ships that visit tropical climes. As stated by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] a few days ago, we have millions of boys, men, and women in the United States who would be glad to find occupation anywhere.

The statement was made by one of the Senators on this side of the Chamber a few moments ago that he knew of graduates of universities accepting positions upon ships with a compensation for their labor of \$45 a month.

We know that most of the modern ships are comfortable and commodious; they are not like the ships of 50 or 100 years ago. There are comforts and advantages, even for the humblest workman, upon them which many people upon land would be very glad to enjoy. The appeal for the American boy made by the junior Senator from Maine, it seems to me, loses its force in the light of the facts and the economic situation to-day.

Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is manifest and the necessity for it seems obvious. Let me read a statement made by a representative of the Department of Labor who appeared a year or two ago before our committee. He and others testified to the fact that large numbers of seamen deserted, mingled with the population, and remained here, putting the Government of the United States to an expense of millions of dollars to ferret them out and deport them. He stated that upon some of the vessels coming from oriental ports into United States ports there were as many as 50 or 60 or 70 Chinese who became deserters and mingled with the population and, as I indicated, subjected our country to heavy burdens in order to effect their deportation.

When we realize that 500,000 or 600,000 have illegally entered the United States within the past 10 years, most of them under the guise of seamen when they were not, it is obvious that there are leaks in our immigration system which should be repaired.

I invited attention yesterday to a statement made by Secretary Doak that quite recently 100,000 mala fide seamen had come into the United States, that the department was seeking to effect their deportation, and that some of them who had been here more than three years insisted that the running of the statute of limitations prevented their deportation. Fortunately the court construed the law differently from the construction placed upon it by those aliens who had illegally and fraudulently come into the United States, and many are being deported.

How are we going to prevent these constant evasions? The evasions come through men shipping as seamen when they are not. Hundreds and thousands of them are coming into the United States. One can not read the testimony that was given in the hearings a few days ago, as well as testimony given in four or five other hearings, without reaching the conclusion that there must be some supplemental legislation to close the doors against these mala fide seamen who enter the United States.

But to return to the statement I was about to read. One of the most efficient employees of our country was Mr. Hurley, who had been in the Immigration Service for many years. He testified as follows, referring to a particular vessel:

The owners of the vessel were fined \$9,000 for violations of the immigration laws. The agents at Marseille, upon learning of the fate of the master of the steamship *P. L. M. No. 21*, ordered a search of another vessel which was leaving for the United States, and eight contraband aliens were discovered on board. The master of the latter-mentioned vessel lost his position.

May I divert for a moment to say that I have here a statement and report of a number of cases which were tried in Germany in matters brought to the attention of the courts there, where it was alleged that conspiracies existed for the purpose of shipping as seamen persons who had been denied visas and were not eligible to come into the United States. A number of them were convicted in foreign countries for their conspiracies to violate our laws, and apparently the cases involved infractions of domestic laws as well.

In some of those cases, in Germany and Poland, reference was made to the fact that there was a system of smuggling aliens into the United States who were ineligible to entrance for citizenship and who were not admissible to our shores, but who came here as seamen for the purpose, of course, of evading our laws and finding homes in the United States.

Proceeding with the statement which I started to read:

The steamship *P. L. M. No. 21* belongs to the Paris-Lyons-Mediterranean Railway Steamship Co., and I might add, in addition, Mr. Chairman, I read in a report that reached my desk that the chief officer who was in command of the above-named vessel on the return voyage, as Mr. Furuseth has stated, lost his position.

Of course the owners of the boat were fined and the evidence disclosed that the master of the vessel was cognizant of the fact that he was carrying persons who were inadmissible to our shores.

I would like to say this: That in so far as desertions are concerned, there is considerable truth in the statements made at this hearing that a number of the deserters do reship foreign. Nevertheless a large number, as Senator REED knows, remain in this country in violation of the immigration laws.

Last June I proceeded to the Delaware & Lackawanna Steel Works, located at Tonawanda, N. Y., and investigated a complaint lodged with the department and bureau by American citizens residing in that city, who stated that there were a large number of what they called "ship jumpers" employed in the plant. The man who had charge of the employment service in the plant informed me that there were 400 East Indians, Malays, Arabs, and Africans employed in the plant at that particular time. On the first day, with the assistance of two officers detailed from the Buffalo office, we obtained the sworn statements of 10 aliens who admitted that they had deserted from vessels and had entered the country in violation of the immigration laws.

I made arrangements to return to the plant the following morning.

Remember, there were 400 aliens in that plant.

When I arrived at the plant the man in charge of the employment service informed me that not one of the class of men above mentioned had shown up that morning for work.

When they learned the immigration officials were on their trail they scattered like chaff and sought hiding places and working places in other portions of the United States.

I then proceeded to Niagara Falls and made investigation of a complaint against the Carborundum Co., and with the assistance of an officer detailed from the Niagara Falls immigration office I obtained the sworn statements of approximately 40 aliens who admitted that they had entered the country in violation of law, some having entered the country surreptitiously over the Canadian boundary and several as deserting seamen.

I returned to Buffalo and telephoned to the employment agent of the Delaware & Lackawanna plant, who informed me that none of these Malays, etc.—

The ones that he had referred to—the 400—

had returned to work. In order to satisfy myself of the truth of this statement, I boarded an electric car and proceeded to the plant and notified the superintendent of the employment service that I desired to check up on the men employed in the boiler room. After completing this work I obtained sworn statements from about 20 more aliens.

This was in another plant.

These aliens were natives of Malay, Africa, East India, or Arabia, and admitted that they had entered the United States in violation of the immigration laws.

These aliens, Mr. Chairman—and this is an absolute fact—when they found out that I was conducting an investigation at this particular plant with a view to ascertaining their right to be and remain in the United States, absconded and proceeded to Perth Amboy, N. J. One of our inspectors attached to the Ellis Island force arrested 29 aliens of the class referred to, who were employed in one of the large industrial plants in Perth Amboy, N. J. The arresting officer informed me that the chief of police of Perth Amboy stated that there are at least 2,000 Malays, East Indians, Arabs, and Africans working in the industrial plants at Perth Amboy and adjacent cities and towns, and that he desired the immigration authorities to deport them, on the ground that they were in the country illegally and that they are engaged in bootlegging, committing all sorts of crimes, and are causing the police considerable trouble.

A few years ago I made an investigation in the anthracite-coal region of Pennsylvania. In one particular plant—the Lehigh-Wilkes-Barre Coal Co., which operates 14 collieries—I arrested 125 to 150 aliens, all of whom admitted that they were deserting seamen.

One hundred and twenty five to one hundred and fifty.

Furthermore, I conducted investigations in various railroad yards, and I arrested approximately 250 aliens who had entered from vessels without inspection, who were employed as strike breakers, taking the place of union shopmen who were then on strike.

Senator HARRIS. When was that? Last year?

Mr. HURLEY. A year ago last fall, I believe.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, this question of dealing effectively with the cases of deserting alien seamen is a big problem. It is a well-known fact that any of our officers can proceed to any of the large industrial plants in this country—and especially in the eastern part—and if he conducts a careful investigation can discover a large number of aliens who have entered illegally, many of whom will be found to have come to this country as seamen. I recently conducted an investigation of the alleged unlawful presence in Chicago, Ill., of a number of alien gunmen, and among

the 30 aliens who were taken into custody under warrants of arrest several of them admitted under oath that they came to this country as seamen and entered without inspection, remaining here illegally.

He then asked to insert in the record as a part of his testimony an article from the Chicago Daily Tribune entitled "Getting Rid of Murderers." I read now from that article:

Every respectable citizen of Chicago breathes easier and sends a vote of thanks to President Coolidge, Secretary of Labor Davis, the immigration authorities, and the city's own detective bureau. Twenty-one Sicilians, gathered up in the tough dives of the bootleg gangland, face deportation. One hundred others were taken into custody and were passed through the sifting process.

Still other scores, escaping the first dragnet, have packed their bags and fled the city. In one night Federal and local authorities did more to put down such gang murders as have become an unchecked mania in Chicago than all previous efforts put together.

And the end is not yet. More raids are promised, more grillings, and more deportation trials. Jeremiah Hurley, directing supervisor of immigration, is in Chicago at the head of six assistants, and he will stay until the situation is cleared up.

Deportation is the one thing the undesirable alien fears. He has learned he can beat the police and the court and the rope. Graft and pull reduce the hazard of being a hired killer to a minimum, and the pay is big. Taught in his native school of the Mafia and Camorra, the alien gunman makes nothing of committing a murder or half a dozen murders. He makes a trade of it.

How these alien murderers got into the country will do for the next step. Chicago is interested now in getting them out of the country. It had to call in the Federal Government, appeal to the White House, to get the job done. It is grateful to the men who are doing it.

Then Mr. Hurley proceeds:

I do not know what can be done except to adopt some legislation that will tighten up the immigration laws so as to prevent a large number of inadmissible aliens, traveling in the guise of seamen, entering in violation of the immigration laws. * * *

From my experience in dealing with the officials of the International Mercantile Marine and the Cunard Line, I know it will not interfere with the operation of their vessels, for the reason that they are trying to do their very best to obey our laws.

I wish to say in passing, Mr. President, that the evidence before the committees at various hearings indicates that there are some vessels that do everything in their power to prevent mala fide seamen being employed upon them and entering our ports; I wish all vessels would pursue the same course; but the evidence shows, particularly during a number of years in the past, that there seems to have been but little regard upon the part of some of those in charge of vessels paid to the character of those whom they employ. The evidence also shows that many persons paid as much as from \$200 to \$1,100 to some one in order to be shipped into the United States upon vessels from foreign ports. Furthermore, evidence was offered indicating that \$1,100 were paid by some who came to the Pacific coast surreptitiously and in violation of the law, and from \$200 to \$400 were not infrequently paid by persons who sought illegal entrance into the United States and who shipped from European ports.

A great many came into the United States illegally as seamen, when they were not, from Mediterranean ports—hundreds and thousands of them—and are now to be found, or were to be found, in various ports of the United States, of course, taking the place of American workmen and contributing, as some of them did, to the criminal activities that have brought so much criticism upon our country.

But with the other steamship lines—

Mr. Hurley proceeds—

it is a real problem. On one vessel flying the Greek flag 185 crew men deserted out of a total crew of 350.

One of the provisions of this bill requires vessels departing from our shores to take with them as many seamen as they brought to our shores. Here is an instance where 350 were brought as seamen and the ship departed with only 165:

Eight of the deserters were marine firemen. With the Greek and Spanish lines we are in considerable trouble.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, this bill, if enacted into law, would not correct the evil about which the Senator is now talking. The immigration law permits bona fide seamen, no matter whether they can be naturalized in our country, no matter whether they are eligible to citizenship under our usual laws, to come in. The immigration law specifically exempts bona fide sailors. I will make reference to that section of the law, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. KING. May I inquire if my friend from New York contends that there are not deserting seamen who have come to our shores by the thousand and that the greater number of them are mala fide seamen?

Mr. COPELAND. So far as their intent is concerned, of course they were not bona fide seamen, but who can judge that except the man himself? However, the bill the Senator is advocating so eagerly and so eloquently, if passed, will not correct that condition in the least; the situation will be exactly the same, because the bill will permit a Chinese ship to come in manned exclusively by the nationals of that country, and under the immigration law those bona fide seamen of that Chinese ship would be permitted to go ashore.

Mr. KING. There is no question about that.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes. Then the Senator's bill is not in any sense an immigration bill, but relates only to the matter of restriction of the privileges allowed of the crews of vessels.

Mr. KING. The Senator must understand that in life we deal with realities. There is no Utopian land that my friend and I will reach before we pass to the Great Beyond.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator from Utah will permit me to say so, perhaps no one in the Senate better understands that fact than I do.

Mr. KING. As a doctor and a philosopher the Senator does.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I inquire if the Senator from Utah desires to pursue his argument further at this time?

Mr. KING. I will yield to the Senator in order that an executive session may be had, as I understand that is the program.

Mr. McNARY. That is the intention a little later, but in the meantime I understand the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] desires to submit a conference report, if the Senator from Utah will be kind enough to yield.

Mr. KING. I yield the floor for the present.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JONES submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6660) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 16 and 24.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, and 45, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 6, 7, and 8 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$90,000, of which sum \$70,000 is made available for the payment of salaries in the District of Columbia" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In

lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"OFFICE OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PUBLIC PARKS OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

"Mount Vernon Memorial Highway: Not to exceed \$4,000 of the appropriation 'Salaries, maintenance, and care of buildings, 1932,' and \$10,000 of the appropriation 'General expenses, maintenance, and care of buildings, 1932,' contained in the independent offices appropriation act, fiscal year 1932, are hereby made available for the fiscal year 1932, for the maintenance of the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway and other Federal lands authorized by the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 432)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"The amount authorized to be deducted from appropriations for the fiscal year 1932 for the Indian Service and placed to the credit of the appropriation for contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, for the purchase of stationery supplies, is hereby increased from \$50,000 to \$55,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Traveling and miscellaneous expenses: The Secretary of the Treasury, upon request of the Attorney General, is authorized to transfer to the appropriation 'Traveling and miscellaneous expenses, Department of Justice, fiscal year 1932,' not exceeding \$12,000 from any other appropriation for the fiscal year 1932 under the control of the Department of Justice."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment after the numerals "1931" in line 10; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Navy Department, except the claim of Harry D. Simons as set forth on page 7 of said Senate Document No. 46, \$1,711.88."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"War Department, except the claims of Dee Tian and Judge Anacleto Diaz as set forth on page 25 of said Senate Document No. 46, \$2,550.70."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$37,107"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42,

and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 7 and 8 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the words "independent offices" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "United States Shipping Board"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 15 and 23.

W. L. JONES,
FREDERICK HALE,
HIRAM BINGHAM,
CARTER GLASS,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
J. P. BUCHANAN,
WILL R. WOOD,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

THE GOLD STANDARD AND BRITISH TRADE

Mr. McNARY obtained the floor.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may send to the desk and ask to have read a short letter from M. H. Dodge?

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

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I send the letter to the desk and ask that it may be read.

There being no objection, the letter was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., January 22, 1932.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,

Senator from Montana, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have just received a copy of a newspaper, The Samachar, from Zanzibar, Zanzibar Island, issue of November 22, 1931, that contains an article that we believe will be of interest to you. We take pleasure in quoting the article.

"THE GOLD STANDARD AND THE BRITISH TRADE

"Proofs are accumulating to show that the suspension of the gold standard in England has given an extraordinary push to British trade and industry in general. The Manchester Association, of Importers and Exporters, Reuter says, have sent a statement to the Premier, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and president of the board of trade urging that the Government should give an assurance that there is no present intention of returning to the gold standard. It is a conundrum for economists. The fall of the sterling led to the suspension of the gold standard in England. But this fall at once reduced the prices of British manufacturers by 20 to 25 per cent and placed British manufacturers at a great advantage as compared with the other manufacturing countries of the world with whom Britain was up to now unable to compete owing to her goods being much costlier. The result is that unemployment is getting reduced by leaps and bounds, as claimed by the new national Government, and all the business centers of Great Britain are humming with business activity. The boycott of Japanese goods in China has also come in handy. No wonder that the said Manchester association should be eager for an announcement by the Government that the gold standard would not be resumed, at least at present.

"All this leads to the shrewd suspicion that this suspension of the gold standard and such other steps taken of late by Great Britain were a very clever ruse—a very well-staged play—to find a way out of the recent falling off in British trade and industry under the camouflage of the financial stringency, which it is claimed led the British Government to adopt the said measures to stave off further fall in sterling and to balance the budget, and so on. Whatever it may be, the suspension of the gold standard has undoubtedly done an immense good to British trade."

It is certain many heartily approve of your bill relating to the remonetization of silver, but few will take the trouble to tell you so. More power to you in your good work.

Yours respectfully,

THE TANGLEFOOT CO.,
(THE O. & W. THUM CO.),
M. H. DODGE,
Foreign Sales Manager.

P. S.—Many believe that unless such action is taken it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to recover our export trade.—M. H. D.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. McNARY. At the request of several Members who are absent, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Couzens	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.
Austin	Cutting	Jones	Robinson, Ind.
Bailey	Dale	Kean	Schall
Bankhead	Davis	Kendrick	Sheppard
Barbour	Dickinson	Keyes	Shipstead
Barkley	Dill	King	Smith
Bingham	Fess	La Follette	Smoot
Black	Fletcher	Lewis	Steiwer
Blaine	Frazier	Logan	Stephens
Borah	George	Long	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Glass	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Glenn	McKellar	Townsend
Broussard	Goldsborough	McNary	Trammell
Bulley	Gore	Metcalf	Tydings
Bulow	Hale	Morrison	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Harris	Moses	Wagner
Capper	Harrison	Neely	Walcott
Caraway	Hatfield	Norbeck	Walsh, Mass.
Carey	Hawes	Norris	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Hayden	Nye	Waterman
Coolidge	Hebert	Oddie	Watson
Copeland	Howell	Patterson	Wheeler
Costigan	Hull	Pittman	White

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order.

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

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, the nomination of General Dawes for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the nominations of the other members have been approved by the Committee on Banking and Currency and the reports have been handed in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. They have been handed in.

Mr. NORBECK. I desire at this time to ask unanimous consent to take up the nomination of General Dawes.

Mr. HARRISON. Will not the Senator ask that all of them be considered by unanimous consent?

Mr. NORBECK. Certainly. I thought I would take one at a time.

Mr. HARRISON. I see. The Senator, then, intends to follow his request by asking unanimous consent to consider the others?

Mr. NORBECK. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I desire to enter an objection. I do not think we ought to be hasty in confirming nominees for such important positions as those to which these gentlemen have been appointed. Therefore, I think the matter should take its regular course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will remain on the calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the calendar is in order.

TREATY

The Chief Clerk announced Executive KK (70th Cong.), a treaty of friendship, commerce, and consular rights between the United States and Norway, signed at Washington on June 5, 1923, and an additional article thereto signed at Washington on February 25, 1929.

Mr. McNARY. In the absence of the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], I ask that the treaty go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the treaty will go over.

FEDERAL FARM BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank Evans, of Utah, to be a member of the Federal Farm Board.

Mr. McNARY. I ask that the nominations for the Federal Farm Board go over for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, they will go over.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION—WILLIAM E. HUMPHREY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William E. Humphrey, of Washington, to be Federal trade commissioner for the term expiring September 25, 1938.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I made inquiry yesterday as to whether hearings had been held on this nomination, and I was advised that they had been held. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee who reports the nomination what developed in those hearings.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, the full Committee on Interstate Commerce held hearings on the question of the confirmation of Mr. Humphrey. Everyone who asked for an opportunity to be heard was heard. So far as I understand, the principal objections made to Mr. Humphrey were not sustained, because there seemed to be a misunderstanding. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was at the hearings; and, as I recall, while I was not present all the time, Representative PATMAN conceded that the charges that he had in mind did not apply to Mr. Humphrey, or at least not exclusively to him.

After the hearings had exhausted themselves, the committee reported Mr. Humphrey's nomination favorably. As I recall, the only objection on the part of those present was raised by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART]. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] was not present, although I understood that he had some objection to Mr. Humphrey's confirmation. Outside of that, there was no objection from the committee.

The hearings were extensive. They were not printed, but they are available to anyone. The reason why they were not printed was because it did not seem to be necessary, and they are available to anyone who may desire to read them.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I held the nomination of Mr. Humphrey up in the committee and it developed in the hearing that when Mr. Humphrey was first appointed upon the Federal Trade Commission he was and had been attorney for some of the lumber interests of the northwestern part of this country. In other words, he had been a lobbyist for them here in Washington.

He was appointed on the commission, however, and served on the commission at least one term, and since he has been on the commission matters relating to the lumber industry have been assigned to him. It is quite natural that that should have been done because he was a lobbyist for them prior to the time he was put on the commission.

Whether he has acted unfairly since he has been on the commission with reference to those interests I am unable to say, but it is quite in keeping with the policy of the present administration and of the previous administration to appoint lobbyists on these commissions to take care of the industries which the commissions were created to look after.

Mr. President, in addition to that Mr. Humphrey represented Mr. Blair Coan, who, the Senate will remember, was sent out to Montana with the idea of "getting" both my colleague and myself. He did appear for him, and I am told he received a fee of only \$200. That was previous to the time he was put upon the commission, however.

In addition to that, I think it must have been quite evident to many who heard the testimony before the committee that Mr. Humphrey was, to say the least, not entirely competent for the position to which he has been appointed. Outside of that he is all right, and I am afraid that if somebody else is appointed, we will get some one just as bad as he is.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] has already made a statement with reference to what transpired in the committee with regard to the hearings. I am not a member of the committee, but I was present. As suggested by the Senator, the particular matters which were called to the attention of the committee by a Representative from my State seemingly were satisfactorily explained, so far as that Representative was concerned.

I want to indicate my opposition to the confirmation of Mr. Humphrey, because I regard him as not qualified by his

past associations, or by his outlook, properly to represent the public on the Federal Trade Commission. One of the chief functions of that body is to investigate and correct trade practices of the great corporations and other commercial interests of the United States. I do not regard Mr. Humphrey as being in sympathy with the spirit of the law establishing the commission. I regard him as one who is in sympathy with the identical interests he is supposed to correct and regulate through the Federal Trade Commission.

I refer particularly to the matter of the adoption by various industries of what are known as trade practices. I believe that many of those trade practices, frequently initiated by the industries and approved by the Federal Trade Commission, become the shield behind which such industries violate the antitrust laws. They become a refuge rather than an instrument of correction and regulation by the Federal Trade Commission.

I was not a Member of this body at the time, but I recall when Mr. Humphrey was first appointed to the Federal Trade Commission. I did not then regard him as qualified, if we are to consider the public interest, for that position. I remember that shortly after his appointment as Federal trade commissioner he made a public address, in which he indicated, in effect, that under his administration business was to have a free hand, that business was not to be interfered with by the Government, clearly implying, of course, that big business, in the respects in which the Federal Trade Commission was supposed to regulate it and correct its abuses, was not to be annoyed and harassed by the commission under his direction.

I refer particularly, among other trade practices and conference agreements adopted, to that of the oil industry. In the hearings Mr. Humphrey stated that he did not vote for that trade conference agreement, but the facts developed that while he had not voted for the first trade practice agreement in the petroleum industry, because he was absent at that time, he had on a subsequent occasion, when a new trade conference agreement on petroleum had been presented, voted for it, and that is the trade conference agreement being observed now by the oil companies throughout the United States.

In view of the report of the committee, opposition may be futile, but I want to register my vote against the confirmation of Mr. Humphrey.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I would be satisfied on this occasion to have a roll-call-record vote to register my vote against this confirmation and to say nothing about it, because on a former occasion, when Mr. Humphrey was first appointed, I went into some detail as to why I felt I could not vote for his confirmation. I do not care to go into that now, as it is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I feel now as I did then. I think I stated on the former occasion—and if I did not I want to state now—that I am moved in my opposition to Mr. Humphrey's confirmation by no personal feeling whatever against Mr. Humphrey. It just happened that my first election to Congress was to the Fifty-eighth Congress, and Mr. Humphrey came to the same Congress, and we were inducted into office at the same time.

In those days in the House of Representatives, under a very long established practice, newcomers were expected to, and did, remain quiet for quite a while. I see my friend the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] smiling at that assertion. If he wants to contradict it, I will yield to him now.

Mr. WATSON. I am in entire agreement with the Senator, and both the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Indiana religiously observed the custom.

Mr. NORRIS. In fact, if we did not religiously observe it we were put out of church pretty quickly. We found that that was the only way to get along.

I mention this only to show that newcomers flocked by themselves; they were in a class by themselves, and therefore those who came in at the same time usually became very well acquainted. So I became very well acquainted with Mr. Humphrey. I hope I am not stretching the truth a particle when I say that we were very good friends, and, as far as I know, we have always remained personal friends since.

Mr. President, I think Mr. Humphrey is not constituted in a way that qualifies him for the position to which he has been appointed. He possesses the ability; as far as I know, he is perfectly honest and reliable, but his viewpoint is such that it seems to me he never ought to be appointed to a position on the Federal Trade Commission, which body has to deal with practices of big corporations and unfair competition between corporations and the smaller fry.

I think Mr. Humphrey is perfectly conscientious in his viewpoint. At least, I have no information to the contrary, and I am assuming that that is true. I think he is a very good lawyer and would make an excellent showing trying a lawsuit. But in all the service I had with him, which extended over a good many years, in various controversies which took place in the House of Representatives between those who I thought were moved by machine control and boss influence in politics, there never was any doubt where Mr. Humphrey would land or where he would go or where he belonged. Never in a single instance did he ever vary, so far as I know, in lining up where his friends, as well as his enemies, knew he would line up.

I agree entirely with what the Senator from Texas has said. I get my idea from my own personal knowledge, and while I realize that Mr. Humphrey may be right in all controversies and I be wrong, nevertheless, holding the ideas which I entertain, I would not for a moment consider a man with the viewpoint of Mr. Humphrey for a position of this kind. There are other positions which I think he would be perfectly well qualified to fill, and I would be glad to support him for such positions if he were nominated for them.

The Senator from Texas referred to trade organizations. I do not want to criticize those who believe in such organizations and in their practices. They may be all right. In my judgment, they are all wrong, a hundred per cent wrong.

No one is a more outstanding representative of those organizations, no one believes in them and the various methods to which they have resorted, which, in my judgment, result always in a circumvention of law, than the President himself, who has made many speeches, some of which I read on the floor of the Senate when he was Secretary of Commerce; he always being called upon to deliver the key speech whenever these great organizations met. So he selected a man for this position who I think agrees with him entirely from an economic point of view.

I concede, of course, that people who have such views have just as good a right to them as I have to mine; that they may be right and that I may be wrong. I concede their conscientious convictions, but in my judgment the little man, about whom we ought to be careful and whose rights ought to be guarded with jealous care, never gets a square deal when he comes into court or comes before a commission composed of men, however honest and able they may be, who hold such views.

For these reasons I am opposed to the confirmation of Mr. Humphrey. I wanted to say this much so that the RECORD might show, if there is to be no roll call, that I would vote against his confirmation.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think it is my duty to state that when Mr. Humphrey's name came up certain complaints were lodged against him by a Representative from Texas, Mr. PATMAN. He appeared in person and made specific charges. The gravamen of the charges was that certain combinations or certain organizations had come, at their own instance, as I understood, and asked to go before a member or members of the Federal Trade Commission and lay before them certain rules governing their practices and to get their approval by the Federal Trade Commission.

As to the specific points brought out by the Representative from Texas as being detrimental to competition, a certain combination killing competition, Mr. Humphrey categorically denied that he participated in them, stating that, on the contrary, he believed such combinations were destructive of helpful and legitimate competition and that he voted against them.

The chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce is present, and I would like to have his attention for just a

moment. I have made the statement that the charges which were brought by the Representative from Texas, Mr. PATMAN, specifically set out that Mr. Humphrey categorically denied that he voted for these practices which were proposed to be adopted, but contrary to his views. Am I correct or not?

Mr. COUZENS. That is my understanding, so far as it applies to the cotton industry.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I said the charges that were brought. Subsequently the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] asked certain questions in reference to the oil industry. Mr. Humphrey was not as clear and specific with reference to his attitude toward the petroleum industry, but he left the impression on the committee by his denial and his statement that he was opposed to trade practices that look toward a suppression of healthful and legitimate competition. That was the general tenor of his attitude before the committee. He cited us to the record, which he states can be obtained at the Federal Trade Commission, as his vote and his attitude.

I felt that it was my duty to make this statement. I have known Mr. Humphrey only as a candidate for the position he now occupies and very casually as a member of the commission, but I was very much surprised, when the charges were brought, at the frankness with which he denied them and seemingly satisfied Mr. PATMAN, the Representative from Texas.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I know how utterly futile it is for me to rise and undertake to oppose the confirmation of any of these nominations. However, I want to take this opportunity to place myself on record with reference to the policy of the administration and its members in reaching out into the affairs of every industry supposed to be regulated in this country and appointing their representatives to sit on these bodies which are supposed to supervise their affairs. We have had our laws nullified by the activities of appointees of this kind. It seems to be the unvarying custom of this and the previous administration, as it was exemplified in the case of a vacancy on the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court stood 4 to 4 on the valuation of the public utilities of the United States, and a vacancy was to be filled. The then acting administration, similar to the present administration, reached out and appointed as the ninth member of the Supreme Court of the United States one of the leading corporation attorneys of the country who had been maintaining the very view upon which the Supreme Court of the United States at that time was divided. Such appointments have nullified the Power Commission, they have nullified the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and have nullified the Trade Commission in the same manner. I intend to vote against the confirmation of every such man who seeks reappointment on these commissions.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary to say anything in regard to Mr. Humphrey in view of the fact that no charges have been sustained. I have known Mr. Humphrey for nearly 40 years, and I am glad to hear the statement here that there is really no question as to his honesty and his integrity. He and I may not always have agreed with reference to various propositions. When he was named before, I felt satisfied as to his honesty, his integrity, and his sincerity of purpose. I am glad that after six years of service there is no question raised in regard to those matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Mr. NORRIS. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAILEY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE], but I understand that he would vote, if present, as I propose to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr.

WATERMAN]. I understand that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I am free to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] during his absence. I find that I can transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS], which I do, and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am paired with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. I withhold my vote.

Mr. FESS. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent on official business.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the following-named Senators are detained on official business: The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW].

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays, 28, as follows:

YEAS—53

Ashurst	Davis	Jones	Smoot
Austin	Dickinson	Kean	Stelwer
Bailey	Dill	Kendrick	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Fess	Keyes	Townsend
Barkley	Glenn	Lewis	Trammell
Bingham	Goldsborough	McNary	Tydings
Broussard	Hale	Metcalf	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Harrison	Moses	Wagner
Capper	Hatfield	Oddie	Walcott
Carey	Hawes	Patterson	Watson
Coolidge	Hayden	Robinson, Ind.	White
Copeland	Hebert	Schall	
Couzens	Hull	Shipstead	
Dale	Johnson	Smith	

NAYS—28

Black	Cutting	La Follette	Norris
Blaine	Fletcher	Logan	Nye
Borah	Frazier	Long	Sheppard
Bratton	George	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Glass	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Bulkley	Gore	Morrison	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	King	Norbeck	Wheeler

NOT VOTING—15

Bankhead	Harris	Pittman	Stephens
Bulow	Hastings	Reed	Swanson
Caraway	Howell	Robinson, Ark.	Waterman
Costigan	Neely	Shortridge	

So the Senate advised and consented to the nomination of Mr. Humphrey as a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I ask that nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made. That completes the calendar.

TREATIES

Mr. BORAH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the following treaty and convention:

Executive A, Seventy-second Congress, first session, a treaty of friendship, commerce, and consular rights with Poland, signed at Washington on June 15, 1931; and

Executive FF, Seventieth Congress, second session, a convention of maritime neutrality, adopted on February 20, 1928, at the Sixth International Conference of American States at Habana, Cuba.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reports will be placed on the calendar.

The Senate resumed legislative session.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 252) to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to make an investigation as to the possibility of establishing a 6-hour day for railway employees, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

INCREASES IN CURRENCY CIRCULATION

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I have recently had some correspondence with Secretary of the Treasury Mellon requesting his views on a proposal to attach the circulating privilege to an additional issue of United States bonds, so that provision would be made for an increase in the national-bank circulation up to the authorized limit. I ask that this correspondence be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Senate and the public.

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

The correspondence is as follows:

JANUARY 15, 1932.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is being suggested in many quarters that further increases in currency circulation will contribute to the relief of the existing credit stringency. In this connection it is pertinent to observe that though the national banks of the country are permitted by law to issue national-bank notes, secured by Government circulation bonds, to an amount not exceeding their total paid-in capital, the existing national-bank-note circulation is considerably less than one-half of the possible authorized total.

On September 29, 1931, the date of the last call of the Comptroller of Currency upon the national banks for a statement of their condition, for which the figures are yet available, a total of 6,658 national banks reported total paid-in capital of \$1,656,374,000. On December 31, 1931, the total of the national-bank notes outstanding was reported as \$656,402,000. Here is a permitted margin on our bank-note circulation, roundly, of \$1,000,000,000 which is not at present being utilized.

Though the national banks theoretically may issue their bank notes to the limit of their paid-in capital, they are in fact greatly restricted in this privilege by reason of the fact that sufficient circulation bonds for this purpose are not available.

The Treasury statement of the public debt as of October 31, 1931, shows that the Government's circulation bonds, bearing 2 per cent interest, then outstanding totaled \$674,625,580. These comprised the so-called consols of 1930, issued in 1900, of which \$599,724,000 are outstanding, and the two issues of Panama Canal 2 per cent bonds, 1916-1936, of \$48,954,180, and 1918-1938, of \$25,947,400.

It is self-evident, therefore, that at the present time the national-bank-note circulation is held down below \$700,000,000, as compared with a possible \$1,650,000,000. It occurs to me that this situation offers the opportunity to increase substantially the currency circulation, if that be in fact desirable, and at the same time furnish a ready market for a substantial issue of Treasury bonds at a low coupon rate.

It would appear entirely possible to issue at this time circulation bonds, with a coupon rate of not over 2¼ per cent, totaling approximately a billion dollars, with the assurance that the national banks would absorb this issue, and by issuing their own bank notes, not only increase the currency circulation but in no wise impair their own cash position, since their own bank notes would offset their investment in the new issue of circulation bonds.

The Treasury by this operation could fund on a long-term basis, at a low interest rate, some of the present short-term indebtedness. Or if that were deemed inexpedient, the capital requirements of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which the Treasury is to be called upon to supply, to the amount of \$500,000,000, and the Treasury's contribution of \$125,000,000 of capital funds to the Federal land banks, could be safely and easily met by an issue of circulation bonds.

I shall highly appreciate information as to whether the Treasury deems such steps expedient and desirable; and, if not, the reasons therefor.

Respectfully yours,

DAVID I. WALSH.

HON. ANDREW W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, January 21, 1932.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of January 15, 1932, in which you ask my comment on the proposal to attach the circulation privilege to an additional issue of United States bonds, so that provision will be made for an increase in the national-bank circulation up to its authorized limit. This would mean additional bonds bearing the circulation privilege to the amount of about \$1,000,000,000.

There are now outstanding about \$675,000,000 United States 2 per cent bonds bearing the circulation privilege, and about \$665,000,000 of these bonds are deposited with the Treasurer of the United States as security for the issue of circulating notes by national banks. If \$1,000,000,000 additional bonds bearing the circulation privilege were made available and the coupon rate fixed at 2¼ per cent, the outstanding 2 per cent bonds would be adversely affected unless the tax rate on circulation were made to conform. Moreover, with a total of \$1,675,000,000 bonds outstanding bearing the circulation privilege, all with a coupon rate under the market, it would seem that unless all such bonds were used as security for the issue of national-bank currency the market for all these bonds would be adverse. I have no evidence before me that would warrant the belief that the circulation of national banks could be increased some \$1,000,000,000 even were it thought desirable.

The Congress, in the Federal reserve act, made provision for an elastic currency responsive to the requirements of business. In the present depression there has been no currency shortage, and although there has been a great increase in the currency outstanding, the Federal reserve system has met the increase without strain. If the suggestion conveyed in your letter were adopted, the total circulation of national banks might be increased, but in view of the existing provision for currency supply, any such increase would in all probability be offset through retirements of Federal reserve notes. I believe such a change would be unwise, as national bank circulation is not elastic, as is the case with Federal reserve notes, and is not immediately responsive to changing conditions.

If the country were confronted with a currency shortage, or if the established provision for currency supply were deemed inadequate, it might be urged with very good reason that, as an emergency measure, provision be made for increasing the national-bank circulation. I do not find the conditions now existing would warrant such action.

Very truly yours,

A. W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE NORTHWEST

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, for many weeks there has been a hearing going on in my State conducted by the governor which is of interest to all the farmers of Minnesota and, I am sure, of great interest to the farmers of all the agricultural States.

The hearing somewhat covers the ground of the fight that has been going on for 25 years between the cooperatives representing the farmers in an effort to cooperatively market farm products and the private grain exchanges.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech of the counsel in behalf of the Farmers Union pertaining to the hearing be printed in the RECORD.

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

CLOSING ARGUMENT OF TOM DAVIS, OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., COUNSEL FOR THE FARMERS UNION TERMINAL ASSOCIATION, IN THE HEARING BEFORE HON. FLOYD B. OLSON, GOVERNOR OF MINNESOTA, JANUARY 18, 1932

Your Excellency, a hearing without parallel in the history of this State has now come to a close.

A fraud—a colossal fraud—which has clutched at the throats of the farmers of the Northwest for 50 years has been dragged out into the light of day.

The chamber of commerce and the grain gamblers of the Nation are now on trial before you.

For years the farmers of this country have been fighting for economic justice and for a marketing system which would protect them from the unjust and gigantic tribute exacted by the grain gamblers of America.

For the first time in our history, laws have been enacted for the purpose of enabling the farmers and producers to market their products and to sell their grain on a nation-wide scale without paying tribute to grain gamblers, boards of trade, and chambers of commerce all over this country.

These selfish interests could not stop the passage of such laws, and they were passed as a result of the efforts of the Farmers Union Terminal Association and some other cooperatives and farm organizations.

When these laws were passed, those interests which had enjoyed the privilege of making a profit out of the needs of the farmers realized that if this movement were successful the most gigantic graft of the ages—the robbery and despoliation of the farmers of America—would be forever at an end.

The chamber of commerce and the grain gamblers knew that honest men were at the head of the Farmers Union Terminal Association. They knew that millions of dollars were brought into this Northwest area for the benefit of the farmers, the business men, and the small bankers through the efforts of the Farmers Union Terminal Association and other cooperatives. They realized that the cooperative movement was going to be a success. They

knew they could not successfully attack the program of the Farmers Union Terminal Association in the open.

A CAMPAIGN OF FALSEHOOD

The chamber of commerce and the grain gamblers have resorted to a campaign of propaganda and falsehood against the Farmers Union Terminal Association and the cooperative movement. This proceeding is a part of that campaign and the most glaring example of their corruption, their perfidy, and their dishonesty.

The ostensible purpose of this proceeding was an effort upon the part of Senator Mullin to remove the railroad and warehouse commission of Minnesota because of certain acts falsely charged against the Farmers Union Terminal Association.

The real purpose was to destroy the cooperative movement and to destroy the faith of the people in the laws which have been enacted for their benefit. The Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis did not dare to bring these proceedings in their own name and they have used Senator Mullin as a smoke screen to assist the grain gamblers in destroying the cooperative movement. They never expected, and do not now expect, to remove the railroad and warehouse commission in this proceeding.

Throughout all these tedious proceedings, the pretended purpose of which was an attack upon the honesty and integrity of one of the best friends the farmers of Minnesota ever had—the Hon. O. P. B. Jacobson—the real purpose and the real people stand out as clear as day.

The men and women on the farms, in the factories, and homes of Minnesota can follow with ease the slimy, crooked trail which like a serpent runs through all these proceedings.

That trail, your excellency, leads to the door of the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis.

This proceeding was initiated by the chamber of commerce. It reeks with the perjury and fraud of officials and employees of the chamber of commerce. It has but one purpose and one objective, and that is to destroy the cooperative movement in the Northwest.

ATTACK AIMED AT FARM BOARD

This pretended attack upon the railroad and warehouse commission is, in fact, an attack upon the Farm Board. It is an attack upon the marketing act. It is an attack upon the Grain Stabilization Corporation—all under the dishonest guise of a silly attempt to get you to remove the railroad and warehouse commission.

This is a result which relator and his attorneys never hoped to attain.

This is a result which would stamp these proceedings as pure politics and as partisan propaganda.

This the Governor of Minnesota will never be a party to.

This the ruler of our sovereign State will never lend his hand to. And why?

Because the charges made by relator have not been proven.

Because the evidence relied upon by relator and his attorneys to bolster their tottering tissue of falsehoods reeks with fraud, with cunning, with conniving, and the rankest perjury ever known in any proceeding, judicial or otherwise, in the history of our State.

Because the chamber of commerce, and it alone, is responsible for and initiated this hearing in an effort to discredit the marketing act.

Because the grain gamblers would use your high office to strike at the one law, the Federal marketing act, which gives to the producers and farmers of this Nation hope for economic justice and fair dealing.

The Farmers Union Terminal Association came into this hearing to answer, not only the false charges against the Farmers Union Terminal Association but the dishonest attack against the marketing act.

The Farmers Union Terminal Association came into this hearing to call the bluff of the chamber of commerce and to drag them out into the light of day where the people of Minnesota and this Northwest can see the fraud, the corruption, the deceit, the treachery of this octopus which has strangled the farmers and producers and which now seeks to destroy the laws which were enacted for their benefit.

We now demand that the chamber of commerce be put where they belong before the people of this Nation.

The Farmers Union Terminal Association came into this hearing because they wanted to, and not because they had to.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PLOT UNCOVERED

The chamber of commerce came into this hearing, not because they wanted to but because they had to. We dragged them in by their heels and held them up so that the people could see once and for all who the real crooks and the real thieves are.

Some of their officials have perjured themselves before the governor of this State in an effort to protect the chamber of commerce in this dirty transaction.

When these charges were first made and first laid before your excellency they were heralded from the front pages of the newspapers of the Northwest, and there was created in the minds of the people the false notion that the Farmers Union Terminal Association had been guilty of misconduct.

How utterly these charges have fallen, and yet how shamelessly have the interests desiring to destroy a cooperative organization persisted in trying to poison the public mind against men and against an institution that are giving the best that is in them for the welfare of the farmers of this Nation.

Sitting in the background and spending the money of the chamber of commerce and the grain gamblers in an effort to put across this kind of a deal are Mr. McHugh, the secretary of the chamber of commerce, and his assistant, Eddie Hughes, the runaway witness who was afraid to face the music and tell the truth.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PAID THE BILL

These were the men who furnished the ammunition for this dastardly, dishonest attack against the Farmers Union Terminal Association, the marketing act, the Grain Stabilization Corporation, and the Farm Board.

Not a single one of their charges has been proven; not a single one of their aspersions and privileged libels and slanders has been established.

In order to bring this proceeding to remove the railroad and warehouse commission, it was not necessary for relator and his counsel to make unjust and dishonest charges in their petition against the Farm Board, the Grain Stabilization Corporation, and the marketing act.

Only one interest could profit by creating in the minds of the people a distrust of the marketing act and of the agencies set up to give relief to the farmers of the Northwest. That interest is the grain gamblers of this Nation.

We intervened because these charges were leveled at an organization that has fought the farmers' battles. Because the real purpose back of this proceeding was to tear down the faith of the farmers and the people in the Farmers Union Terminal Association.

This was the result which the chamber of commerce and the grain gamblers hoped to accomplish.

This is the first shot in a battle which must go on until the farmers of this Nation, through laws and through organization, have the right to market their products without becoming the victims of the chamber of commerce or the grain gamblers of this land.

The Farmers Union Terminal Association is a cooperative organization, owned and controlled by its stockholders, who are farmers and producers. They, and they alone, elect their board of directors who, in turn, elect their officers.

It is an organization in which every stockholder has a voice and its purpose has been and will be to give to the farmers some real service in the marketing of their products.

These proceedings, with McHugh, of the chamber of commerce in the background, were intended to destroy the names and reputations of not only elected public officials but of men and of organizations who are honestly and sincerely fighting for the public welfare.

No name has been too sacred, no reputation too honored, but what it has been attacked by those responsible for this proceeding.

CHARACTER ASSASSINS

The chamber of commerce desires above all else to destroy the faith of the people in Mr. Huff, the president of the Farmers National Grain Corporation, and in Mr. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Terminal Association. The grain gamblers know that the ability and integrity of these two men are unquestioned. They know that the farmers of the Northwest are fully aware of the sacrifices and the hardships these men have endured and of the work they have done in behalf of the producers.

The institutions which can profit most by destroying the faith of the people in these loyal and able servants are the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis and the Chicago and Duluth Boards of Trade.

Let us analyze the charges contained in relator's complaint.

The one thought that should be constantly kept in mind is this: If these ridiculous charges made against the Farm Board, the Stabilization Corporation, and the marketing act were proven, who could hope and expect to profit by such a contingency? None could hope to gain or profit by such a result but the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis and the grain gamblers of this Nation.

THE MARKETING ACT

On page 1 of petitioner's complaint we find an allegation quoting the marketing act. Now, it may be said that these allegations and others contained on some five pages of this so-called complaint were essential to a proper understanding and presentation of this matter. But counsel for relator are insisting that you remove the railroad and warehouse commission for certain illegal acts. If they should be removed for illegal acts, it would make no difference whether such acts charged against the commission had been committed by a cooperative organization or by a member of the chamber of commerce.

Why are these things in the complaint?

Who wanted them there?

What have they to do with the specific charges of wrongdoing?

These charges have nothing to do with this proceeding. The broadcasting of these charges, dishonest as they are, constituting the most baseless slanders ever set on foot, can do only one thing and that is to cause the people to lose faith in their Government and in the laws passed for the good of all instead of for the profit of the few.

After particularly alleging the set-up of the Farm Board, the Stabilization Corporation, the Farmers National Grain Corporation, and the Farmers Union Terminal Association, relator proceeds to make wholesale charges, which are false, as to the officials of these organizations.

Not a shred of evidence has been produced to sustain any charge of wrongdoing on the part of these organizations. The only purpose of these charges was to benefit the chamber of commerce

and the grain gamblers. They alone profited by the broadcasting of these charges.

I call your excellency's attention to one allegation reading as follows:

"There is outstanding subscribed stock of the Farmers National Grain Corporation with a par value of \$640,000, of which some 10 per cent, or \$64,000, has been paid for in cash and notes taken for the balance. This corporation, with only \$64,000 of paid-in capital stock, made a net profit in 1930 of \$666,000 after all expense of operation, salaries, etc., were deducted. This sum represents largely commissions paid to the Farmers National Grain Corporation, as agent of the Grain Stabilization Corporation, comes out of the \$500,000,000 revolving fund and hence out of the taxpayer."

An attempt was made by relator to prove this charge.

What relator's counsel failed to state and what they have been unwilling apparently to prove is that the compensation paid to the Farmers National Grain Corporation for the handling of grain was the same commission that was paid to the private grain concerns and members of the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis and the Duluth Board of Trade.

PRIVATE ELEVATORS ALSO PROFIT FROM STORAGE

It will interest you to know that numerous elevator companies in Minneapolis, Duluth, and in Chicago were paid the same commission as was paid the Farmers National Grain Corporation for the handling of grain for the Grain Stabilization Corporation.

What the grain gamblers are complaining about is that the Farm Board and the Grain Stabilization Corporation allowed a cooperative to handle grain.

The Farmers National Grain Corporation, a cooperative, functioned so efficiently and so well for the interests of the producers that these commissions were lost to the grain gamblers.

What the grain gamblers wanted was a monopoly and not competition.

What they got was competition, and plenty of it.

The profits made by the Farmers National Grain Corporation revert back to the cooperative organizations who own and control the stock in the Farmers National Grain Corporation, and, in turn, these profits are returned to the cooperative elevators and the individual farmers.

The people are not complaining about this. There was no occasion to set forth these charges in the complaint of relator except that it was desired by the chamber of commerce in an attempt to discredit the marketing act.

On page 4 of their complaint they again set forth a charge that profits were made by the Farmers National Warehouse Corporation in the city of Duluth, Minn., by the storing of grain.

But counsel for relator offered no evidence to sustain this charge.

The Railroad and Warehouse Commission of Minnesota had no jurisdiction over such matters. It was not necessary, in order to hear the charges in the present matter, to refer to these things. It was done with a desire to create a false impression and poison the public mind. Such a result could benefit only the chamber of commerce and the grain gamblers. The taxpayers are not complaining about this. The farmers know it is for their benefit. The cooperative elevators receive their proportionate share of these profits, and what every farmer should do is to join the Farmers Union Terminal Association and help in seeing that the marketing act remains as a law in this country so that these farmers and farmer-cooperative elevators can get these profits which have always been gobbled up by the grain gamblers.

And again, for the benefit of the chamber of commerce, relator further states:

"The agricultural marketing act requires that the members of the Federal Farm Board shall not actively engage in any other business, vocation, or employment and fixes the salary of such members at \$12,000 per year.

"The Federal Farm Board, however, permits the Farmers National Grain Corporation and its allied Grain Stabilization Corporation to pay its officers and managing agents salaries greatly in excess of this sum."

This has nothing to do with the matter before your excellency. It is a matter within the control of the Farmers National Grain Corporation. They have the right to decide what salaries to pay their officials. The Federal Farm Board and the Railroad and Warehouse Commission of Minnesota have no jurisdiction over such a matter.

Again relator states:

"George S. Milnor receives a salary of \$50,000 per year and the other officers in proportion, which sums, together with the net profit of \$666,000 shown on the books of the Farmers National Grain Corporation, are paid out of the so-called revolving fund."

SALARIES? SUCCESS IS WHAT HURTS THEM!

There is a limit to one's credulity and there is a challenge to one's intelligence, and in the charge above quoted both of them are attained. Granting that Mr. Milnor receives a salary of \$50,000 per year as general manager of the Farmers National Grain Corporation, what has it to do with these proceedings?

The Farmers National Grain Corporation handled a business last year of 391,000,000 bushels of grain, with a net profit to the producers of two and one-half million dollars. Many a general manager and officer of corporations handling far less volume of business are paid greater salaries than was paid in this instance.

The salary paid to Mr. Milnor is but an infinitesimal proportion of the amount that the grain gamblers of this Nation have annually stolen from the farmers of this country.

A business running into hundreds of millions of dollars a year needs a general manager of ability and integrity. No one has ever questioned either the ability or the integrity of the general manager of the Farmers National Grain Corporation.

It is because he has succeeded too well. It is because Milnor and Thatcher and Huff have too well protected the interests of the farmer that the chamber of commerce is squealing. It is because Thatcher and Huff and Milnor can not be bought or bribed or bullied that the grain gamblers are whining and seeking to destroy the faith of the people in the only law passed for the protection of the American farmer, the marketing act.

The chamber of commerce is whining about the salaries of the officers of the Farmers National Grain Corporation but seem to forget the salaries paid by the millers and the private grain interests, running into millions of dollars, every dollar of which comes out of the pocket of the American farmer and not one penny of which ever gets back to him. It is the purpose of the cooperative movement to get this money back to the farmer and not let the grain gamblers keep it.

WHAT ARE PRIVATE GRAIN TRADE SALARIES?

Does the chamber of commerce think for a moment that the farmers of this country do not know that hundreds of men in the private grain trade draw salaries far in excess of any officers of any cooperative, and every dollar of this salary is paid by the American farmer and comes out of his pocket?

The Farmers Union Terminal Association and other cooperatives are giving these profits back to the farmer and producer. That is why the chamber of commerce is squealing.

The marketing act may need improvement. If necessary, I would join with you and every other progressive forward-looking man in seeing that teeth are put into that law that will more fully protect the American farmer and producer.

The one institution that doesn't want that law improved is the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis and its allied gamblers.

They want the law repealed and destroyed. They want the people of this Nation to lose faith in that law so that they, and they alone, can continue to rob, cheat, and defraud the farmers and producers as they always have.

It is charged that salaries are "paid out of the so-called revolving fund." This is another falsehood and its only purpose is to injure the marketing act—to benefit the chamber of commerce.

No effort was made to show that the salary of Mr. Milnor was paid out of the revolving fund or that it comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

All they desired was to make the charge, have it broadcast and headlined through the newspapers, and then slink away and hope that the damage had been done, not by proving anything but by merely making a dishonest and unfounded charge.

This is in keeping with the conduct of every character assassin throughout all time. Only men who profit by fraud, only men who resort to dishonesty, would make such a charge. Who is it that profits by fraud? Who is it that profits by dishonesty? Who is it that has profited by unfair dealing? The Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis and the grain gamblers of this Nation.

Now, Governor, what are the facts? Namely, this: The Farmers National Grain Corporation is a private corporation the same as any private corporation. It functions through officers, and in order to protect the interests of the farmer and the farmers' cooperatives who own and control the Farmers National Grain Corporation it must have men of experience, ability, and integrity, and they have such men at the head of that institution. Men who have defrauded no one but who have fought a decent, clean fight for the farmers. Their salaries are paid out of the profits they make and not out of the revolving fund.

WHO IS DOING THE COMPLAINING?

Is there anything wrong with such an institution? The only ones who are complaining are the chamber of commerce and the grain gamblers. They have been in the habit of taking all the profits and keeping them. Now, because a cooperative organization pays its officers salaries which are necessary in order to have the best men they can obtain to protect their interests, and then pay part of these profits back to the farmers and to the cooperatives, we find that the colossal thieves of the ages, the chamber of commerce and the grain gamblers, are whining and crying because they can not keep all the profits in their own pockets. They are crying and whining to high heaven because the farmers know that there is a profit in the handling of grain, and that, under the cooperative plan, the more liberal the laws are made the more those profits will come back to the farmer and producer. This is just what the chamber of commerce does not want. This is just why you have been compelled to sit here all these long weeks.

Let us turn to another charge, reading as follows:

"The declared policy of the Federal Farm Board is to make no loans to farmers or farmer elevator companies on their wheat who do not belong to or are not affiliated with its regional cooperative associations, such as the Farmers Union Terminal Association, the plan being to compel all producers, or their agents, to come into or be a part of its set-up and bound by its rules and regulations. The loan is made by the Farm Board to its national or regional association and by it to its members."

This statement is true, but the remarkable fact is that the very plan above outlined is what raised havoc with the grain gamblers. The policy above set forth and quoted is a good policy, and the Federal Farm Board should have the appreciation and support of every producer in the Nation for being big enough and fearless

enough to adopt such a policy instead of taking its orders from the grain gamblers and the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis.

That policy was for the purpose of breaking down a selfish monopoly in the handling of grain that has bled the farmers of this Nation out of their life's blood.

That is the policy the Farmers Union Terminal Association is fighting for, and every producer should support such a policy and should join this movement and uphold the hands of the officers of the Farmers Union Terminal Association, who are making this fight for the producers of this country. The grain gamblers and the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis are afraid that the farmers will realize and know the benefits which have already been obtained for the producers through the efforts of the Farmers Union Terminal Association.

EVERY FARMER SHOULD SUPPORT COOPERATION

Every farmer should join the Farmers Union Terminal Association without putting the organization to the expense of solicitation. The evidence brought out in this hearing should convince every farmer in this country that it is not only for his best interests but that it is his duty to join the Farmers Union Terminal Association and build up one great, powerful cooperative organization that will forever destroy the power of private monopoly and the citadel of privilege and give to the farmers that which is their right and for which they have been fighting for years—an honest, efficient, nation-wide marketing organization. If nothing else comes out of this hearing, you should be commended for having enabled the farmers to know what this fight is all about.

On page 5 of Relator's Complaint we find the following charge: "The Farmers Union Terminal Association, regional agent of the Farmers National Grain Corporation, through M. W. Thatcher, its general manager and active officer in charge of its operations, and assisted by L. M. Abbey and their subordinates, have put into effect in this northwestern wheat-growing area certain illegal and fraudulent practices for the purpose of swelling the profits of the Farmers Union Terminal Association for the purpose of creating a large fund for the payment of salaries, bonuses, and commissions to certain of its officers and agents."

This charge has not been proven. What was its purpose except to benefit the chamber of commerce and the grain gamblers and to attack General Manager M. W. Thatcher, of the Farmers Union Terminal Association, and to destroy the faith of the farmers in a man who has given every waking hour of his time for the past 25 years in behalf of the cooperative movement?

The grain gamblers hoped to destroy the good name and reputation of Bill Thatcher, whose loyalty to the cooperative cause is known throughout the Northwest.

THE OLD GAME OF ATTACKING LEADERS

The Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis and the grain gamblers would give a million dollars to ruin Bill Thatcher, and they have spent thousands of dollars spreading libels and lies against this man because they know that he is unpurchasable.

Throughout all of these years, while he has been fighting the battle of the farmers and the producers, he has been subjected to false indictments, to persecution, and through it all he has remained faithful and true to the cause of the producers and the toilers. This proceeding was inspired by McHugh in order to destroy a man who knows what this fight is about and who is able to whip the chamber of commerce.

WHEAT AND POLITICS

The charges made in this proceeding are on a par with the falsehoods and libels contained in a book entitled "Wheat and Politics," issued by one J. W. Brinton. The same purpose which actuated the writer of this book controlled the chamber of commerce in this proceeding.

When Eddie Hughes, the assistant secretary of the chamber of commerce, was on the stand he was asked this question:

"Have you ever read a book called 'Wheat and Politics'?"

His answer was:

"Yes; I have read it."

He was then asked:

"Do you know a man by the name of Henderson?"

And his answer was:

"No, sir. I don't know which Henderson you mean. I know a Henderson."

Counsel then said:

"The Henderson I mean is the man who went to Brinton and gave him \$2,500 for a thousand of those books."

How quickly counsel for the relator objected to this evidence.

Why was relator unwilling to let you know whether or not the chamber of commerce sent Henderson to buy these books?

Who else but the chamber of commerce would want a thousand copies of this trash?

It is a well-known fact that this book, issued by Brinton, has been sent to the managers of elevators all over this country and that statement after statement contained in this book refers to many of the charges set forth in relator's complaint.

The information upon which the charges in this proceeding were made was furnished to relator by the chamber of commerce.

Eddie Hughes tells us that he has read this book "Wheat and Politics," and if he doesn't run out of the United States, he may some day have to tell the people that he furnished Brinton the alleged information against the Farmers Union Terminal Association which is contained in this book.

BRINTON TRIED TO GET A JOB

Brinton, the man who wrote "Wheat and Politics," is a personal enemy of Thatcher. During the summer of 1931 he hung around

the offices of the Farmers Union Terminal Association begging for work, and when he couldn't get it he went out to destroy the Farmers Union Terminal Association and to lie about the man who refused to give him a job.

He has been as willing in his book "Wheat and Politics" to lie about Thatcher and the Farmers Union Terminal Association as Weiss has been willing to perjure himself on the stand.

This man makes the statement in his book that "the Thatcher organization committed a crime against the farmers and defrauded them when it bought the wheat, or it committed a crime and defrauded the Government when it sold this wheat—and it probably did both."

The above statement is the most contemptible falsehood ever uttered. Even the chamber of commerce could not stoop as low as this. And if the chamber of commerce will ever dare to make a statement like this, they will pay to the Farmers Union Terminal Association a million dollars for libel. I dare the chamber of commerce to make that kind of a statement.

Of course, it can be made by a man who is not financially responsible and who would not be worth the cost of the paper necessary to sue him.

Only the grain gamblers can profit by the sending out of this book. Every farmer and every elevator man who has received a free copy of this book must know that somebody who has an interest in destroying Bill Thatcher and the Farmers Union Terminal Association is responsible for sending out this book.

THE ROGUE'S GALLERY

The chamber of commerce should hire Brinton and put him in the same office and in the same room with McHugh and Eddie Hughes. What a pretty picture this would make for the farmers to look at.

If I had my way, I would hang this picture in every elevator in the land and I would put under this picture:

"Here is McHugh, who was enjoined by the Federal Trade Commission because of his practices against the equity cooperative exchange."

"Here is Eddie Hughes, who fled the State to protect the chamber of commerce."

"And, ladies and gentlemen, in the middle I want you to look upon J. W. Brinton, the man who begged Bill Thatcher for a job and who, when he couldn't get it, wrote a book in order to destroy the men who are now making a success of the fight against the grain gamblers of the country."

The cooperative movement is born of the sacrifices, the heartaches, the tears, and the toil of the men and women on the farms and fields of America. It is for them that I am talking to-day.

It is for the farmers that the cooperative organizations are fighting and it is the duty of every forward-looking man and woman to help establish a great cooperative institution for the marketing of the farmers' products to the end that their exploitation shall cease forever in America.

It is because the grain gamblers fear that the cooperative movement will become more of a success that they are moving heaven and earth to destroy this movement in its beginning.

WILL THE FARMERS UNDERSTAND?

It is to the interest of the farmers and producers to realize that these false and libelous attacks against Huff, Thatcher, and Milnor, and the other men who are leading the cooperative fight are spread throughout the newspapers of this land for the purpose of destroying the faith of the farmers in the best friends they have ever had.

This proceeding before your excellency is but a part of the concerted, well-organized propaganda that is being spread throughout this Nation against the Farm Board and against the Farmers Union Terminal Association in order to break down and destroy the marketing act.

The farmers must not forget when they read these attacks in the newspapers or in books like "Wheat and Politics" that the only interest which can gain by destroying their faith in the cooperative movement is the grain gamblers who have millions upon millions to stake in this fight and who have made millions upon millions of dollars out of the farmers of this Nation.

This is a fight between the grain gamblers, with unlimited millions at their command, and the farmers and producers of this land, who can only win with the success and triumph of the cooperative cause.

This is propaganda and a scheme to destroy the faith of the farmers in the cooperative movement. If this can be accomplished, then the grain gamblers will be back in the saddle and the farmers will pay the bill.

No wonder that the chamber of commerce would spend thousands of dollars in getting information upon which this proceeding is based.

No wonder that Eddie Hughes ran out of the State.

No wonder that he has read "Wheat and Politics" and is familiar with it.

No wonder is it that he didn't know which Henderson it was or whether it was the man who paid Brinton \$2,500 for a thousand copies of the book.

We are not afraid of this contest, and in spite of all the newspaper attacks and the paid propaganda that have been spread through the land, if the farmers will get the facts they will stand firmly back of the men and back of the organizations that are fighting their battles.

If the Farmers Union Terminal Association and the cooperative organizations of this country are successful, it means once and

for all the end of grain monopoly. It means that plunder and privilege and looting and stealing from the farmers of this land will be forever at an end.

THE SPECIFIC CHARGES

We now come to the so-called specific charges of wrongdoing against the Farmers Union Terminal Association.

Charge No. 1 is as follows:

"1. By charging its members and others a commission for the sale of grain when bought by itself for its own account.

"The Farmers Union Terminal Association is a commission merchant under the Minnesota statutes and holds a license from the State of Minnesota as such.

"Section 6204 of the General Statutes for 1927 reads:

"No person, persons, firm, or corporation, whether doing business in a chamber of commerce, board of trade, or elsewhere in this State, engaged in selling grain, etc., as commission merchant, or for others for a compensation in any manner, who shall hereafter receive or accept for sale for account of the consignor or owner thereof any such property, or who shall sell or attempt to sell or dispose of such property for account of such consignor or owner, shall hereafter be interested, directly or indirectly, as purchaser or otherwise than solely as the agent of such consignor or owner, etc."

"Section 6205 provides that any person who shall violate any provisions of this act shall upon conviction be punished by imprisonment or a fine, and that their license shall be void and that they shall be disqualified for two years from obtaining a new license.

"The Farmers Union Terminal Association has repeatedly violated this statute by charging a commission on the grain it has bought for itself and for grain it has bought for Farmers National Grain Corporation, whose agent it is."

This charge is false, and I would be inclined to say it was knowingly false. It is the charge of a crime against the Farmers Union Terminal Association, and if true the officers of the Farmers Union Terminal Association would have been long ago indicted.

This charge is the result of either abysmal ignorance or of cunning deceit.

It was broadcast through the land. It was headlined in the newspapers of the Northwest. Governor, what was its unholy purpose? Only one thing—to deceive and mislead the people. Whom, and whom alone, could it benefit? Only the miserable outfit who sponsored this proceeding, the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis.

THE OLD EQUITY FIGHT

The farmers of this country are well aware of the fact that the investigation by the Federal Trade Commission, made at the request of the Equity Cooperative Exchange, showed that in numerous instances cars of grain shipped by the farmers to Minneapolis were handled as many as 11 times by different commission firms and commissions or profits charged against the farmer's grain for every time it was handled by a commission firm.

Cooperative laws were passed in order to prevent this kind of a steal and to allow the cooperatives to keep control of the grain from the time it leaves the farmer's hands until it reaches the mill.

These laws were passed to put an end to the looting of the farmer. They were passed to make the grain gamblers quit their stealing.

The history of fraud and of dishonesty and of the looting of the farmers of the Northwest by the chamber of commerce is the very reason that section 6204, charged in relator's complaint, was enacted. It was passed in order to make the grain gamblers quit their stealing.

The Minnesota Legislature, in 1921 and 1923, passed laws specifically permitting a cooperative to sell grain to itself, and only in this way could the cooperatives carry out their program and benefit the farmer.

The above charge was dismissed at the very start of these proceedings, but the chamber of commerce had the benefit of having this charge headlined in the newspapers and circulated all through the country for the purpose of poisoning the minds of the customers of the Farmers Union Terminal Association.

Charge No. 2 reads as follows:

"2. By purchasing for itself grain shipped to it on consignment at less than the market price.

"It not only buys grain itself and charges a commission, but in many instances pays the shipper 2 cents per bushel less than the prevailing market price on that day."

An attempt was made to prove this charge. Eddie Hughes, assistant secretary of the chamber of commerce, was on the stand as a witness. It was he who pretended to furnish the evidence on which this accusation was based. He could have been asked if he knew of any instance where the Farmers Union Terminal Association ever bought grain below the market price. Why was he not asked this question? The charge was not proven, but again it is well known that the chamber of commerce was the party interested in making such an accusation.

MORE PROPAGANDA

This dishonest attack had been broadcast over the Northwest, creating suspicion and distrust against the Farmers Union Terminal Association and the cooperative movement, but after weeks of taking up the time of the governor and of the railroad and warehouse commission, he closes his case, "We move to dismiss this charge."

We now come to charge No. 3, reading as follows:

"3. By charging the local elevator a so-called 'service charge' of three-fourths of a cent per bushel on each bushel of grain in a local elevator on which the farmer had secured a storage ticket, and by virtue of which had made a loan from the Grain Stabilization Corporation, through the Farmers Union Terminal Association when delivery of that wheat was called for by Grain Stabilization Corporation, and was deducted from amount due the local elevator for storage and handling of said grain.

"In these cases Farmers Union Terminal Association performed no service whatever for the local elevator, and such deduction was illegal and fraudulent. Many of such deductions have been refunded on the insistence of the local elevator."

At the close of the evidence, relator's counsel also moved to dismiss this charge.

It was stated by the relator in the last paragraph of this charge that the "Farmers Union Terminal Association performed no service whatever for the local elevator, and such deduction was illegal and fraudulent."

This is a serious charge if true, and if false it is a serious indictment of the good faith of relator.

It was a false charge. It was not proven. But mark you, governor, this charge had been broadcast throughout the land. The evidence clearly showed that a service was rendered to the local elevator; that work of a substantial character was done to protect the interests of the local elevator, and that the charge was made because the Farmers Union Terminal Association was a member of the Duluth Board of Trade, and that the board insisted on that charge being made by its members.

These charges were refunded to those who remained loyal to the Farmers Union Terminal Association and the cooperative movement after the Farmers Union Terminal Association had repeatedly requested the Duluth Board of Trade to allow it to do so.

And the evidence shows that the profits made by this service charge, as well as all the profits made by the Farmers Union Terminal Association, are and will be refunded to the farmers and to the elevator companies in dividends to the stockholders, both preferred and common, and in patronage dividends to the shippers of grain.

On the other side of this picture, what do we see? We see that the chamber of commerce and the grain gamblers belonging to the chamber of commerce make this same charge, but they keep the money. They pocket the cash, and none of it goes back to the farmers or the elevator company.

The chamber of commerce are squealing like a stuck hog because they can not steal it all and keep it all. They are whining because the farmer gets some of it back. They are crying because the people now know how the tollers are cheated.

This is private business without governmental interference! This is the freebooter's license to rob the producer to the limit of the law! The palatial homes in Minneapolis and Duluth of the grain gamblers of this Nation represent these profits, and in these homes you will find the farmers' daughters working as menials.

THEY TAKE BUT NEVER GIVE

In this winter of '31 and '32 there are tens of thousands of farmers on the frozen prairies of Minnesota, North Dakota, and Montana who had lost all of their crops through the scourge of grasshoppers and because of drought.

Those farmers have not sufficient to keep body and soul together.

They are without the funds to pay school teachers and keep their schools open.

Their sons and their daughters have had to leave home and come to the city and rap at the doors of the homes and the factories and the workshops, begging for work in order to try and get something to help the folks back home.

All this while, Governor, we can see in the palatial homes in the cities of Minneapolis and Duluth and Chicago the self-satisfied members of the chamber of commerce and boards of trade. They are enjoying themselves off the profits they have made from the toil and the work of the farmers of this Nation.

While these farmers are fighting to keep from starvation, the grain gamblers and their families are spending the profits out of this unholy system of exploitation in California and in Florida.

While the farmer is swinging his pitchfork the grain gambler is swinging his golf clubs.

While the farmer is begging for bread the grain gambler is drinking his highball.

While the little children of the farmers are denied the chance of education the grain gamblers are hauling their children with private tutors through the Southland.

In this emergency and while the grain gamblers are trying to wreck the Farmers Union Terminal Association, that cooperative organization has assisted in sending more than 200 carloads of food and clothing into these destitute areas.

Thousands upon thousands of overcoats, suits of clothing, dresses, overshoes, shoes have been packed into these cars through the efforts of the Farmers Union Terminal Association and sent into this stricken area to all farmers, regardless of their membership in the Farmers Union Terminal Association.

WHO PREVENTED US FROM GETTING FREE FREIGHT FOR DROUGHT RELIEF

Governor, you know that many of the members of the chamber of commerce are stockholders in the railroads of this country, and when the Farmers Union Terminal Association wanted to ship a carload of vegetables to the starving people of Montana they had

to pay for every carload that was shipped from \$350 to \$700 freight charges.

The men at the head of the Farmers Union Terminal Association have been devoting their days and their nights not to making profits but to spending the profits that have been made in order to give some relief to the farmers of the Northwest. This is the organization that you are asked to destroy. The employees and officers of the Farmers Union Terminal Association have dug down into their pockets until it hurt and contributed thousands upon thousands of dollars of their personal funds in order to help carry on this program to save the farmers from starvation and from death.

While the grain gamblers are trying to wreck the Farmers Union Terminal Association, this organization is right now grinding 50,000 bushels of wheat into flour and giving it free of cost to the starving farmers of the Northwest.

And while the Farmers Union Terminal Association has been fighting the fight of humanity, what has the chamber of commerce been doing?

Why, Governor, they have been spending thousands of dollars to wreck this organization and to vilify and traduce the good name and the reputation of men who are willing to give of their time and of their money in order to save the farmers of the Northwest.

The most disgusting spectacle I have ever seen is the picture of the fat and self-satisfied profiteers leveling their mud batteries at men who are devoting their time for human need.

If the thousands of dollars that have been spent by the chamber of commerce and the grain gamblers to destroy the marketing act and to wreck the cooperative movement had been used to feed the starving farmers of the Northwest it would have resulted in the saving of human life and the alleviation of human suffering for thousands of suffering humanity.

Now we come to another charge. Charge No. 4 reads as follows:

"4. Excessive and exorbitant handling charges on grain covered by farm storage loans. A charge of 8 cents per bushel was deducted."

The Farmers Union Terminal Association is a cooperative organization owned and controlled by farmers and producers, and, it is true, it made an 8-cent charge to the farmers who borrowed money on the grain stored on their farms.

This claim that the charge was excessive was not proven, and at the close of the evidence relator's counsel moved to dismiss it. He should have been fair enough to have stated to you that it was a proper charge, an honest charge, and one which no honest man could criticize.

You will remember how day after day was taken up in the presentation of this matter, in the refutation of this false charge, and in showing you the history of the loan program which was carried on by the Farmers Union Terminal Association. It was a work which would merit the approval of every forward-thinking citizen.

THE 8-CENT CHARGE

The 8-cent charge made to the farmer for this loan consisted of what? Interest for the entire period of the loan; delivery charges paid to the local elevator or paid back to the farmer, if he loaded the grain himself; the cost of insurance and bonds; the expense of field men to inform the farmers as to the benefits of the program; expense of broadcasting and of public meetings and of the issuance of the Farmers Union Herald, which contained information enabling the farmer to understand just what this 8 cents was for.

In this connection I quote from the Farmers Union Herald for November, 1929, the following:

"Question. When the Farm Board made its announcement that a hundred million dollars would be made available to cooperative marketing associations for the purpose of stabilizing wheat prices it was also announced that the basic price would be \$1.25 for No. 1 northern, basis Minneapolis, and \$1.12 basis Duluth.

"In your published table the basic prices used are \$1.17 for No. 1 northern and \$1.04 for No. 1 durum.

"Answer. Eight cents are set aside and held in reserve for marketing expense. No one could tell exactly what the marketing expense would be; therefore, the Federal Farm Board wanted the figure placed high enough so no losses would be sustained in getting the grain to market. This 8 cents per bushel is divided into two parts, so far as the Farmers Union Terminal Association is concerned. An allowance of $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents is set aside for interest, insurance, operating, and sales expense. Three and one-half cents per bushel is set aside and held in reserve to be paid to country elevators to cover handling and loading costs. If the elevator ships the grain to us, the elevator will be allowed the $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents per bushel. If the elevator does not ship the grain covered by storage tickets on which we advance money to the Farmers Union Terminal Association, the elevator will not be paid anything and the $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents per bushel will be refunded to the grower.

"Q. Is the 8 cents which the Farmers Union Terminal Association allows for handling costs a 'fixed' charge?—A. No; it is merely estimated on a basis of safety. If we advance too much money to the grower, we will 'hold the bag' for the excess, so we have estimated costs on what we think is a fair margin. We guarantee that it will not be more; and if it is more, we lose."

Every farmer who made this loan knew all about this. This charge was approved by the Farm Board. It was not exorbitant but resulted in a loss to the Farmers Union Terminal Association.

Regardless of that loss, the Farmers Union Terminal Association is not complaining, because through this loan program they were able to get the farmers of the Northwest over \$10,000,000 on their wheat at the pegged price of \$1.25.

The farmer has not complained about this 8-cent charge because it benefited him and gave a service.

The evidence shows that the Farmers Union Terminal Association, in an effort to help the farmers through these times, inaugurated a loan program before the passage of the marketing act and were loaning money to the farmers up to approximately 70 per cent of the market value of their grain.

THE FARM STORAGE CALLS

The Farmers Union Terminal Association, realizing that the farmer was being robbed, started out in North Dakota and Montana to pass farm storage acts which would enable the farmer to store his grain on his farm and thereby save 1 cent per bushel per month. It took money to carry on this campaign, to get speakers, to hire halls, to pay for radio broadcasting, to meet the members of the legislatures of these States, and to pass these laws. This was a service rendered by the Farmers Union Terminal Association, and for that service they are entitled to the everlasting gratitude of every farmer in North Dakota and Montana.

The evidence of Mr. Thatcher clearly shows not only the fairness of the charge but the sincerity, the sacrifice, the effort, and the work that was performed by the Farmers Union Terminal Association in order to give to the farmers the benefit of this loan program.

WHAT THE FARMER PAID THE PRIVATE GRAIN TRADE

Before the Farmers Union Terminal Association and other cooperatives entered this field what did the farmer have to pay when he borrowed money on his grain? The farmer knows it was 8 per cent and more. He borrowed to the extent of 70 per cent of the market price of his grain and took a chance on that market price going down. If it went down, he pocketed the loss and the line elevators and the members of the chamber of commerce got their 8 per cent and got his grain.

Under his agreement with the Farmers Union Terminal Association, the farmer could not lose. He received a loan at the pegged price of \$1.25, and, after deducting freight and handling charges, if the grain was in Minot, N. Dak., he received approximately \$1 a bushel, even when the market price was 10 to 20 cents lower than the price he obtained.

If the price went up, he could sell his grain, pay the loan, and get the benefit of the raise in price. If the price went down, all that the Farmers Union Terminal Association could do was to take the grain and the loss was borne by the stabilization operations of the Farm Board.

Now, the Farmers Union Terminal Association borrowed 70 per cent or 75 per cent on this pegged price from the Federal Intermediate credit bank and borrowed the rest from the Federal Farm Board and gave as security the storage tickets for the wheat, whether the wheat was on the farm or in the elevator.

This was a benefit to the farmer and to the local merchant in the Northwest, for the farmer could get his money and if the price went up dispose of the loan and take his profit, and if the price went down, he had borrowed, through the Farmers Union Terminal Association, the full market value of the grain and in addition thereto the pegged price. That money, Governor, through the efforts of the Farmers Union Terminal Association, to the extent of over \$10,000,000, was left in the Northwest, spent with local merchants in this time of depression.

Let me give you an example of what the situation of the farmer was before the Farmers Union Terminal Association and other cooperatives had entered this field. We have, for instance, an old line elevator at Minot, N. Dak., with a capacity of 30,000 bushels. The farmer brings in his wheat. He receives a storage ticket and he is charged 1 cent per bushel per month storage charges.

ROBBED OF MILLIONS

Thirty thousand bushels is a small capacity, and what happens? The elevator at Minot ships this wheat into Minneapolis to a member of the chamber of commerce and, without the knowledge and consent of the farmer, it is sold on the market. In this procedure we can assume that at least 300,000 bushels of wheat is annually handled in this way by this elevator. This is an illustration of how millions of bushels are handled on each crop and the farmers have been robbed out of millions of dollars by this practice.

The farmer had to pay 1 cent per bushel per month on all of this wheat, which was not in storage so far as the grain gamblers were concerned but which was in storage so far as the farmer was concerned. When the farmer's wheat was sold in Minneapolis, a $1\frac{1}{2}$ -cent charge per bushel was made against him. The money received from the sale was held in Minneapolis, deposited in the banks there, and when the farmer wanted some money on his storage ticket, he went to the local bank or elevator and invariably paid 8 per cent for money on a storage ticket. In addition to this, he was paying 1 cent per bushel per month for storage for wheat that was not in storage.

Before the Farmers Union Terminal Association obtained the passage of these storage laws and entered upon this loan program, the farmer's grain was sold without his knowledge or consent. The market was glutted and the price depressed. The money was kept in Minneapolis and other cities where the terminal markets were located to the credit of the commission merchant and the farmer was still charged 1 cent per bushel per month for the storage of this grain which had been sold. And then when he borrowed money he was charged as high as 8 per cent interest for borrowing his own money.

This condition still obtains and that is what the Farmers Union Terminal Association is fighting against.

After the passage of the farm storage acts in North Dakota and Montana the farmer could keep his grain on the farm, save the storage charges, and get the benefit of this loan program.

The testimony in this case shows that through the efforts of M. W. Thatcher, the general manager of the Farmers Union Terminal Association, a pegged price was obtained for wheat on the Minneapolis and Duluth markets of \$1.25 per bushel for No. 1 wheat, and that this was 7 cents more per bushel than in any other market, which was a recognition of the value and quality of the wheat raised in the spring-wheat region and which brought several million dollars additional profit to the farmers of the Northwest.

WHY THE PEGGED PRICE WAS LOWERED

This price which the farmer was receiving would have remained where it was but for the complaints made by the milling interests, who were members of the chamber of commerce.

No wonder they hate Bill Thatcher! No wonder they want to wreck the Farmers Union Terminal Association!

As a result of these complaints by the millers the farmers suffered a loss of 5 cents a bushel.

It is the old, old story that whenever the people pass a law which takes away from monopoly the privilege of making a profit out of the needs of the people they squawk to high heaven. Governor, when these laws were passed and these agencies put into operation it took away from the grain gamblers of the Nation the privilege of making a profit out of the needs of the farmers. It is the intent and purpose of these laws to forever take away that privilege from the grain gamblers, and that is why they are squealing and hollering and resorting to the most contemptible methods ever known in the history of this Nation to discredit the marketing act.

Every law which has ever been passed which attacks privilege and which attacks monopoly in order to benefit the producers and the laborers has always met with the most vicious, dishonest, and unfair opposition of those who have that privilege and have that monopoly.

This was true when the parcel post law was passed, when the express companies had a monopoly and had a privilege of making a profit out of the needs of the people.

And for 20 years progressive men and women fought for the parcel post law, and for 20 years, through conniving, through fraud, through corruption of legislators, the express companies who had enjoyed this privilege opposed the passage of this law.

To-day every citizen realizes that while this law functions at the expense of the taxpayers of this Nation and that the expense comes out of the Treasury of the United States, that it is a benefit to the mass of people.

THE TRUE PURPOSE OF GOVERNMENT

The purpose of government is to serve the people and not private interests, and the fight that is being carried on now by co-operative organizations throughout this Nation is a fight against privilege, is a fight against monopoly, is a fight to take away from these monopolists the right to make a profit out of the needs of the people and to put these profits back into the hands of those who are entitled to them—the producers and the toilers of our land.

Every time an elevator or a farmer ships a carload of grain to the Farmers Union Terminal Association, the profits made from the handling of that carload of grain go back to the shipper in the form of a patronage dividend.

Every time he ships a carload of grain to the private grain dealers, any profit made in the handling of that grain stays in the pocket of the grain dealer.

The grain gamblers know that if they can injure and damage the Farmers Union Terminal Association and mislead the farmers so that they will not ship to the Farmers Union Terminal Association, that all of the profits made in the handling of this grain will be kept in Minneapolis, Chicago, or Duluth.

Every farmer who wants to increase his profits should ship his grain to the Farmers Union Terminal Association and help to build up an institution which will return hundreds of thousands of dollars in coming years to the farmers of the Northwest.

THE TWO PLUGGED CARS

We come now to charge No. 6, reading as follows:

"6. By 'plugging' cars of wheat and flax by putting 2 feet of screenings in the bottom of each car, the screenings being of no value."

The evidence shows that only two cars were so plugged. All that is necessary to say in regard to this is that the man who plugged these two cars was discharged by the Farmers Union Terminal Association, the man Weiss, the perjurer, the cheat, the fraud—the man who was sent to the Farmers Union Terminal Association by a member of the chamber of commerce.

The man who, when he was discharged, ran hot-footed to a member of the chamber of commerce, a brother of Senator Mullin. The man who then went to McHugh to give him an affidavit against the Farmers Union Terminal Association. And how gladly McHugh, the secretary of the chamber of commerce, received him into his arms.

We are conversant with the testimony of how these affidavits were drawn. We know they were inspired by McHugh and by members of the chamber of commerce.

We are fully aware of the perjury and brazen falsehood that was hurled into your teeth during these proceedings by this witness Weiss.

LAKEVILLE BLUNDER OF THE CHAMBER

And now we come to charge No. 7, reading as follows:

"7. By issuing illegal warehouse receipts at the Lakeville elevator."

No attempt was made to prove this charge. The making of it was a dishonest trick. It could benefit nobody but the chamber of commerce, and, after hearing the evidence in this case, you know that they are the parties who suggested it. Eddie Hughes, the vanishing witness, was the man who furnished this sort of testimony to Mullin and later admitted it was false, but still we find it in the charges. And when all the evidence is in, all we get is the bland statement that relator dismisses the charge.

Charge No. 8 reads as follows:

"8. By selling 20 cars of No. 1 Dark Northern wheat out of the Lakeville elevator, that warehouse receipts were outstanding on, that did not belong to it, and substituting inferior wheat therefor, and subsequently shipping out the inferior wheat under the warehouse receipts calling for No. 1 Dark Northern."

No evidence was offered to prove this charge. No attempt was made to establish it.

Who, Governor, could profit by the broadcasting of these charges except the chamber of commerce?

Who furnished this evidence? The answer is Eddie Hughes, the assistant secretary of the chamber of commerce. He furnished this evidence and later confessed it was false.

All of these charges which I have discussed were initiated by McHugh and by Hughes. They furnished the evidence, false as it was, which enabled relator and his counsel to broadcast the charges. I hope they deceived Senator Mullin. I know they deceived counsel for relator.

The reason that McHugh gave for drawing these affidavits and furnishing this testimony to Mullin and his attorneys does not ring true.

McHUGH HAS FOUGHT COOPERATION FOR YEARS

He is the same man who was restrained by the Federal Trade Commission from pursuing his nefarious tactics against the Equity Cooperative Exchange, and the evidence shows that 80 per cent of the paid-up members of the Farmers Union Terminal Association were formerly members of the Equity Cooperative Exchange.

He is the man among others that the Federal Trade Commission found guilty of the most contemptible acts, some of which are as follows:

"By means of boycott and threats of boycott the said chamber and the members thereof conspired and agreed among themselves and with others to induce its members and others to refuse to buy from, sell to, or otherwise deal with the said Equity Cooperative Exchange, its stockholders, or the members of the St. Paul Grain Exchange. The said respondents (including McHugh and the chamber of commerce) for more than 10 years last past have been engaged in a conspiracy and agreement among themselves and with others to annoy, embarrass, and to destroy the business of the said Equity Cooperative Exchange, its stockholders, and the St. Paul Grain Exchange and its members, with the purpose and the intent of the said chamber, its officers and members, to secure and maintain for it and its members a monopoly of the grain trade at Minneapolis, Minn., and within a hundred miles thereof; that all these activities mentioned herein in these findings on the part of the said chamber, its officers and members, secured and retained for them a monopoly of the grain trade at Minneapolis and within a hundred miles thereof, and unduly hindered and restrained competition in interstate commerce between the members of the said chamber, on the one hand, and the said Equity Cooperative Exchange and its stockholders and the members of the St. Paul Grain Exchange, on the other."

And again the Federal Trade Commission found:

"The respondents (including McHugh and the chamber of commerce), between May, 1912, and May, 1917, with the plan and purpose of injuring and destroying the business of the said Equity Cooperative Exchange and the said St. Paul Grain Exchange, published, in trade and daily newspapers, false and misleading statements concerning their financial responsibility and the methods used by them and their officers and members in transacting business in grain."

Again, the Federal Trade Commission, in this proceeding against McHugh and the chamber of commerce, found that they had "falsely accused the Equity Cooperative Exchange of conducting a fraudulent transaction and of charging a shipper 'double commission' on certain carloads of grain shipped to said exchange by the Farmers Elevator Co., of Glenburn, N. Dak."

With reference to this, the Federal Trade Commission further said:

"Upon investigation the Railroad and Warehouse Commission of Minnesota found and stated that no fraud had been committed by the Equity Cooperative Exchange or its sales agent, P. E. Cooper, in respect to such transaction."

Again, the Federal Trade Commission found:

"The respondent, John G. McHugh, as secretary of the said chamber, wrote other letters which were intended to destroy and which did injure the credit and standing of the Equity Cooperative Exchange with banks, farmers, and customers and the public generally."

As a result of this conduct, the Federal Trade Commission found that McHugh and the chamber of commerce "have committed acts to the prejudice of the public and competitors of respondent chamber and competitors of the members of respondent chamber and which acts constitute unfair methods."

This is the same McHugh who drew the affidavits in this case.

This is the same McHugh who furnished the evidence to relator and his attorneys to start these proceedings.

This is the same McHugh who is now trying to do to the Farmers Union Terminal Association exactly what he did to the Equity Co-

operative Exchange—to ruin it by false and dishonest charges and propaganda.

Why did McHugh have Hughes collaborate with Mullin and his attorneys in the preparation of these false charges?

Why did they spend thousands of dollars in hiring men and in taking photographs?

And why, Governor, was it necessary for them to pass these things on and give them to Mullin and his counsel in order to start these proceedings?

There could be only one purpose and that was to destroy the Farmers Union Terminal Association.

Why did McHugh refuse to give to the Railroad and Warehouse Commission the affidavits which he had drawn?

The same methods, the same underhanded trickery, the same sneaking around and using others to do his dirty work has been used by McHugh in bringing about this proceeding as was used by him in destroying the Equity Cooperative Exchange.

There can be no doubt in any man's mind that the chamber of commerce, and it alone, is responsible for the drawing of the false affidavits which are relied upon in this proceeding to ruin and destroy the Farmers Union Terminal Association.

ELEVATOR "M"

Now, we come to elevator "M." The charge is contained in paragraph 5 on page 6 of the complaint, and it reads as follows:

"5. By tampering with wheat inspection samples in substituting No. 1 dark northern wheat in the samples in place of No. 2 and No. 3 wheat contained therein, and thus securing a false inspection report upon which false warehouse receipts were issued, which it sold to and borrowed money from the Grain Stabilization Corporation, thus defrauding the taxpayer.

"To illustrate: On March 28, 1931, at elevator 'M' in Minneapolis it had 320,748 bushels of No. 1 dark northern wheat and 723,656 bushels of 29 different varieties of inferior wheat.

"During the month of April it had this wheat regraded and reinspected, and its employees, acting under orders of L. M. Abbey, superintendent of terminals, changed the samples and secured a regrade of No. 1 dark northern for all of this wheat so that on May 2, 1931, without any wheat having been shipped in, its report showed 1,042,741 bushels of No. 1 dark northern on hand in elevator 'M.'"

A mere statement of the above shows its utter dishonesty. The relator charges that the taxpayer was defrauded. This is an absolute falsehood. As these proceedings progressed, it must be apparent that the relator is more interested in his brother, a member of the chamber of commerce, than he is in the taxpayers. He has taken up the time of the governor of this State for several weeks, taken you away from your duties, and taken up the time of the railroad and warehouse commission, and taken them away from their duties without any thought of the taxpayer.

In brief, the charge is that the Farmers Union Terminal Association tampered with the samples when the wheat was run in April, 1931. One fact stands out in this case: That the purchaser was not defrauded and is not complaining and that the taxpayer has not been defrauded and is not complaining.

WEISS, THE PERJURER

The miserable charges made by Weiss as to the tampering with the samples was first made in the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis.

The affidavit signed by Weiss, which McHugh said Weiss would not sign until he got some one to corroborate him, was signed in the chamber of commerce, and, mark you this, Governor, the affidavit was signed by Weiss without anybody to corroborate him.

Let us analyze these proceedings. Weiss is discharged by the Farmers Union Terminal Association, and the first man he goes to is Mr. Mullin, a brother of the senator and a member of the chamber of commerce. The next men he goes to are Eddie Hughes and McHugh, who represent the chamber of commerce. All he claims is that the samples were changed.

When under oath before the railroad and warehouse commission he testified that he did not change any of the samples, but that Anderson, the superintendent, was the only man who changed the samples.

When he was under oath before the governor of this State he first testified that he did not change any of the samples, and then, in order to bolster up this case, he also testified under oath that he himself changed some of these samples.

In order to fasten this ridiculous charge upon the Farmers Union Terminal Association, Weiss states that in March, 1931, he had a talk with Mr. Abbey, the terminal superintendent of the Farmers Union Terminal Association, but all he claims is that Mr. Abbey told him to run the wheat in elevator "M" for No. 1 wheat. He further states that Mr. Abbey called him into a private room and gave him certain secret instructions.

The testimony of three reputable men shows that Weiss was perjuring himself with this line of testimony. Mr. Abbey, the terminal superintendent of the Farmers Union Terminal Association, testified that he never had any such talk with Weiss and that all he told him to do was to run the elevator for No. 1 wheat.

Abbey's statement is corroborated by the testimony of Mr. Barry and Mr. Googins, neither of whom has any interest whatsoever in the outcome of this proceeding. Both of them stated to you under oath that Weiss never left the room during this talk with Abbey or ever went into a private room with Abbey.

Weiss's testimony last June before the railroad and warehouse commission and his testimony before you in this proceeding stamp him as an unmitigated liar, and the testimony of these reputable men further proves that he is nothing but a perjurer;

and with Weiss proven to be a perjurer the main bulwark of this case has fallen like a house of cards.

The chamber of commerce, who is responsible for starting these proceedings, fully realize that if Weiss is believed, that it is evidence of a crime.

Men are governed by motives, your excellency, and where there is no motive for doing an act, reasonable minds realize that those who charge such an act usually state a falsehood.

When the question of the weigh-up of elevator M was first suggested by Mr. Abbey, the terminal superintendent, it is admitted that he wanted to run the elevator and weigh and grade this grain car in the usual way, and in the doing of which there was an utter impossibility of tampering with the samples. It was Weiss, the perjurer, who suggested to Abbey that the grain should be run by building a hopper on the track scale. It must be apparent to you that this gave Weiss the opportunity to build up the false testimony he has given in this case.

Under oath Weiss tells you that Abbey never asked him or suggested to him to tamper with the samples or to in any way impair the integrity of this grain. All the wheat in elevator M was easily made into No. 1, and the only motive that can be drawn from such conduct on the part of Weiss and of McHugh is that Weiss was the willing tool of the chamber of commerce.

EVERETT, THE OTHER CHAMBER TOOL

The only other evidence upon which this case was founded was the testimony of one Everett. These proceedings have developed that Everett was formerly an employee of the chamber of commerce; that a member of the chamber of commerce sent him to the Farmers Union Terminal Association where he was given employment; that after the Farmers Union Terminal Association had discharged Everett from their employ, Everett went to the chamber of commerce offices and there gave an affidavit which was dictated and drawn for him by McHugh and Eddie Hughes, which affidavit was used with Weiss's statement to institute these proceedings.

After Everett had given this alleged evidence to the chamber of commerce he was employed by the chamber of commerce, and right now is one of the chamber's trusted and honored employees.

It is an old trick of conspirators throughout history to plant men inside of an organization which they want to destroy, and the evidence clearly shows that both Weiss and Everett were gotten into the Farmers Union Terminal Association for no other purpose than to bore from within and to make trouble for the cooperative.

Now, Everett's testimony does not claim that any samples were tampered with but he makes the ridiculous statement that the stream of wheat was split in order to make No. 1 wheat, but the evidence shows that this was a physical impossibility in the construction of the elevator.

Any intelligent man realizes that the cutting of this stream could not benefit the Farmers Union Terminal Association.

Who could conceive of such a thing except a fraud and a cheat?

Without anything to be gained by such a proceeding you are asked to believe the testimony of Everett in this regard, the same man, Governor Olson, who was sent to us by a member of the chamber of commerce and who is now in the employ of the chamber of commerce.

As lawyers we know that men are controlled by their association and the fact stands out in this case that the association of Weiss is constantly with the chamber of commerce.

No one could gain by the making of such a charge except the grain gamblers, and these charges bear a striking similarity to what was done by McHugh and his associates when they were restrained by the Federal Trade Commission from pursuing such tactics.

Further refuting the testimony of Weiss we have Mr. Anderson, the superintendent, who was on the stand here, a man of unquestioned integrity who has no personal interest in this lawsuit. Anderson testified that he never tampered with a sample and he is corroborated by Mr. Kamb, another man of integrity.

In other words, we have the sworn statements of five witnesses showing the utter unreliability of Weiss, the main witness for the chamber of commerce in this case.

WEISS'S CONTRADICTIONS

Let us analyze the testimony of Weiss. The first time he was under oath was when he made an affidavit in the office of the chamber of commerce and there he states, under oath, that he told Abbey that he would take the samples. On cross-examination here he admitted that he never talked to a single State man about the taking of the samples; that he always knew that State employees took the samples and that no State employee ever told him that they would not take the samples.

In his affidavit he states the samples were taken by Anderson, elevator foreman, and that Anderson placed the samples in sacks furnished by the State inspection department.

When these affidavits were obtained the railroad and warehouse commission upon learning of it asked McHugh, of the chamber of commerce, to come over to them and present these affidavits, and he refused. They had to subpoena him, and then he came as he did, as a witness before you with a lawyer. He then delivered copies of these affidavits to the commission and they called Weiss before them, and there Weiss testified under oath:

"Q. You are familiar with this affidavit that you made?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. How did you come to make that?—A. One of the chamber men asked me how the Farmers Union was getting by. I told him I wouldn't lie for them or anybody else."

Why was a member of the chamber of commerce interested about the Farmers Union Terminal Association? Why did he want to know how they were getting along? What does that mean to the average man?

And then Weiss testified:

"Q. Who asked you?—A. Eddie Mullin."

This is the brother of Senator Mullin.

And then this man Weiss, under oath, testified before the commission:

"The State man caught a sample and put it in the basket by the pit."

When a witness here he testified that the State men never caught a single sample. When are you going to believe such a man?

Again he testified before the railroad and warehouse commission as follows:

"Commissioner LAURISCH. Wouldn't the State weigher catch any of the run himself?"

"A. Yes; he caught it all."

Again, he testified before the commission:

"Q. Who drew up the affidavit?—A. The secretary of the chamber."

"Commissioner LAURISCH. McHugh's assistant?"

"A. No; McHugh himself."

When he was under oath here he testified that McHugh did not draw the affidavit; that he drew it himself; and that McHugh had nothing to do with it. It is upon the testimony of this monumental liar, and upon his testimony alone, that you are asked to make a finding against the Farmers Union Terminal Association.

Again, Weiss was asked:

"Commissioner LAURISCH. Then the Grain Stabilization Corporation, through this manipulation of these samples, got a quantity of grain as No. 1 dark northern which, as a matter of fact, is not according to your judgment No. 1 dark northern?"

"A. Yes, sir."

"Q. Did you advise them of that fact after you got into trouble with Abbey and quit?—A. No, sir."

"Q. Why not?—A. I didn't think it was necessary."

"Q. Didn't you think it was just as necessary to tell them as it was to tell the chamber of commerce?"

Governor, what was his answer? Here it is. I quote:

"A. I thought the chamber would take care of that."

Why should there be in the mind of this man the idea that the chamber would take care of it unless they had made a deal with him? What was the urge which prompted him to tell the commission that the chamber of commerce would take care of that?

Yes; he thought the chamber would take care of that just as they took care of the Equity Cooperative Exchange.

Wouldn't you like to know the talk that took place between McHugh and Weiss before he came to the conclusion that the chamber would take care of the Farmers Union Terminal Association?

The same man, McHugh, of the chamber of commerce, who inspired the fight against the Equity Cooperative Exchange, is the man who initiated and was the moving power back of this proceeding.

Again, Governor, this question was asked Weiss:

"Q. What reason could you give us for not notifying me, if I should happen to be the buyer or the party who was going to get this doctored grain? I can see easy enough from your point of view why you didn't say anything about it while you were an employee, but after you were let out I don't see why you should not want to protect the buyer?"

Governor, what was the answer? Here it is. I quote:

"A. I thought the chamber would take care of that."

And then this question:

"Q. You mean you thought they would take care of Abbey?"

And then this answer:

"A. You can put it that way."

This is his testimony before the commission, Governor.

The next time we meet with Weiss he is again under oath here, sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and what does he say?

He denies under oath that he ever stated that McHugh drew this affidavit. Why did he do this, Governor? Was he trying to protect McHugh and the chamber of commerce?

At one time or the other he lied, and lied deliberately. He lied under oath when he told you that McHugh did not draw the affidavit, because, Governor, when we had Mr. McHugh, the secretary of the chamber of commerce, on the stand, after hours and hours of questioning, he was forced to admit that he drew every word and every paragraph of the affidavits of Weiss and Everett.

Before you Weiss denied saying that he told Eddie Mullin he wouldn't lie for the Farmers Union Terminal Association or anybody else. Before the commission he says he did make that statement.

Before you he testified that the State men never took a sample. Before the commission he told them that McHugh drew the affidavit; before you he says, "McHugh had nothing to do with it."

Before the commission he testified under oath that he thought the chamber would take care of it. Before you he testified, also under oath, that he never said anything of the kind.

It is upon the testimony of this perjurer, and on his testimony alone, that you are asked to find evidence of wrongdoing on the part of the Farmers Union Terminal Association.

STATE MEN ALL AGREE ON TESTIMONY

There have been upon the stand some six or eight men employed by the railroad and warehouse commission, each and every one of whom say that they took these samples; that there was only one basket there instead of two, as Weiss testified; that these samples were never mixed or tampered with. These men have served the State for the past 20 to 30 years as weighers and as inspectors. They are clean-cut, honest men, and against them is only the testimony of Weiss, who can not be believed under oath.

In addition to this, there is the testimony of Anderson, the superintendent, that he never mixed a sample or in any way tampered with them.

Now we come to a more important matter. Men may lie and men may be mistaken, but circumstances can not lie. When the first run was made in April, 1931, every sample was taken by the State men or under their direction and every bushel of wheat in the April run graded No. 1 and the average test weight was 58.363 pounds.

There was shipped into elevator M from May 7 to July 28, 1931, 260,000 bushels of wheat. The testimony is undisputed that its average test weight was 58.5 pounds. This grain was put in the top of the tanks. From May 2 to July 18 there was shipped out of elevator M 150,000 bushels of wheat, and the average test weight was 58.5 pounds.

WHEAT IN AND OUT OF THE ELEVATOR

Then this significant fact: From July 29 to August 4 there was also shipped out of elevator M 155,000 bushels of wheat of an average test weight of 59.1 pounds. Would any one with average intelligence, if he had tampered with samples in order to make 57-pound wheat weigh 58 pounds before delivery, ship out 155,000 bushels of wheat weighing 59.1 pounds?

What I want to emphasize is this: If the Farmers Union Terminal Association knew they did not have 58-pound wheat, they never would have shipped out 155,000 bushels of wheat that averaged 59.1 pounds to the bushel.

After the April run was closed and storage tickets issued, on May 4 this grain was sold to the Farmers National Grain Corporation. Following this the Grain Stabilization Corporation became the owner of these storage tickets. These storage tickets do not provide for the delivery of the identical grain but for the delivery of grain of the same kind and grade.

When the commission learned of these charges they demanded from McHugh the affidavits of Weiss and Everett. McHugh refused to produce them until compelled to do so by a subpoena. Then he appeared with his lawyer just as he did at this hearing. The only men I have ever known who carried their lawyers with them had something to conceal.

Then, to preserve the identity of the grain, the 12 tanks in question were sealed and three men, working on 8-hour shifts, were placed on guard to see that not a single bushel of that grain was tampered with.

This continued until July 28. The seals were then removed by the railroad and warehouse commission on the advice of the attorney general of this State.

The following morning, July 29, three men employed by the Grain Stabilization Corporation, the buyer of this wheat, were there when the August run commenced. Every bushel of wheat in that elevator was run tank for tank and samples were taken from the belt as the wheat came from the tanks by these three men before the wheat could be run or cleaned or in any other way tampered with.

The undisputed evidence shows that the average test weight of every bushel of wheat in the tanks under question was 58.15 pounds. Who should be more interested in the weight and quality of that wheat than the buyer, the Grain Stabilization Corporation?

Here is a significant fact in this testimony that must not be overlooked: When the Grain Stabilization Corporation inspectors were there they took samples every 15 minutes from the belt as the grain came from the tanks. When they found the grain running light, or under 58 pounds, they took samples every five minutes. That means that when grain was running over 58 pounds they would only take one sample every 15 minutes, but when it was running below 58 pounds they would take three samples in 15 minutes, which necessarily reduced the average. In spite of all this the record shows without dispute that the grain averaged 58.15 pounds.

Experts have testified that when samples are taken from the belt before the grain is dry it will weigh from three-tenths to five-tenths of a pound per bushel lighter than its real weight. The undisputed testimony of Mr. Storch, of the Grain Stabilization Corporation, shows that the scale upon which the tests were made by him and the two men working under him averaged three-tenths of a pound a bushel less than the State scales. These two circumstances clearly indicate that the weight of the wheat in elevator M sold by the Farmers Union Terminal Association to the Grain Stabilization Corporation actually weighed nearer 59 pounds per bushel than 58 pounds.

In addition to the testimony of the inspectors for the Grain Stabilization Corporation, who purchased the wheat, we have the evidence of the State inspectors and State weighers who inspected every bushel of this wheat, car by car, and their tests show that the average test weight of this wheat was 58.375 pounds. Every bushel of this wheat was run into the cars and tested and probed from ten to fourteen times, and shows that there was not a bushel of wheat in this elevator that was not No. 1 wheat.

Every bushel of wheat is tested and weighed by the State men when it comes into an elevator. Colonel Wilkinson testified that after the question was raised as to the integrity of these storage tickets he had an analysis made from the records and samples of every bushel of grain that came into elevator M from the day it was opened until March 31, 1931, when this wheat was run for grade, and that from that analysis he was satisfied that there was enough grain in that elevator in quality and weight to fulfill and satisfy every storage ticket issued against the grain.

He further testified that these 12 tanks were run and tested by the inspectors of the buyer, the Grain Stabilization Corporation, by taking samples at the mouth of the tank on the belt just as he had insisted it should be done all the time.

WHAT THE OFFICIAL TESTS SHOW

We have tabulated each of the tanks in question with the April weigh-up, the cold samples taken by the purchaser at the mouth of the tank, and the official test by the State, and they read as follows:

	The April weigh-up	Cold samples taken at August weigh-up	Official test by State and Federal inspectors at August weigh-up
Tank 103.....	58.5	58.3	58.8
Tank 104.....	58.3	58.7	59.15
Tank 105.....	58	58.1	59.01
Tank 106.....	58.5	57.8	58.8
Tank 107.....	58.3	57.8	57.77
Tank 108.....	58.2	58	58.87
Tank 109.....	58.5	57.95	58.78
Tank 111.....	58.4	58.4	59
Tank 112.....	58.5	57.4	58.69
Tank 113.....	58.5	58.5	59
Tank 114.....	58.2	57.9	58.775
Tank 116.....	58.7	59	58.84
Average weight per bushel.....	58.38	58.15	58.87

No other testimony should be needed to convince anyone that the testimony of Weiss and of Everett is unqualifiedly false.

It clearly appears that the Farmers Union Terminal Association, instead of defrauding anybody at elevator "M," more than fulfilled the requirements as to the quality and weight of this wheat.

The Farmers Union Terminal Association has been guilty of no misconduct. The purchaser is not complaining. The buyer raises no question. How miserably relator has failed in his attempt to destroy the cooperative movement!

In the minds of many people there arises the thought that if in an elevator there are half a million bushels of wheat grading No. 1 which may weigh 59 pounds to the bushel and half a million bushels of wheat grading No. 2 because it weighs 57.5 to the bushel that a miracle must be performed in order to make a million bushels of No. 1 wheat. The best answer to that is the testimony of this man Weiss, whom we forced to tell the truth when he said:

"Q. Was that the common practice in the Soo elevator to mix grain to make No. 1?—A. When they load under warehouse receipts they did.

"Q. In other words, a warehouse receipt would be issued by this elevator for so many bushels of No. 1 wheat?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. At the time they were issued there probably would not be as much No. 1 wheat as No. 2 wheat, but there would be enough to make the weight?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. That is the common practice in any elevator?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. There is nothing wrong with that?—A. Perfectly legitimate."

In other words, the public should know that when half a million bushels of wheat weighing 59 pounds is mixed with half a million bushels of wheat weighing 57.5 pounds, that the total million bushels will weigh more than 58 pounds to the bushel and is No. 1 wheat.

There is nothing mysterious or miraculous about it. It has always been done and always will be done. This does not require a State senator, in a mad desire for publicity, to get the magician Thurston and go down to elevator M and there have his picture taken with Thurston and, with a silly grin on his face, ask this kind of a question, "How can 720,000 bushels of low-grade wheat become 720,000 bushels of No. 1 dark northern overnight in elevator M with records showing that no new wheat was brought into the elevator?"

When counsel for relator realized that they had fallen down and that no one could believe the testimony of Weiss, we then find them changing front and claiming that after the Farmers Union Terminal Association had sold this wheat to the Farmers National Grain Corporation that you should remove the commission because it allowed the public terminal elevator license to be canceled. The commission could do nothing but that, your excellency.

THATCHER'S STATEMENT

Mr. Thatcher in his statement before you, among other things, said:

"The representatives of the Stabilization Corporation, the Farmers National Grain Corporation, and the Farmers National

Warehouse Corporation were together in St. Paul at the time this matter was discussed as to how the purchaser of the elevator M facilities could become a public warehouseman so that the new warehouseman could issue the regular legal warehouse receipt to replace the one that had been canceled—the actual legal mechanics it had to go through in order to do this thing. Also the question of this grain that was in the house, as to its quantity and character. Those were the things that were involved, and all of the parties wanted to know that. The Farmers Union Terminal Association wanted it, the Stabilization Corporation wanted its receipts, and the new warehouseman wanted to know all of those things; and the only way we knew to determine what was in the house was to weigh it so the new purchaser would be in a position to become a public warehouseman and be in a position as such to issue regular Minnesota warehouse receipts to the Grain Stabilization Corporation. That wasn't decided in five minutes; we had to get information what the law was, what the mechanics was. To us there was nothing mysterious about it. We knew those were the facts and the law.

"I want to state that the officers of the three institutions—four, I should say—the Farmers Union Terminal Association, the Grain Stabilization Corporation, the Farmers National Warehouse Corporation, and the Farmers National Grain Corporation, were all in attendance, as I recall it, were all aware—nobody was being deceived; there was no need of policemen of the State to protect the buyer or the owner of the warehouse receipts—that is to say, they were all there, all engaged in trying to do the thing in an ordinary, businesslike manner, to check out the old owners and check in the new owners and get these warehouse receipts to the Grain Stabilization Corporation—these public-warehouse receipts—to them just as quickly as possible; and these were the steps we understood we had to take in order to qualify the new owner as a public warehouseman, so he could issue the warehouse receipts."

When we intervened in this case we made the following statement:

"Now comes the Farmers Union Terminal Association and asks leave to intervene in this proceeding and states to your excellency that this proceeding is a conspiracy on the part of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and the private grain interests of the Northwest to destroy the farmers' cooperative movement and to injure the Farmers Union Terminal Association."

And again we said:

"Your petitioner states that said proceeding is not made in good faith; that the relator, State Senator Gerald Mullin, is not now and has not at any time been interested in the farmers' cooperative movement; that a brother of said Senator Mullin is a member of the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis, and that he, along with other officials of the chamber of commerce, has aided and abetted in the plan and scheme to destroy the confidence of the people in the Farmers Union Terminal Association and in the farmers' cooperative movement generally; that the Farmers Union Terminal Association specifically denies the charges contained in the complaint of said relator, and avers that they are made in bad faith and that said Senator Mullin never at any time hoped to secure any order from your excellency for the removal of any member of the railroad and warehouse commission."

We have proven that the chamber of commerce is back of this proceeding, that they initiated it, and that they alone are responsible for it. The very fact that the chamber of commerce is interested ought to put the public on guard. This organization has never stopped at anything in order to destroy the cooperative movement or to rob the farmers of this country.

WITNESSES COMPARED

Many witnesses have appeared before you in this proceeding. Let us compare some of them.

I bring before you the witness Weiss. He was sent to us by a member of the chamber of commerce, and stranger things have happened than the fact that the chamber of commerce would send a man in to destroy the cooperative movement. Before you stands a man who was discharged for drunkenness and misconduct. When he leaves the employ of the Farmers Union Terminal Association, where does he go? He goes to the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis. What does he do there? He signs an affidavit drawn by McHugh, secretary of the chamber of commerce.

Then we see him before the railroad and warehouse commission testifying under oath.

Then we see him before your excellency, again under oath. In each and every instance we find that he is an absolute falsifier and perjurer.

The thought has occurred to me that when Senator Mullin took his oath of office as a senator he swore to uphold and enforce the laws of the State of Minnesota, and sitting here before your excellency and before the senator was a man who was a downright perjurer. Have you heard of the senator seeking to bring this fraud to justice? He has sat here and attempted to justify the testimony of the perjurer Weiss.

In contrast to Weiss, we have Mr. Storch, of the Grain Stabilization Corporation. It was his duty to see that every bushel of wheat delivered to his employer, the Grain Stabilization Corporation, was 58-pound wheat.

There was no motive for him to deceive, lie, cheat, or defraud. He was an honest employee who made the tests and watched this wheat as it came bushel by bushel out of these tanks, and testified before you, without contradiction, that every bushel weighed more than 58 pounds.

Which of these men would you want to believe? An admitted perjurer or a man against whose integrity not a word has been raised?

Let me paint another picture. In this case, in spite of himself, there has been dragged in Mr. McHugh, the secretary of the chamber of commerce. He didn't want to come here. When he came he came with a lawyer. He was on the stand, and I asked him if he knew Morin. With a simplicity that belied his countenance, he answered, "Yes; he used to work for us."

Then there was dragged out from Mr. McHugh the fact that the testimony and the records upon which this proceeding is based were drawn up and furnished by Morin to the chamber of commerce.

It was revealed that the chamber of commerce paid more than a thousand dollars to Morin. Every bit of Morin's work was turned over to Mr. Mullin for the purpose of destroying the Farmers Union Terminal Association.

CONSPIRACY PROVEN

This shows a conspiracy of the rankest sort. This man McHugh for years has been the moving power against the cooperative movement. It was he who was enjoined by the Federal Trade Commission for his practices in fighting the Equity Cooperative Exchange.

It was he who dictated the affidavits of Weiss and Everett. Many people believe it was he who arranged for Mr. Hughes to run out and away from the governor of this State. Every effort of his life has been against the cooperative movement and against the farmers of the Northwest.

He recognizes his master, the chamber of commerce, and is a faithful servant. Do you think for an instant that when he testified under oath that he did not know where Mr. Hughes, his assistant, was that he told you the truth? As he sat here and fawned before counsel for intervenor there was present in his face and in his soul the consciousness of guilt.

What, I ask you, when the end of the road is reached, can anyone say for McHugh, of the chamber of commerce?

Where has he ever been known to do anything for the cause of the common mass of people?

His whole life has been a life of selfishness, of intrigue, of conniving against every effort that has ever been made to give the farmers of the Northwest decent treatment and economic justice, and it is such a man, the secretary of such an institution, that has been willing to hide behind Senator Mullin in an effort to put across this kind of a deal. It is this man who asks the Governor of Minnesota to destroy the marketing act.

In contrast to McHugh we have M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Terminal Association. Here is a man who has devoted his life to the cooperative movement. All his efforts have been directed in behalf of the farmers and producers of this country. He was upon the stand for days at a time, and every word of his testimony, in my opinion, is believed by your excellency.

During all of these proceedings he has thrown open his books, his records, everything at his command, in order to enable your excellency to get at the truth. Honest men do this, but dishonest men hide the facts and dishonest men run away from testifying.

Through his efforts as head of the Farmers Union Terminal Association, during these times of depression, every preferred stockholder of the Farmers Union Terminal Association has received 8 per cent on his stock, and in 1931, 20 per cent of the preferred stock was retired, bringing to the farmers of the Northwest tens of thousands of dollars. There has been paid back in patronage dividends thousands of dollars to the farmers of the Northwest. The record of the Farmers Union Terminal Association for the last three years is a record that any man could be proud of, a record of service to the people, a record of sacrifice and of work in order to build up the cooperative cause and make it a success.

It is M. W. Thatcher against this man McHugh, and I welcome you to take your choice.

On the one hand, we have a man whose record is one of service to the people. On the other hand, we have the record of a man who sat upon the stand and with fishy eyes looked out upon the audience and every word he uttered and every syllable he stuttered was in an effort to prevent you from finding out that the chamber of commerce was back of this deal.

Somehow or another I feel that men who sacrifice and work for the common welfare of the mass can be trusted better than those who work for private interests.

Somehow or another I feel that the cooperative movement ought to have the help of the progressives of this Nation. I am sure that these proceedings will result in great good, because they have already convinced the people of the Northwest that the chamber of commerce is back of this deal. This is one of the most dishonest efforts ever made to destroy confidence in public officials and in laws enacted for the public welfare.

HUGHES'S PHOTOGRAPH

Now, I want to draw another picture and it is of Eddie Hughes, the assistant secretary of the chamber of commerce.

Judas Iscariot would be a saint and Benedict Arnold a blessed memory compared to him.

We have not been able to get Mr. Morin, who ran out on us. He was employed and paid over a thousand dollars by the chamber of commerce to get the very information which was handed over to relator and his counsel to start these dirty proceedings. Where he is I do not know. When Mr. McHugh was on the stand we find that he hid behind Eddie Hughes on the hiring of this man Morin.

We then asked McHugh where Hughes was, and what was his reply? "He is away on his vacation and will not return until the Monday after the first of the year."

We then sought to find Hughes.

On the night before Christmas, Hughes came back to Minneapolis and was served with a subpoena. For days he had been in a hotel at Eau Claire, Wis., not taking a vacation but hiding because he was afraid to testify in this case. On the stand he admitted that he ran out of the State of Minnesota in order to avoid testifying.

Then, with as corrupt a heart as ever poured forth fraud and dishonesty, he tells us that the reason he didn't want to testify was because he did not want to embarrass Ed Johnson and Probstfeld, two employees of the railroad and warehouse commission. Both of these men testified that what he said was a falsehood and a lie.

In order to protect the chamber of commerce Hughes was willing to lie. He sat upon the stand for half a day and testified that just before Christmas time, the most sacred day of the year, he would be with them.

He testified that while he was at Eau Claire, Wis., he called up the janitor of the chamber of commerce, and then, under oath, said that Mr. McHugh did not know where he was and that his wife and children could not have found him. In all the annals of jurisprudence and all the trials that have ever occurred, a more monumental liar has never been discovered.

He was willing to injure and malign two men in the employ of the railroad and warehouse commission to protect his master, the chamber of commerce. This man should go down in history as the most ridiculous liar that has ever appeared in any proceeding.

So ridiculous was his testimony that your excellency took up the questioning of this man, and the following occurred:

"Governor OLSON. If Mr. McHugh, during the time you were absent from Minneapolis and Minnesota, desired to locate you on a matter of business affecting your duties with the chamber of commerce, how would he find you?"

"A. He couldn't have found me."

"Q. Did your wife know where you were?—A. I don't think she did."

"Q. Didn't you call her up on one occasion?—A. She might have known it from where the telephone call came from. It would be the only way she would know it."

"Q. Do I understand you correctly if some matter came up affecting your duties at the chamber of commerce that no one could locate you?—A. That's correct. I have done that before on vacation. It isn't the first time that I have done it; I mean going away without leaving my address."

"Q. Do I understand you to say that when you left Minneapolis for Eau Claire on the first occasion or the second occasion, or both occasions, that Mr. McHugh knew you were taking your vacation at that particular time because you didn't want to testify in this proceeding and disclose confidential information which you had?—A. I think I would put it this way—that I told him I wanted to take a vacation and that I hadn't had one, and that I wanted to go away; and I told him I had what I felt was information which had been given me in confidence in this trial. At that time neither one of us knew there was any subpoena out for me, and I told him I was going and I went."

"Q. That is hardly answering my question.—A. I tried to answer it."

"Q. I say, did Mr. McHugh know when you left that you were taking your vacation at that particular time because you didn't want to testify in this proceeding if you were called as a witness, because of this confidential information that you might be obliged to disclose?—A. I think that is a correct statement of it; yes, sir."

"Q. And is it correct to assume that at some time during your absence they could have discovered your whereabouts by asking your wife where you were?—A. I don't know. I don't know whether he could or could not."

"Q. You don't know whether your wife would refuse or not refuse to disclose your whereabouts?—A. I don't know whether she knew where I was. I didn't tell her where I was going. If that is what you mean. I don't know whether she knew where I was or not."

"Q. Did you tell her how long you expected to be gone?—A. I told her I would probably be gone 10 days or 2 weeks."

"Q. You made no provision in case some accident should happen to your family by which you might be reached and notified?—A. No, sir."

"Governor OLSON. That's all."

"Mr. DAVIS. If your little baby had been sick or died you made no provision for them to get in touch with you? You don't mean that, do you?"

"A. That is a correct statement of it; yes, sir."

All the while he was testifying, he had his lawyer here. He ran out of the State, not once but twice, in order to avoid testifying. He tells you that the first man he got in touch with upon his return just before Christmas was McHugh, the secretary of the chamber of commerce, his master and his boss. The second man he got in touch with was the attorney for the chamber of commerce, and it was to this attorney that he first told the ridiculous story that his reason for running away was not to embarrass employees of the railroad and warehouse commission.

Looking this whole transaction over and realizing the perjury and falsity of Weiss's testimony, the dishonesty of McHugh, and the downright dishonesty of Hughes, should your excellency longer hesitate as to what to do in this case?

O. P. B. JACOBSON

Just two more pictures before I close. One is the picture of an old man who for 25 years has served the people of Minnesota. Upon election after election he has been honored with the faith and confidence of the people of this State, and has been elected railroad and warehouse commissioner. I refer to O. P. B. Jacobson, of Ottertail County, as honest a man as ever sat in public office. A man who has devoted the years of his service in behalf of the farmers and producers. Governor, the one man above all others in the State of Minnesota who has fought against the Federal grain grading act and for the farmers of the Northwest.

It is this man whose honesty is attacked. It is this man whose integrity is questioned. It is this man whose service to the people is sought to be vilified. It is he, and he alone, who has had to stand the brunt of this attack. Let it be said to the shame and disgrace of those who are responsible for it that the people of Minnesota know that the old viking from Ottertail County has always been honest and square and fair by the people.

Mr. Jacobson has suffered enough. He has never deserved this kind of a deal, and the time has now arrived here for you to exonerate him and let the people of Minnesota realize that the chamber of commerce, in all their greed and all their dishonesty, can not take away from old O. P. B. Jacobson the one thing he holds dear above everything else, and that is his good name and his honest reputation.

SENATOR MULLIN

Let us look at the other side of the picture for a moment before I close. A young man, elected for a short while to the office of State senator, whose brother is a member of the chamber of commerce, brings this proceeding, and under oath charges the various crimes and misdemeanors which have never been proven.

Governor, why did he do so? I want to be charitable, if possible, in this matter. I want to say that perhaps it was his desire to become a hero and a champion of the people that induced him to make these charges. He is extremely young and very unsophisticated. He has been raised in the city and is unacquainted with country ways.

But do not forget this: Before these charges were filed he and his counsel sat down in conference with Eddie Hughes, the assistant secretary of the chamber of commerce, and with Mr. Morin, the witness who ran out and whom we have never been able to get, and prepared these charges. I would like to concede that when he first brought these charges that the gentleman acted in good faith. I would at least hope he did.

But when he has sat here through these proceedings and seen the case reeking with perjury and fraud and corruption, I can not understand why he did not rise up and protest. To be sure, he sought publicity and has received it and will receive it to the end of his day. "Elevator M" will always be his name from this time forth. No matter where he goes or what he does, Jerry Mullin will always be known as "Elevator M," the colossal joke of the ages, the fraud perpetrated upon the Governor of the State of Minnesota.

To my mind, as this case progressed, there came a time when Senator Mullin could have risen to the heights and proved himself one of the biggest men in the State of Minnesota. That time was when the testimony of Mr. Storch, of the Grain Stabilization Corporation, showed that every bushel of wheat which the Grain Stabilization Corporation purchased weighed more than 58 pounds. There was the opportunity for Senator Mullin to have shown himself to be a real man. We all make mistakes, and when we realize them we ought to be big enough to admit them. I am sorry the senator failed to live up to his opportunity.

Governor Olson, the relator in this case, must stand or fall upon the record, and nothing else. No political contingencies can avail him in any degree.

The evidence in this case clearly shows that the Farmers Union Terminal Association has been guilty of no wrongdoing, and I am confident your excellency will so find.

The relator has failed to prove a single charge in his complaint. On the contrary, it has been shown by abundant evidence that the moving power back of this miserable proceeding was McHugh and the chamber of commerce.

The chamber of commerce has failed in their mad attempt to ruin the cooperative movement, but there is evidence in this case which should prove of benefit to the farmers of the Northwest. We know better now than ever before the ways and manners in which the farmers have been mulcted. We know that storage laws should be enacted and that laws should be enacted providing that the farmer should not be compelled to pay freight on his dockage and receive nothing for it.

The chamber of commerce has unwittingly done the farmers of the Northwest and your excellency a great service. They had hoped to ruin the cooperative movement. They have erected the scaffold which will hang the grain gamblers.

APPEALS TO GOVERNOR TO HELP GET LEGISLATION

The producers of this State, the cooperative organizations of Minnesota, and my client, the Farmers Union Terminal Association, want to uphold your hand, Governor Olson, in every effort that you may make for the passage of laws that will give to the producer and the farmer fair treatment that will protect them from exploitation. No greater opportunity and no grander privilege has ever before confronted a Governor of Minnesota, and I know that with your love for the progressive cause you will rise to the occasion, and as a result of your efforts and your leadership the farmers of Minnesota can look forward to a better day.

Governor, the greatest fraud now existing against the farmers is the Federal grading act. Your voice, I am sure, will be raised in protest against this inequity.

If we had the grading acts which O. P. B. Jacobson has fought for, this hearing would not have been possible.

The people of Minnesota want you to join hands with him. For 25 years he has fought for the farmers and sought to protect their interests and has battled against the Federal grain grading act. This act was passed for the benefit of the millers and the grain gamblers of this country. It has cost the producers untold millions of dollars. Your influence and the high position and estate which you occupy will enable you to lead the fight which will give to the farmers of the Northwest and of this country an honest, a fair, an equitable grading act. I thank you.

SIX-HOUR DAY FOR RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution from the House and asks the attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS].

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 252) to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to make an investigation as to the possibility of establishing a 6-hour day for railway employees was read twice by its title.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, may the joint resolution be read at length?

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

The Chief Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and is hereby directed to investigate what would be the effect upon operation, service, and expenses of applying the principle of a 6-hour day in the employment of all classes and each particular class of railway employees because of such application.

Sec. 2. The commission is further directed to report its findings to the Congress on or before December 15, 1932.

Mr. COUZENS. I ask that the House joint resolution may be substituted for a similar joint resolution adopted by the Senate last week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not necessary. The adoption of the House joint resolution will have the same effect.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I call the attention of the Senator from Michigan to the fact that the joint resolution to which he refers as having been adopted by the Senate is probably out of the possession of the Senate. Let the Senator ask merely for the consideration of the House joint resolution.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be so referred.

ADDITION TO SKULL VALLEY INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, out of order I wish to have considered at this time House bill 6663, recently passed by the House. A similar bill, being Senate bill 2553, was passed by the Senate last week, but the House bill was passed first and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs. It has to do with setting aside on the public domain in Utah half a section of land for the use of the Skull Valley Indian Reservation. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs may be discharged from the further consideration of the House bill and that it may be considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let it be reported for the information of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I shall have to object to the immediate conclusion of the bill. The calendar will probably be called to-morrow or next day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

PREFERENCE TO DOMESTIC ARTICLES IN GOVERNMENT PURCHASES

Mr. JONES. Out of order, I introduce a bill. It is not very long, and I ask that it may be read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3349) authorizing the purchasing officers of the Government to give preference to domestic articles was read the first time by its title and the second time at length and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the heads of the several executive departments and independent establishments of the Government, shall, in advertising for proposals for supplies or equipment, require bidders to certify whether the articles proposed to be furnished are of domestic or foreign growth, production, or manufacture, and shall, notwithstanding that articles of the growth, production, or manufacture of the United States may cost more than similar articles of the growth, production, or manufacture of foreign countries, purchase or contract for, within the limits of the United States, only articles of the growth, production, or manufacture of the United States, unless in their judgment the interest of the Government will not permit, and if the excess of cost be not unreasonable.

EMERGENCY PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Friday next I intend to call up Senate resolution 72, submitted by me, providing the parliamentary situation will permit of my doing so.

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, January 28, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 27 (legislative day of January 26), 1932

MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

William E. Humphrey to be a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Claude B. Mayo to be captain.

Eugene T. Oates to be commander.

To be lieutenant commanders

Elmer E. Duvall, jr.	Albert L. Hutson.
Lloyd E. Clifford.	Walter L. Taylor.
Willis M. Percifield.	Miles R. Browning.
John Meyer.	Ellis H. Geiselman.
William S. Holloway.	Ernest H. Krueger.
Mallery K. Aiken.	Jack H. Duncan.
Hiram L. Irwin.	Watson O. Bailey.
Rico Botta.	Leland P. Lovette.
Ralph H. Norris.	Wallace M. Dillon.
Frank C. Fake.	Edmund J. Kidder.
Bronson P. Vosbury.	Edward D. Walbridge.
Donald W. Loomis.	Leroy W. Busbey, jr.
William S. Heath.	Smith D. A. Cobb.
Elbert C. Rogers.	Malcolm A. Deans.
Jerauld Wright.	Ralph S. Riggs.
Harry W. Need.	Carlos W. Wieber.
Charles D. Leffler, jr.	Edwin D. Gibb.
Earle W. Mills.	John M. Haines.
Harry D. Hoffman.	William A. S. Macklin.
Harold G. Eberhart.	John W. Rogers.
Victor C. Barringer, jr.	Charles G. Moore, jr.
Martin R. Derx.	Robert L. Mitten.
Graeme Bannerman.	Mays L. Lewis.
Henry S. Kendall.	Elmer V. Iverson.
Stanley M. Haight.	Stanley C. Norton.
William E. G. Erskine.	Chauncey R. Crutcher.
Edward W. Wunch, jr.	William K. Phillips.
John D. H. Kane.	Ralph C. Alexander.
James W. Whitfield.	Samuel H. Hurt.
Harold E. MacLellan.	Herbert R. Sobel.
Albert S. Marley, jr.	Allan P. Flagg.
Peter K. Fischler.	Vaughn Bailey.
Harry W. von Hasseln.	Frank O. Wells.
Guy D. Townsend.	Henry Hartley, an additional number.
Oilton R. Bennehoff.	William R. Buechner.
Arthur T. Moen.	Arthur B. Dorsey.
Ross P. Whitmarsh.	Charles W. A. Campbell.
Ralph H. Henkle.	Jonathan H. Warman.
Gordon B. Woolley.	

Joseph W. Bettens.
Charles Antrobus.
Frank E. Nelson.
Philip S. Flint.
Melvin C. Kent.
Anthony Prastka.
Raymond A. Walker.
Ola D. Butler.
Peter J. Gundlach.
Albert M. Hinman.
Stephen A. Loftus.
Herbert R. Mytinger.
Harold A. Turner.
Curry E. Eason.
Brice H. Mack.
Herbert J. Meneratti.
William A. Mason.
John F. Murphy.
Clarence R. Rockwell.
Paul E. Kuter.
Simon L. Shade.
Albert E. Freed.
Harry J. Hansen.
Newcomb L. Damon.
John J. Madden.
Clyde Lovelace.
Martin Dickinson.
William H. Farrel.
George S. Dean.
Charles F. Fielding.
Judson E. Scott.
Robert B. England.

Lars O. Peterson.
Omar B. Earle.
Edwin Fisher.
George R. Blauvelt.
Chester L. Nichols.
Thomas M. Leovy.
Harold F. Fultz.
Benjamin W. Cloud.
Frederick S. Conner.
Howard W. Kitchin.
Leland D. Webb.
William Knox.
Clyde C. Laws.
Thomas E. Flaherty.
Arthur R. Ponto.
Merwin W. Arps.
Jerome L. Allen.
William A. Tattersall.
Grover A. Miller.
Marion C. Erwin.
Lester M. Harvey.
Frederick A. Ruf.
Harry L. Thompson.
John F. Warris.
Francis E. Fitch.
John M. Sheehan.
George R. Henderson.
George T. Owen.
Loverne A. Pope.
Rossmore D. Lyon.
Fred C. Dickey.

To be lieutenants

Kenneth D. Ringle.	Henry C. Johnson.
William M. Haynsworth, jr.	John S. Keating.
Albin R. Sodergren.	Fred W. Walton.
Robert A. MacKerracher.	Leon N. Blair.
John E. Shomier, jr.	Harry D. Felt.
Walter C. Holt.	Percival E. McDowell.
Joseph E. M. Wood.	John M. Will.
Frank H. Newton, jr.	Karl G. Hensel.
Samuel P. Comly, jr.	Herbert M. Wescoat.
Francis L. Robbins.	Arthur F. Dineen.
John L. Brown.	Robert H. Rodgers.
David W. Hardin.	Samuel G. Fuqua.
Matthew S. Q. Weiser.	Charles D. Beaumont, jr.
William P. E. Wadbrook.	Frank E. Shoup, jr.
Morris Smellow.	Frederick Moosbrugger.
Harry H. Keith.	Francis M. Hughes.
Joseph T. Sheehan.	William R. Thayer.
Church A. Chappell.	Alfred H. Richards.
Harold N. Williams.	Steele B. Smith.
George K. Hodgkiss.	Charles R. Ensey, jr.
Thayer T. Tucker.	Stanley Leith.
Claude H. Bennett, jr.	Edwin R. Peck.
George W. Welker, jr.	John C. McCutchen.
John M. McIsaac.	George A. Dussault.
Frank H. Bond.	Curtis S. Smiley.
Thomas L. Turner.	Murvale T. Farrar.
John L. Welch.	Louis A. Reinken.
Frederick M. Trapnell.	Balch B. Wilson, jr.
William L. Hoffheins.	Howard L. Young.
Louis F. Teuscher.	Marvin M. Stephens.
William K. Mendenhall.	Olin Scroggins.
Richard M. Scruggs.	Harold Doe.
Frederick A. Edwards.	Josephus A. Briggs.
William E. Hennigar.	Robert P. Wadell.
Peter W. Haas, jr.	Thomas E. Boyce.
John C. Goodnough.	Richard M. Oliver.
Joseph L. Kane.	Francis D. Hamblin.
Donald S. MacMahan.	James E. Fuller.
Walter C. Russell.	Harold H. Connelley.
James H. Willett.	Pleasant D. Gold, 3d.
Philip S. Reynolds.	Arthur L. Mañer.
Ralph J. Arnold.	Philip H. Ryan.

Dwight H. Day.
Boltwood E. Dodson.
Henry M. Cooper.
John J. Jecklin.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Donald S. Gordon.
John B. Taylor.
Eldon C. Mayer.
Edward N. Teall, jr.
Monro M. Riker.
Robert A. Johnson.
Edmund E. Garcia.
Henry T. Jarrell.
John Bailey.
Robert B. Morgan, jr.
Byron C. Gwinn.
Richard E. Fenton.
Fred J. Leatherman.
Daniel W. Latimore.
Henry F. Gorski.
Herbert T. Tortorich.
Winston I. Quattlebaum.
James R. Lee.
Robert E. Van Meter.
John Quinn.
Harry E. Sears.
George H. Moffett.
Harlow J. Carpenter.
Joseph Finnegan.
Wilfred J. Hastings.
Philip F. Wakeman.
William S. Pye, jr.
Thomas A. Ahroon.
John A. Bole, jr.
William A. Schoech.
William A. Cockell.
John F. Mullen, jr.
William H. Jacobsen.
David L. McDonald.
Cuthbert J. Bruen.
Theodore F. Ascherfeld.
Joseph F. Quilter.
William S. Parsons.
William J. Millican.
Wells Thompson.
Edward T. Eves.
Earle C. Hawk.
Michael P. Bagdanovich.
Milton G. Johnson.
George P. Enright.
Albert O. Momm.
Rodney B. Lair.
Norman F. Garton.
William M. Searles.
John R. Pierce.
Victor B. Cole.
Evan E. Fickling.
Albert C. Burrows.
Robert O. Strange.
Robert C. Peden.
Irwin F. Beyerly.
John T. Bowers, jr.
Carl A. R. Lindgren.
Hugh R. Nieman, jr.
Daniel J. Wagner.
Allan G. Gaden.
Thurmond A. Smith.
Edwin B. Dexter.
Hurley McC. Zook.
Stephen H. Ambruster.
Elwood C. Madsen.
Michael F. D. Flaherty.

Donald E. Wilcox.
Thomas J. Casey.
Aaron P. Storrs, 3d.

Rollo N. Norgaard.
Robert J. Archer.
Idris B. Monahan.
Thomas Ashcraft.
John L. Collis.
George E. King.
Charles H. Kendall.
Albert J. Walden.
George Fritschmann.
Matthew Radom.
John K. McCue.
James H. Brett, jr.
Francois C. B. Jordan.
Chesford Brown.
Edward A. Hannegan.
Leonard F. Freiburghouse.
Thomas W. Jones.
Neale R. Curtin.
Edwin J. S. Young.
John T. White.
Clarence M. Bowley.
Thomas A. Donovan.
Frederick E. Moore.
Joe E. Wyatt.
J. Clark Riggs, jr.
David W. Todd, jr.
Robert L. Morris.
Alan B. Banister.
John C. Alderman.
John M. Boyd.
Marcel R. Gerin.
John E. Burke.
Roger M. Daisley.
Jesse J. Underhill.
Alfred M. Aichel.
Paul R. Anderson.
Walter N. Gray.
William W. Shea.
Philip D. Gallery.
Stephen N. Tackney.
John A. Williams.
William F. Raborn, jr.
Julian H. Detyens.
Robert T. S. Keith.
Nic Nash, jr.
Lindell H. Hewett.
George K. Huff.
Frank McD. Nichols.
Basil N. Rittenhouse, jr.
Donald A. Lovelace.
Weldon L. Hamilton.
Lex L. Black.
Jack C. Renard.
John G. Urquhart, jr.
Eugene W. Fitzmaurice.
Robert S. Hall, jr.
Guy W. Stringer.
Harry W. Richardson.
Phillip G. Stokes.
Robert A. Pierce.
Charles P. Huff, jr.
John F. Nelson.
John A. Scott.
Max L. Catterton.
Julian H. Leggett.
Earl H. Pope.

To be ensigns

Howard J. Abbott.
Noah Adair, jr.
Charles W. Aldrich.
Edward H. Allen.
Robbins W. Allen.
Charles R. Almgren.

Augustus H. Alston, jr.
Jay S. Anderson.
Richard K. Anderson.
Richard S. Andrews.
Richard N. Antrim.
Philip H. Ashworth.
Thomas Ashworth, jr.
Walter C. Bailey.
Horace D. Barker.
Raymond H. Bass.
Alcorn G. Beckmann.
Frederick J. Becton.
Robert P. Beebe.
Allen C. Bell.
Louis J. Bellis.
Sherman W. Betts.
James O. Biglow.
Edward M. Bingham.
Joseph D. Black.
Orrin F. Black.
Edward M. Blessman.
Charles T. Booth, 2d.
Robert M. Bowstrom.
Frederic R. Brace.
William B. Braun.
John H. Brockway.
Ward Bronson.
Charles B. Brooks, jr.
Henry E. Brossy.
Elliott M. Brown.
Frederick J. Brush.
Edward S. Burns.
Eugene V. Burt.
John W. Byng.
Bruce L. Carr.
John D. Cashman.
Hiram Cassedy.
John F. Castree.
Bryant A. Chandler.
John L. Chew.
Paul W. Clarke.
John B. Colwell.
James I. Cone.
Charles O. Cook, jr.
Lawrence B. Cook.
Eb S. Cooke.
Robert W. Cooper.
Nathaniel C. Copeland.
Thomas H. Copeman.
Warren G. Corliss.
Leo O. Crane.
Richard H. Crane.
Francis D. Crinkley.
Charles L. Crommelin.
John D. Crowley.
John W. Crumpacker.
Ralph Cullinan, jr.
Arthur A. Cumberledge.
Damon M. Cummings.
Arthur N. Daniels.
Donald V. Daniels.
DeAtley I. Davis.
James H. Davis.
Edward M. Day.
George DeMetropolis.
James C. Dempsey.
Lucian F. Dodson.
John O. F. Dorsett.
Harrington M. Drake.
William A. Dunn.
Ralph W. Elden.
Lee A. Ellis.
Ernest B. Ellsworth, jr.
Ralph N. Ernest.
Ernest E. Evans.
Rudolph J. Fabian.
Robert S. Fahle.

Robert B. Farquharson, jr.
Elwin L. Farrington.
James I. Fawcett.
John B. Fellows, jr.
Cleon H. Felton.
Edward F. Ferguson.
Reid P. Fiala.
Benjamin P. Field, jr.
Maxim W. Firth.
William W. Fitts.
John A. Fitzgerald.
William H. Fitzgerald.
Arthur I. Flaherty.
Joseph E. Flynn.
Francis J. Foley.
Joseph F. Foley.
Lorenz Q. Forbes.
Edward L. Foster.
Archie D. Fraser.
George F. Freeman.
William M. Freshour.
Robert E. Gadrow.
Winsor C. Gale.
Wilmer E. Gallaher.
John W. Gannon.
Josef M. Gardiner.
Clarence L. Gasterland.
Will M. Garton, jr.
Peter M. Gaviglio.
Benjamin Ghetzler.
Wayne F. Gibson.
Roy O. Gilbert, jr.
William J. Giles, jr.
Thomas E. Gillespie.
Ralph G. Gillette.
Harry M. S. Gimber, jr.
Frank G. Gould.
Donald S. Graham.
James D. Grant.
Albert D. Gray.
George M. Greene.
Thomas J. Greene.
Edward H. Guilbert.
Byron L. Gurnette.
Oscar E. Hagberg.
Vernon R. Hain.
Henry H. Hale.
Madison Hall, jr.
Norman Hall.
Mann Hamm.
Douglas T. Hammond.
John F. Harper, jr.
George A. Hatton.
Claude V. Hawk.
Carson Hawkins.
Richard R. Hay.
Nelson M. Head.
Robert B. Heilig.
Andrew J. Hill, jr.
Thomas W. Hogan, jr.
Harry W. Holden.
John C. Hollingsworth.
William W. Hollister.
Merrill S. Holmes.
Arnold H. Holtz.
Ernest C. Holtzworth.
Edwin B. Hooper.
Charles M. Howe, 3d.
Francis W. Hoye.
Robert E. Hudson.
George P. Huff.
John N. Hughes.
William C. Hughes, jr.
Raymond P. Hunter.
John D. Huntley.
Alden H. Irons.
Clifton Iverson.

Raymond H. Jacobs.
 Clifford T. Janz.
 Marvin J. Jensen.
 Charles M. Jett.
 William H. Johnsen.
 Harlan T. Johnson.
 Willis O. Johnson.
 Alvin A. Jones.
 Ashton B. Jones, jr.
 Robert E. C. Jones.
 Robert F. Jones.
 Karl E. Jung.
 John F. Just.
 James H. Kelsey, jr.
 Gerald L. Ketchum.
 Joseph V. Kiehlbauch.
 Robert D. King.
 Victor A. King.
 Charles C. Kirkpatrick.
 Charles E. Kirkpatrick.
 John E. Kirkpatrick.
 Millard J. Klein.
 Thomas R. Kurtz, jr.
 Sidney J. Lawrence.
 James T. Lay.
 William R. Lefavour.
 Joseph W. Leverton, jr.
 Bafford E. Lewellen.
 Burton C. Lillis, jr.
 Carl A. Lizberg.
 Robert E. Lockwood.
 Ernest W. Longton.
 Carlton C. Lucas.
 Hylan B. Lyon.
 Eugene S. Lytle, jr.
 Donald J. MacDonald.
 George K. MacKenzie, jr.
 Robert W. Mackert.
 George B. Madden.
 Elliot E. Marshall.
 Marshall T. Martin.
 Forsyth Massey.
 Jesse S. McAfee.
 Frank C. McAllister, jr.
 John S. McCain, jr.
 Reginald R. McCracken.
 William R. McCuddy.
 Edwin A. McDonald.
 William V. McKaig.
 Baxter M. McKay.
 Francis A. McKee.
 Bernard F. McMahon.
 Vincent J. Meola.
 Francis B. Merkle.
 Alfred B. Metsger.
 Lion T. Miles.
 Justin A. Miller.
 Norman M. Miller.
 John O. Miner.
 George G. Molumphy.
 John R. Moore.
 Daniel S. Morris.
 Charles A. Morrow, jr.
 William J. Morrow, jr.
 McDonald Moses.
 Jesse H. Motes, jr.
 Phillip W. Mothersill, jr.
 Carleton E. Mott.
 Horace D. Moulton.
 Henry Mullins, jr.
 James A. Murphy.
 John A. Myer.
 Horace Myers.
 Floyd B. T. Myhre.
 Ray C. Needham.
 Raymond H. Nelson.

Samuel E. Nelson.
 Rathel L. Nolan, jr.
 William C. Norvell.
 Joseph E. O'Brien.
 Michael G. O'Connor.
 Edward J. O'Neill.
 James M. O'Toole.
 Seymour D. Owens.
 Charles K. Palmer.
 Lee S. Pancake.
 John C. Parham, jr.
 William K. Parsons.
 Thomas B. Payne.
 Harold Payson, jr.
 Hepburn A. Pearce.
 George E. Peckham.
 Francis M. Peters, jr.
 James M. Peters.
 Richard W. Peterson.
 Thomas C. Phifer.
 Ransom A. Pierce.
 Samuel H. Porter.
 Peter G. Powell, jr.
 John G. F. Prescott.
 Frank R. Putnam.
 Lawson P. Ramage.
 Frank G. Raysbrook.
 Allan L. Reed.
 John S. Reese.
 Henry A. Renken.
 James R. Z. Reynolds.
 Alvin F. Richardson.
 Clark A. Ritchie.
 Horacio Rivero, jr.
 Berton A. Robbins, jr.
 Edward L. Robertson, jr.
 Bernard F. Roeder.
 Anthony C. Roessler.
 Thomas W. Rogers.
 Albert K. Romberg.
 David L. Roscoe, jr.
 Harold B. Russell.
 William M. Ryon.
 Robert R. Sampson.
 Walter P. Schoeni.
 George T. Schultz.
 Harry E. Seidel, jr.
 Charles F. Sell.
 Leland G. Shaffer.
 Alfred E. Sharp, jr.
 Ward T. Shields.
 William B. Sieglaff.
 William J. Sisko.
 Andrew J. Smith.
 Curtis E. Smith.
 James T. Smith.
 Julius E. Smith, jr.
 Norman E. Smith.
 Ronald K. Smith.
 Victor H. Soucek.
 Jerry C. South, jr.
 Arthur E. Stafford.
 Richard C. Steere.
 Edward F. Steffanides, jr.
 Frederic S. Steinke.
 Andrew P. Stewart.
 Walter J. Stewart.
 George R. Stone.
 Charles T. Straub.
 Daniel A. Stuart.
 Joseph B. Swain.
 Eugene Tatom.
 Robert L. Taylor.
 Robert A. Theobald, jr.
 Willis M. Thomas.
 Warren R. Thompson.

Joseph T. Thornton, jr.
 Donald W. Todd.
 Theodore A. Torgerson.
 Joseph C. Toth.
 Alfred B. Tucker, III.
 Thomas D. Tyra.
 Gordon A. Uehling.
 Schermerhorn Van Mater.
 Charles S. Vaughn.
 Alexander C. Veasey.
 Louis F. Volk.
 James B. Vredenburg.
 Ford L. Wallace.
 Kinloch C. Walpole.
 Nathaniel E. Warman.
 Hazlett P. Weatherwax.
 John A. Webster.
 James B. Weiler.
 Frederick U. Weir.
 Charles L. Werts.
 Karl R. Wheland.
 Justin L. Wickens.

Henry R. Wier.
 Donald T. Wilber.
 Prentis K. Will.
 George K. Williams.
 Henry Williams, jr.
 Jack B. Williams.
 Lowell W. Williams.
 Russell C. Williams.
 Francis T. Williamson.
 Albert H. Wilson, jr.
 Arthur L. Wilson.
 George S. Wilson.
 Peyton L. Wirtz.
 James M. Wood.
 Lester O. Wood.
 Ronald J. Woodaman.
 Edward A. Wright.
 Sinclair B. Wright.
 John T. Wulff.
 Evan W. Yancey.
 Andrew L. Young, jr.
 William P. Woods.

To be surgeons

Enoch G. Brian.
 Ross U. Whiteside.
 George G. Herman.
 Alfred L. Gaither.
 Emil J. Stelter.
 James F. Terrell.
 Jesse D. Jewell.
 Harvey W. Miller.
 Joseph F. Lankford.
 Frank W. Quin.
 Francis E. Tierney.
 Charles A. Costello.
 Forrest M. Harrison.
 Harold A. Noreen.
 Robert W. Thomas.
 Richard W. Hughes.
 Harrison L. Wyatt.
 Alva A. Shadday.
 Cyrus C. Brown.
 Henry D. Hubbard.
 James L. Manion.
 Guy Fish.
 Louis E. Fitzsimmons.
 John G. Smith.
 Isaac B. Polak.
 Camille M. Shaar.
 Frederick R. Haselton.
 Wilbert W. Munsell.
 Leslie O. Stone.
 Benjamin H. Adams.
 Clifford G. Hines.
 John B. O'Neill.
 James C. Kimball.
 William H. Harrell.
 Clinton G. DeFoney.
 James G. Dickson.
 DeWitt T. Hunter.
 David O. Bowman.
 Harry J. Noble.
 Arthur H. Pierson.
 Earl E. Sullivan.
 Houston B. Fite.
 Gilbert H. Larson.
 Samuel E. Johnson.
 Daniel P. Platt.
 John A. Marsh.
 Reuben H. Hunt.
 James K. Gordon.
 Jose A. Perez.
 Henry A. N. Bruckshaw.
 William F. Kennedy.
 Francis D. Walker.

Royal A. McCune.
 Franklyn C. Hill.
 Charles R. Tatum.
 Maurice Josés.
 Thomas F. Duhigg.
 Benjamin W. Gaines.
 James D. Benjamin.
 Emmett J. Brady.
 Harry A. Keener.
 Paul F. Dickens.
 Henry C. Kellers.
 Lincoln Humphreys.
 Albion H. Cecha.
 Ernest F. Slater.
 Irving E. Stowe.
 Francis P. Field.
 Everett B. Taylor.
 Dwight Dickinson, jr.
 William A. Epstein.
 Alfred G. Tinney.
 Arthur J. White.
 Ray E. A. Pomeroy.
 Jonathan E. Henry.
 Fleete S. Steele.
 Acipfar A. Marsteller.
 John A. Topper.
 Edward M. Steger.
 Earl E. Dockery.
 Charles Wheatley.
 Clarence N. Smith.
 John G. Davis.
 William S. Bunkley.
 Gleaves B. Kenny.
 Roy J. Leutscher.
 George E. Mott.
 Cyrus R. Currier.
 Henry L. Fougereousse.
 Otis B. Spalding.
 David E. Horrigan.
 J. Howard Branan.
 Victor B. Riden.
 James P. Bowles.
 Clyde W. Brunson.
 James D. Blackwood, jr.
 John B. Bostick.
 John T. O'Connell.
 Vincent Hernandez.
 Ray W. Hayworth.
 Stuart J. Trowbridge.
 Samuel H. White.
 Edward J. Goodbody.
 Richard B. Blackwell.

To be passed assistant surgeon

Harry L. Goff.

To be assistant surgeons

Clarence Minnema.
 Thomas M. Arnett.
 Malcolm W. Arnold.
 Lawrence E. Bach.
 Robert Bell.
 Martin H. Benson.
 Reuben A. Benson.
 William T. Booth.
 Weston T. Buddington.
 James B. Butler.
 Alvin R. Carpenter.
 Alvin J. Cerny.
 Harold J. Cokely.
 William H. L. Collis.
 Victor G. Colvin.
 Daniel C. Corriher.
 Murphy K. Cureton.
 Giffin C. Daughtridge.
 Adrian J. Delaney.
 Lewis T. Dorgan.
 Kenneth W. Elkenberry.
 Leslie D. Ekvall.
 William L. Engelman.
 Benjamin G. Feen.
 James E. Fulghum.
 Andrew Galloway.
 Willard M. Gobbell.
 Clark G. Grazier.
 Powell W. Griffith.
 Ralph D. Handen.
 Eugene R. Hering, jr.
 George R. Hogshire, jr.
 Clifford M. Hughes.
 Edward F. Kline.
 Frederick R. Lang.
 Frank A. Latham.
 William P. Locke.
 Ralph M. McComas.
 Isaac S. McReynolds.
 Clarence F. Morrison.
 Langdon C. Newman.
 Roger R. Olsen.
 Erwin H. Osterloh.
 Elbert F. Penry.

Paul K. Perkins.
 James A. Price.
 Howard L. Puckett.
 Edward M. Quinn.
 Joseph F. Rech.
 George B. Ribble, jr.
 James J. Sapero.
 Oscar Schneider.
 Howard K. Sessions.
 Robert E. Shands.
 Marcy Shupp.
 Richard J. S. Silvis.
 Francis K. Smith.
 Rudolph E. Swenson.
 Donald R. Tompkins.
 Otto E. Van Der Aue.
 Burt O. Wade.
 Ernest M. Wade.
 John H. Ward, jr.
 Robert L. Ware.
 Leon H. Warren.
 Fitz-John Weddell, jr.
 John J. Wells.
 John M. Wheelis, jr.
 Thomas L. Willmon.
 James E. Wilson, jr.
 Donald O. Wissinger.
 John D. Yarbrough.
 Isadore Zugerman.
 Joseph L. Zundell.
 Eugene R. Hammersley.
 Charles D. Bell.
 Paul M. Hoot.
 Morris M. Rubin.
 John F. Register.
 Edward T. Gary.
 Gabriel E. Obester.
 Louis M. Harris.
 Charles R. Moon.
 Keitt H. Smith.
 Clifford P. Powell.
 Thomas W. McDaniel, jr.
 Stephen E. Flynn.
 Edgar J. Easley.

To be dental surgeons

William F. Murdy.
 Clarence A. Chandler.
 Ronnie A. Berry.
 Nicholas S. Duggan.
 William J. Rogers.
 Carl E. Reynolds.
 Edmund Laughlin.
 Edward J. Fitzgerald.
 Charles S. Weigester.
 Carlton B. Morse.
 Rolland W. Quesinberry.

Ralph P. Morse.
 Ernest C. Johnson.
 Claude A. Angonnet.
 Charles H. Morris.
 Clifford E. Kelly.
 Elmer C. O'Connell.
 Harrison J. LaSalle.
 Henry C. Lowry.
 John L. McCarthy.
 Patrick A. McCole.
 Henry G. Ralph.

To be assistant dental surgeons

George N. Crosland.
 Victor A. LeClair.
 Robert W. Wheelock.
 James H. Connelly.
 Merritt J. Crawford.
 Adolph W. Borsum.
 Paul M. Carbiener.
 Claude E. Adkins.

Richard H. Barrett, jr.
 Erwin J. Shields.
 Lauro J. Turbini.
 Richard M. Bear.
 Max W. Kleinman.
 Robert W. Moss.
 James A. Morton.

To be medical inspectors

Carleton I. Wood.
 William W. Wickersham.
 William H. Michael.

Joel T. Boone.
 Frederic L. Conklin.
 Clarence W. Ross.

To be pay inspectors

Omar D. Conger.
 James P. Helm.
 Robert S. Chew.
 Oscar W. Leidel.
 Charles C. Copp.
 John J. Gaffney.

John A. Byrne.
 Richard S. Robertson.
 Charles V. McCarty.
 Eaton C. Edwards.
 John B. Ewald.
 Samuel R. White, jr.

To be paymasters

Harry A. Hooton.
 Charles W. Charlton.
 Palmer J. McCloskey.
 John B. Daniels.
 Arthur P. M. Shock.
 James M. Easter.
 Gerald A. Shattuck.
 Melvin F. Talbot.
 Edwin D. Foster.
 Walton Dismukes.
 Horace D. Nuber.
 William J. Carter, jr.
 David W. Mitchell.
 Archy W. Barnes.
 George P. Seifert.
 Thomas M. Schnotala.
 Charles E. Sandgren.
 Andrew J. McMullen.
 Alvah B. Canham.
 Frank W. Hathaway.
 Theodore S. Coulbourn.
 John H. Seifert.
 Arthur G. King.
 Orville D. Foutch.

LeRoy Moyer.
 Edward R. McKenzie.
 William C. Colbert.
 Benjamin Berkowitz.
 Edison H. Gale.
 Percy J. Hutchinson.
 Herbert C. Lassiter.
 William R. Ryan.
 James C. Masters.
 William E. Lund.
 Roy E. Smith.
 Lawrence C. Fuller.
 Samuel V. Dunham.
 Stephen E. Smith.
 John L. Cash.
 Clarence W. Baker.
 Charles W. Brown.
 Allen C. Bridges.
 Independent W. Gorton.
 Arthur A. Lee.
 Daniel Lynch.
 Edward H. Duane.
 Max Baum.
 Charles W. Stevenson.

To be assistant paymasters

Clark T. Abbott.
 Peyton P. Callaway.
 Stanley Mumford.
 Joseph F. Tenney.
 Marshall H. Cox.
 Ignatius N. Tripi.
 Charles L. Keithley.
 Walter R. Wright.
 Frederick A. Kinzie.
 Sidney A. Freeberg.
 Edward P. Trenholme.

William E. Moring.
 Bernhard Tieslau.
 Harvey C. Hope.
 Francis B. Risser.
 Arnold J. Carlson.
 Frederick DeB. Witzel.
 Warren W. Whiteside, jr.
 John H. Sewell.
 Harry R. Godbey.
 George A. Johnson.

To be assistant naval constructor

John H. Spiller.

To be civil engineer

Ralph D. Spalding.

To be assistant civil engineers

Albert J. Fay.
 Howard F. Ransford.
 Horace B. Jones.

To be chief boatswains

Daryl W. Cardell.
 Edwin M. Jacobsen.
 Harold T. Petersen to be chief gunner.

To be chief electricians

George L. Van Slyke.
 Harry F. Letts.

To be chief radioelectricians

Delmar L. Tuft.
 Albert D. Walker.
 James M. Kane.
 Augustus L. Day.
 Elmer T. Stone.
 Douglas S. Green.
 William J. Thompson.
 Lee J. Delworth.
 William R. Morley.

To be chief machinists

Sterling P. Womack.
 John J. Deignan.
 Ivan L. Brown.
 Walter W. Eshelman.

To be chief carpenters

Harry P. Cummings.
 Thomas F. Coyne.
 George W. Steeves.
 Alfred J. Ray.
 Henry B. Britt.

To be chief pay clerk

Philip C. Dahlquist.

POSTMASTERS

DELAWARE

Stephen W. Miller, Camden.

IOWA

Roscoe W. Petersen, Bettendorf.

Howard C. Copeland, Chariton.

Andrew C. Link, Dyersville.

Eliza K. Alldredge, Melbourne.

John A. Hale, Tripoli.

KENTUCKY

Roy Fraim, Alva.

Lenard W. Thrasher, Burkesville.

Emma A. Ellis, Campbellsville.

Lizzie B. Davisworth, Cumberland.

Benton W. Mauzy, Dixon.

Albert D. Boulard, Elva.

Claude P. Freeman, Fulton.

Arthur G. Powell, Irvine.

Mary L. Easum, Jeffersonton.

Mary O. Manby, La Grange.

John B. Searcy, Lawrenceburg.

Lillie M. Jackson, Lebanon.

Benoni H. Lott, Lewisport.

Frank A. Mohnsey, Lynch.

Marsh F. Chumley, McHenry.

John M. Miller, Middlesboro.

Carl A. Reis, Mogg.

Gilson P. Tate, Monticello.

Fred L. Sears, Nicholasville.

Burton Roberts, Richmond.

Inez M. Christian, Sturgis.

Edith Eaton, Uniontown.

Tacie G. Thoroughman, Vanceburg.

James L. Howard, Wallins Creek.

MASSACHUSETTS

Samuel L. Porter, Amesbury.

John D. Quigley, Ashland.

Henry E. Bearse, Centerville.

Maynard N. Wetherell, Chartley.

William H. Lilley, Chicopee.

Walter L. Tower, Dalton.

Gilbert W. O'Neil, Gloucester.

Charles H. Slocumb, Greenfield.

Leroy E. Johnson, Groton.

William F. Keller, Holliston.

George A. Coolidge, Hudson.

Leon C. W. Foote, Lee.

Ernest H. Wilcox, Manchester.

Turner R. Bailey, Medfield.

Charles D. Streeter, Mount Hermon.

Harold Winslow, New Bedford.

George W. Orcutt, North Abington.

James T. Potter, North Adams.

Alonzo W. Jones, Orleans.

Margaret E. Rourke, Prides Crossing.

William E. Chaffin, Scituate.

Wesley G. Rose, South Deerfield.

Maurice Williams, South Easton.

John H. Preston, South Hadley.

Frederick C. Haigis, Turners Falls.

Otis J. A. Dionne, Walpole.

Blanche E. Robinson, Wareham.

Thomas E. Hynes, Wayland.

George D. Roe, Westfield.

Henry O. Bailey, West Newbury.

Mary A. Fallon, West Stockbridge.

NEW YORK

Annie J. McFadden, Ardsley.

Howard E. Whealey, Baldwin.

Clarence G. Jones, Barneveld.

Vida E. Freeman, Bloomingdale.

William G. Fisher, Chadwicks.

Clarence A. Bratt, Clarence Center.

Norman D. Higby, Constableville.

George C. Palmer, Cuba.

Frank P. Morstatt, Garnerville.

Edward T. Cole, Garrison.

Herbert L. Merritt, Katonah.

Charles L. Stackpole, Lyon Mountain.

Ernest K. Smith, Middleburg.

Ambrose D. Eldred, New Hartford.

Carl R. Allen, Oriskany Falls.

Frank V. Palmer, Philmont.

William H. Savage, Seneca Falls.

William T. Williamson, Troy.

Dennis W. Messler, Trumansburg.

Ray C. Kelsey, Weedsport.

Julius H. Fisher, Wellsville.

Grace A. Harrington, West Point.

George T. Anderson, Whitesboro.

C. Irving Henderson, Worcester.

PENNSYLVANIA

William P. Bush, Bellwood.

Henry Doering, Bethayres.

Robert K. Ritter, Bethlehem.

Karl R. Volk, Boswell.

Clarence G. Dixon, Butler.

Chestina M. Smith, Centralia.

George F. Marsh, Clifton Heights.

Samuel E. Spare, Doylestown.

John Martinelli, Fairbank.

Henry W. Redfoot, Fredonia.

Rachel M. Thurston, Iselin.

William N. Baker, Lewisburg.

Clarence E. McGhee, Minersville.

Oscar R. Moser, Mont Alto.

Evalyn M. Roberts, Morganza.

Rapha C. Sieg, Mountainhome.

Mary R. Clapper, New Enterprise.

Frank M. Berk, New Ringgold.

Lina E. Williams, Reno.

Eli B. Weaver, Ruffs Dale.

Daniel M. Witmer, Safe Harbor.

Laura M. Gilpatrick, Seward.

Herman S. Van Campen, Shavertown.

Harry B. Lee, Springville.

Elmer E. Grover, Wapwallopen.

Joseph P. Kearney, Wynnewood.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, every new day is worthy of our best endeavor. May we measure our duty by our obligation by taking hold of the ordinary tasks and common experiences and transmit them into permanent values. Let us open our hearts to Thee, even as we would a dear friend who has come to keep us delightful company and make us feel that our labor is altogether worth while. Grant that the law of justice may be upon our lips and the spirit of kindness in our hearts. We thank Thee for the fine joys of life and for Thy gracious will concerning us. Teach us that life in its divinest essence is nobility of soul, purity of heart, and a zealous activity in doing good. May we walk worthily, labor justly, and hate and despise falsehood and cowardice. In the name of Jesus. 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 bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1207. An act granting an increase of pension to Helen K. Snowden;

S. 1569. An act for the relief of Della D. Ledendecker;

S. 1861. An act authorizing the George Washington Bicentennial Commission to print and distribute additional sets of the writings of George Washington;

S. 2569. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of Lewis O. Wick;

S. 2894. An act prohibiting misrepresentation as to seating accommodations by theaters in the District of Columbia; and

S. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to authorize the printing of 100,000 copies of the annual report of the Federal Farm Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931.

DEFENSE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a speech made by me in defense of the American Legion on January 17, 1932.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The address is as follows:

IS THE AMERICAN LEGION AN ASSET

I do not believe the Legion needs any defense from the charges made by Mr. Marcus Duffield, nor am I authorized by the American Legion to speak in its behalf, but feel that there are certain misunderstandings in the public mind which should be cleared up and which can easily be done. I hold no office in the Legion and speak as an individual.

I am only too glad, as a member of the Legion, to defend it against unfair attacks and uphold its principles and purposes as established by the preamble to its constitution, which reads as follows:

"For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a 100 per cent Americanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our association in the Great War; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy; to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness."

President Hoover and General Pershing have both, on public occasions, praised the preamble of the Legion in no uncertain terms. I had the honor of serving on the committee on the constitution at the first convention of the American Legion in the United States, held at St. Louis in May, 1919, and was selected as chairman of the subcommittee on the preamble, which was in fact a subcommittee of the committee on the constitution. The committee on the preamble consisted of Col. Jack Greenway, of Arizona, Judge Davis, of Portland, Oreg., now of Wilmington, Del., and myself as chairman. We worked over the wording of the preamble for 48 hours, shaping and reshaping the wording until I was authorized to report it for the subcommittee of three in its final form, which has never been changed by so much as the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." Time and experience have ratified and confirmed these few lines.

I have purposely referred to the framing of the preamble as it concisely enunciates the principles and aims of the Legion, and also because of some misunderstanding and confusion created by President Hoover in his address before the Legion convention at Boston in 1930, when he erroneously referred to the Legion preamble as having been written in Paris, which is without foundation of fact.

The intent of the authors of the preamble was for a liberal interpretation of its wording; and as long as that policy is adhered to, I expect to continue to belong to the American Legion and uphold its purposes.

The Legion is the largest and most important patriotic organization in the United States, and its opportunities for service to community, State, and Nation are practically unlimited. It is a powerful organization, composed of civilians bound together through common service in the defense of their country that can be depended upon to form a bulwark for law and order and oppose tyranny or oppression, anarchy or revolution.

I believe under the new national commander, Henry L. Stevens, and the able cooperation of the national legislative representative, John Thomas Taylor, at Washington, that the Legion will take a more aggressive attitude in combating the spread of communism and all revolutionary doctrines aimed at our free institutions and republican form of government.

The Legion has organized a militant campaign against unemployment and is doing effective work to find positions for unemployed veterans in all the industrial cities of the Nation. It has supported the efforts of the Labor Department to create veterans' employment bureaus, which are functioning efficiently in all the larger cities.

The Legion has organized 10,500 cities and towns to create employment along the Rochester and Buffalo plan, where the Legion demonstrated what could be done by making a house to house drive to persuade people to make repairs and improvements now. The Legion is urging manufacturers to employ additional men to do all necessary work at the present time.

The American Federation of Labor, Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs, and the churches are all cooperating with the Legion in its nationwide program to relieve the unemployment situation. The efforts of the Legion to obtain jobs for veterans and nonveterans is a fine constructive piece of work.

The Legion has done more for the disabled service men than all other organizations combined, and in making that statement I do not in any way reflect on the splendid work that has been and is still being done by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans. However, while some of the ardor of those superpatriots, who repeatedly and dramatically announced during the war that nothing was too good for our disabled, has oozed and dwindled away because it cost money and meant increased taxes, the legionnaires have always placed the welfare of their disabled comrades first on their legislative program. To-day whenever any legislation is being considered in behalf of the disabled war veterans, such as civil-service preference or allowance for widows and orphans, the old cry that nothing is too good for them is seldom, or never, heard. But let some legislation be considered for the able-bodied veteran, such as the adjusted service certificate loan bill, and all the big metropolitan papers will howl in unison about the promises and pledges made to the disabled during the war in order to defeat it.

The American Legion has been unjustly charged with dictating all kinds of policies to the Congress of the United States and with utterly ignoring article 2 of the Legion constitution, which reads as follows:

"The American Legion shall be absolutely nonpolitical and shall not be used for the dissemination of partisan principles or the promotion of the candidacy of any person seeking public office or preferment."

The Legion is absolutely nonpartisan; even its bitterest enemy can not deny that.

The undercover opponents of the Legion, the draft dodgers, the stay-at-homes, the ultraradicals, the peace-at-any-price women's organizations, the political bosses who always fear the onward march of youth, the war profiteers, and big taxpayers are united in the desire that the American Legion should be deaf, dumb, and blind on all the great issues with which our people and Nation are confronted.

I am glad that no individual can from now on say that the Legion dodges great controversial issues. At the last national convention the delegates refused to pussy-foot on prohibition and came out squarely for a referendum on this important issue which affects the lives, welfare, habits, and sentiments of all the American people.

The American Legion needs no defense against any such flimsy charges as made by Mr. Duffield, that it is a powerful political machine like the old Grand Army of the Republic, dominating and dictating to the Members of Congress and to the President of the United States.

There were many legionnaires, including myself, who had felt prior to the Detroit convention held last September that the Legion had failed to pay adequate attention to great public questions and that it had not taken its proper place in formulating public opinion and shaping the destinies of our country. What the Legion thinks to-day should be welcomed and followed by the American people, as the Legion represents a cross-section of our country, all of its members having served in the armed forces of the United States during the World War. If a nation is to be worth dying for in time of war, it must be worth living for in time of peace.

It is the manifest duty of the Legion, the largest veterans' organization in the United States, to take the leadership on most of the nonpolitical and nonpartisan issues affecting the interests of the American people and help in making our country a better place to live in for oncoming generations.

I doubt if anyone will deny that the Legion has far less political influence than the old G. A. R., which had only a fraction of its membership. Within two years after the Civil War 50 per cent of the Members of Congress had served in the Union Army, whereas to-day, 14 years after the armistice, only 15 per cent of the Members of Congress are World War veterans.

There has been more misunderstanding and unjustifiable criticism of the Legion and of all veterans on account of the passage in the closing days of the last session of the bill providing for additional loans to war veterans than of any other legislation since I have been in Congress. I am glad of this opportunity to defend the Legion and all veterans against the massed editorial attacks of most of our metropolitan papers since the increased veterans' loan bill became law. I have no hesitation in saying, without any reservation, that during my service in the House of Representatives I know of no veterans' legislation that has been sounder, saner, or safer as far as the interests of the public and taxpayers are concerned.

The people back home, through reading utterly erroneous articles in the metropolitan newspapers, have been led to believe that Congress, by providing for additional loans of from 22½ per cent to 50 per cent on the adjusted-service certificates held by the World War veterans, has deliberately organized a raid upon the Treasury which will increase taxes and hamper and retard business. These unfair, untrue, and iniquitous charges have been

spread throughout the land by the metropolitan press and are ably supported by numerous magazines and business periodicals. I challenge any individual, newspaper, or magazine to explain just how the veterans' loan bill as passed by the Congress constitutes a raid on the Treasury, or will increase taxes or retard business.

Under the provisions of the bill the veteran has to pay $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent at compound interest for any loan he may make on his adjusted-service certificate, except in the New York and Boston districts, where he pays 4 per cent, whereas the Treasury Department borrows the money at 3 per cent and makes a profit of from 1 to $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on every loan to a veteran, at his expense.

There is no possible way of figuring out how the financing of these loans to the veterans can cost the taxpayers one red cent. But in spite of that, the taxpayers back home have been deceived into believing that they were footing the bill because of numerous unjustifiable editorials appearing in the daily press asserting that the additional loans to veterans would increase Federal taxes. There is in the United States Treasury a fund now in excess of \$1,100,000, and added to each year, for the purpose of paying off the adjusted-service certificates when they mature in 1945.

The Treasury Department can use this money by refunding it if it so desires, or it can sell securities on a 3 per cent basis—possibly more from now on—and then loan the money to the veterans at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest. The greater the number of veterans who receive loans from the Government the larger the profit of the Government at the expense of the veterans.

I do not propose to call Uncle Sam a Shylock, but it certainly is a pretty lucrative business operation, which should bring in a net profit of at least \$10,000,000 annually to the Federal Government for the next 15 years. That does not sound so much like a raid upon the Treasury or increasing Federal taxes.

There are a number of misstatements concerning the Legion that have been repeated so often they have almost been accepted as facts by the public. One is that Congress acted in a cowardly manner as a result of demands made by an imaginary soldier bloc, which is untrue and a reflection both upon the membership of Congress and upon the veterans. However, it is effective propaganda in the hands of international bankers, who send a billion dollars of American money to foreign countries each year but are opposed to any loan to our own veterans in an emergency, even if the Government makes a profit out of it, as it might affect the bond market for additional foreign loans.

Collier's Weekly in a recent issue says editorially: "The \$1,000,000,000 veterans' loan passed in a mood of political frenzy by the last discredited Congress was a dole for the unemployed." The only truth in this statement is that the Members of Congress who voted for the bill knew that there was a large amount of unemployment among the veterans of the World War, some 50,000 being without jobs in New York City alone. I am informed that in this period of business depression and unemployment there is a great deal of hardship and suffering among the unemployed World War veterans. Although the World War veterans represent only 3 per cent of the population, yet they represent approximately 15 per cent of the unemployed. There are over 700,000 unemployed veterans, or, in other words, 20 per cent of all World War veterans are unemployed. It must be self-evident that the veterans, being between the ages of 30 and 40, most of whom are married and have families to support, have not been able to set aside any surplus or reserve for emergency purposes, such as unemployment in unexpected periods of business depression.

The World War veterans are merely a cross section of the American people, good, bad, and indifferent. However, it is safe to say that over 90 per cent of the veterans are using the loans made on their own Government certificates to pay rent, buy food and clothes for their children, and pay off debts accumulated through unemployment, including interest on mortgages on their homes and small business enterprises, premiums on fire, disability, and life-insurance policies, and very often doctors', nurses', and hospital bills. I have heard of a number of cases where these loans have permitted veterans to secure specialists who have saved the lives of their children.

The bill as passed by Congress was in no sense a bonus, which means a gift. It merely permitted additional loans as an emergency measure up to 50 per cent on a Government certificate, the best security in the world, and owned by veterans who have to pay $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent compound interest. I resent, and I know that millions of veterans and their friends resent, the articles appearing in the press which call attention to the fact that some individual veteran got drunk on his so-called bonus money and was arrested for disorderly conduct. Of course out of approximately 2,000,000 veterans who, it is estimated, will apply for and receive loans, there will be the 1 per cent that will blow in the money. One per cent will amount to 20,000, and the metropolitan press has regaled their readers with glowing accounts of the misdeeds of the 1 per cent of good-for-nothing veterans and forgot all about the 99 per cent of ex-service men who have used the loans intelligently and for the benefit of their families in an emergency, and at the same time, in my humble opinion, for the advantage and promotion of business generally in every State in the Nation.

My only objection to the bill as passed is the high rate of interest— $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent—imposed upon the veterans, when the Government borrows for less and makes a profit out of each loan. In no case should the loan carry more than 4 per cent, and it would have been fairer to the veteran to arrange the interest at the same rate that the Government pays on its Treasury bills or certificates, or in whatever borrowing operations are necessary to finance the loan.

The United States public debt is now about \$17,000,000,000, having been reduced from a war peak of \$27,000,000,000 in the past 12 years. It is only right, during the business depression, that we should pause for a breathing spell in reducing our national debt. Then as soon as we pass safely out of the existing emergency, we should continue the sound policy of liquidating our national debt as rapidly as business conditions will permit.

Mr. Duffield seems to be much worried if perchance a legionnaire should at some time in the future be elected President of the United States. Why not elect a legionnaire? Who has more right to aspire to the Presidency than a veteran of the World War, and the sooner one is elected the better it will be for the country.

Mr. Duffield stated erroneously that the Grand Army of the Republic had only 20,000 members in its prime days. Such is not the fact; there were at one time over 500,000 members of the Grand Army of the Republic.

Mr. Duffield has attempted to picture the Legion as a great bellicose, militaristic machine, on the side of war as against peace. It is true that the Legion stands for adequate national defense and for the maintenance of the 5-5-3 ratio in naval construction. The policy of the Legion is that the United States must always be ready to defend itself, particularly in view of the present disturbances throughout the world. Any other course would be sheer folly until other nations reduce their naval and military armaments.

There is probably no group in the United States that hates and loathes war more than those who actually fought on the battlefields of France and saw their friends and buddies shot down by unseen foes, blinded by poisonous gas, or blown up by high explosives hurled from guns miles away. There is little glory in modern warfare, and none know it better than the World War veteran.

The Legion was among the first of the great organizations to indorse the proposal to outlay war, which eventuated in the Kellogg pact.

No; the Legion is opposed to war and all forms of military aggression that lead to war. It has no imperialistic aims and seeks no conquered territories anywhere in the world. It is composed of civilians who served in the armed forces of the United States during the World War, and most of them would be willing, if necessary, to defend their country, both in peace and in war, against its enemies from without and from within.

The charge that the Legion is imperialistic and militaristic comes from the same sources—communists, socialists, pink intellectuals, and pacifists—who hurl identical charges and propaganda against the United States, which has a northern border line of 4,000 miles without a single fort, gun, or soldier, and would not accept even as a gift any additional territory in the world. It has no foundation in fact; but criticisms and attacks, if often enough repeated, deceive some people and obtain a misguided following.

In conclusion, let me point out that the veterans are not asking for charity, or even a bonus. They were certainly entitled in this emergency to have received additional loans on their own service certificates, which costs the Government nothing. As I stated on the floor of the House of Representatives, Secretary Mellon should have given a sumptuous dinner to all those who voted for the adjusted service certificate loan bill in the form in which Congress passed it, as it was the most economical of approximately 50 measures that were introduced, including some for payment in full of the face value of the certificates in cash, which would have cost \$3,409,250,000, and which was voted down at the last Legion convention.

The Legion demonstrated conclusively at the Detroit convention that the general welfare of the American people was paramount, and the demands made by many ex-service men for further loans on adjusted-service certificates were emphatically denied, after an open debate, because a big majority of the delegates realized that the Federal Government would have been placed under a terrific financial strain at a time when the Treasury Department already was faced with a huge deficit.

The American people owe a debt of gratitude to the American Legion for its sound constructive action, which has been acclaimed throughout the Nation even by some of its bitterest opponents among newspaper editors.

The Legion stands to-day where it has always stood since its foundation—for the best interest and welfare of our country and of all of its citizens. Without fear of contradiction, I maintain that anyone who defames the Legion does a disservice to the American people and to our country.

PENSIONS

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6596, an act granting pensions and increases 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 title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 37, strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive.

Page 41, strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive.

Page 41, strike out lines 15 to 18, inclusive.

Page 44, strike out lines 17 to 21, inclusive.

Page 52, after line 7, insert:

"The name of Jane M. Ford, widow of Abel C. Ford, late of the Ninth unattached company, 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 Ida H. Stinson, widow of Avery F. Stinson, alias Amos Simpson, late of Company A, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Mary J. McLaughlin, widow of Moses J. McLaughlin, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Margaret A. Kollock, widow of Horace T. Kollock, late of Company B, Thirtieth 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 Annie P. Hall, widow of David H. Hall, late of the 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 Almeda Crosby, widow of Enock S. Crosby, late of Battery K, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Susan Dadmum, widow of Josiah A. Dadmum, late musician, Third 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 Susannah Powers, widow of George Powers, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-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 Mary C. Stewart, widow of Irenious D. Stewart, late of Company E, Twenty-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 Myrtle G. Geoffroy, widow of Gregorie L. Geoffroy, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Sabina C. T. Fox, widow of John Fox, late of Troop G, Eighth 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 F. Robbins, widow of Ephriam Robbins, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month, and \$30 per month when attaining the age of 60 years.

"The name of Rosa Webb, helpless child of Stiles Delass Webb, late of Troop D, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Mattie J. Price, widow of Cyrus Price, late of Battery G, Fifth Regiment United States Colored Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Harriet C. Church, widow of John A. Church, late of Company K, Twenty-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 A. Cline, widow of Lemiel Cline, late of Company B, Seventy-fourth 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 John William Duff, helpless child of William F. Duff, late of Company B, Ninety-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Mary Currier, widow of John Currier, late of Battery B, First Regiment Ohio 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 Margaret Cottrill, widow of Henderson Cottrill, late of Company B, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Ohio 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 Hattie G. Kennedy, widow of William H. H. Kennedy, late of Company G, Eighty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Flora A. Irwin, widow of Samuel L. Irwin, late of Company H, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio 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 Margaret D. Haines, widow of Caleb F. Haines, late of Company D, Eighteenth 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 Herman Reissenbigler, helpless child of George Reissenbigler, late of Company F, Twenty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Tabitha Alkire, widow of Alexander Alkire, late of Troop E, First 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 Josephine L. Wilson, widow of Joseph S. Wilson, late of the 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 Margaret E. Wells, widow of William A. Wells, late of Company C, Sixtieth 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 Jane West, widow of William West, late of Company E, Sixty-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 Mary Roby, widow of John W. Roby, late of Company B, Ninety-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 Kate Ann McGinnis, widow of Neriah N. McGinnis, late of Company H, Twenty-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 Sarah N. Houseman, widow of Henry Houseman, late of Company G, Thirty-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 Almera J. Chiles, widow of John F. Chiles, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-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 Ann M. Stead, widow of Benjamin G. Stead, late of Company H, 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 J. S. Clyde Baldwin, helpless child of John S. Baldwin, late of Troop E, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Elizabeth Caulk, widow of Alexander Caulk, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-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 Mary J. Goodson, widow of Jesse N. Goodson, late of Company F, One hundred and eighty-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 Eliza Darnell, widow of James Darnell, late of Troop I, Eighth Regiment Tennessee 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 John G. Smith, helpless child of Samuel R. Smith, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Eliza J. Young, widow of Shelby D. Young, late of Troop E, First 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 S. Audella Burdick, widow of Charles H. Burdick, late of Company K, Thirteenth 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 Sarah Flier, widow of John H. Flier, late of Company E, Second 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 Charlotte E. Patt, widow of Benjamin A. Patt, late of Company I, Fourth 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 Fanny L. Johnson, widow of Duttee Johnson, jr., late of Company E, Fifth 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 Mandilla Nitchman, widow of John Nitchman, late of Company I, Fifty-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 Martha Stonesifer, widow of Ishmael Stonesifer, late of Company F, One hundred and thirtieth 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 Laura E. Young, widow of Addison S. Young, late of Company B, Twenty-ninth 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 Isabelle H. Redfield, widow of David Redfield, late of Troop B, Fourteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Medora Bailey, widow of John F. Bailey, late of Battery A, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Elizabeth E. Caskey, widow of Joseph Caskey, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month, and \$30 per month when she attains the age of 60 years.

"The name of Harriet A. Pelton, widow of Lysander Pelton, late of Company C, One hundred and 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 Jennie B. Southwick, widow of Joseph P. Southwick, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Ida M. Cunningham, widow of Ellison Cunningham, late of Troop H, 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 Jennie S. Fountain, widow of John M. Fountain, late of Company A, Fourteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Lucy N. Teel, widow of George Teel, late of Battery E, First Regiment New Hampshire 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 Bridget A. Whittle, widow of Albert B. Whittle, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Canzada Pierce, widow of Plummer F. Pierce, late of Company I, One hundred and second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Emma C. Nichols, widow of Robert S. Nichols, late of Company D, Ninth 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 Mary C. Atwood, widow of Julius C. Atwood, late quartermaster sergeant, One hundredth 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 Cindarella L. Kelsey, widow of William Kelsey, late of Company I, Eighth 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 Louisa A. Worthington, widow of Eugene A. Worthington, late of Company E, One hundred and sixth 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 Beatrice J. Rose, widow of Ludin Rose, late of Troop G, Sixth 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 Nettie Thaxton, widow of Monroe S. Thaxton, late of Troop A, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Valeria Middleton, widow of William Middleton, late of Company E, Second Regiment Potomac Home Brigade Maryland 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 John W. Meredith, late of Company D, South Cumberland Battalion Kentucky Capital Guards, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

"The name of Carrie B. Martin, helpless child of Silas E. Martin, late of Company B, Battalion Virginia Substitute, West Virginia Exempts, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Tuluva V. M. Bortsfeld, widow of Amos Bortsfeld, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-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 Mary White, widow of David A. White, late of Company C, Twelfth 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 Ella A. Linsea, widow of Emanuel Linsea, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Mary Ross, widow of Calvin Ross, late of Company E, Eighty-third Regiment United States Cavalry Volunteer Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Bridget Striegel, widow of Christian Striegel, late of Company H, Forty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Sarah A. Bolton, widow of John Bolton, late of Company D, 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 Samantha A. Mundell, widow of Ransom Mundell, late of Troop L, Sixteenth 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 Frank C. Clifford, helpless child of Henry H. Clifford, late of Company E, One hundred and nineteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Della B. Ammons, helpless child of Abraham Ammons, late of Company I, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Ellen Blodgett, widow of Silas Blodgett, late of Troop H, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month, and \$30 per month when she attains the age of 60 years.

"The name of Jennie McBurney, widow of Andrew McBurney, late of Company K, Thirty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Rosalie Kunkel, widow of Charles H. Kunkel, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Alice A. Colburn, widow of Lewis A. Colburn, late of Troop A, First Regiment Provisional 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 Cynthia Combs, widow of Harrison Combs, late of Company M, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky 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 L. Gundiff, widow of George A. Gundiff, late of Troop L, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky 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 Spinner, widow of Joseph Spinner, late of Company I, Twenty-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 Viola Compton, widow of Albert Compton, late of Troop L, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Susannah Lanham, widow of Ansel Lanham, late of Troop M, Eighth Regiment Kentucky 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 Mattie P. Busey, widow of Isaac M. Busey, late of Troop B, Ninth Regiment Kentucky 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 C. Havens, widow of Willbur F. Havens, late of Company D, 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 Mary E. Smith, widow of Artemas Smith, late of Company H, One hundred and 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 Anna Kelley, widow of Jerry Kelley, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Iowa 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 Millie Reed, widow of Addison Reed, late of Troop C, Sixth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Mary M. Hudson, widow of Charles C. Hudson, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-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 Anna L. Nesbet, widow of Joseph M. Nesbet, late of Troop B, Tenth 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 Anna P. Allen, former widow of Isaac Phipps, late of Company A, Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month and \$30 per month when she attains the age of 60 years.

"The name of Emma K. Pickett, widow of Albert J. Pickett, late of Troop B, Fifth Regiment Indiana 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 Margaret L. Roberts, widow of Calvin T. Roberts, 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 Mary J. Espy, widow of Robert J. Espy, late of Company D, Ninth 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 Sarah Weaver, widow of John H. Weaver, late of Company K, 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 Lenora Cartwright, widow of James W. Cartwright, late of the 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 Mary S. Stowe, widow of John Stowe, late of Company K, One hundred and sixteenth 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 Richard Southerland, late of Company A, Hall's Gap Battalion Kentucky State-Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

"The name of Rosa Risdon, widow of Daniel Risdon, late of Company G, Ninth 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 Sarah M. Hatfield, widow of Andrew Hatfield, late of Company A, Fourteenth 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 Amelia Bee, widow of Joel Bee, late of Company M, Sixth 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 Sarah Pennel, widow of John Pennel, late of Company E, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio 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 Henry Ellis, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

"The name of Jane Price, widow of James D. Price, late of Capt. G. W. Porter's company, Butternut Valley Guards, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Esther A. Dixon, widow of Albert E. Dixon, late of Company A, Nineteenth 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 F. Dobson, widow of Palmer F. Dobson, late of Troop K, 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 Rosina Dohon, widow of Constant Dohon, late of Troop D, Fourth 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 Jemima M. Metcalf, widow of George A. Metcalf, late of Troop F, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Henry Coonce, late of Captain Hart's Morgan County company, Missouri Mounted Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

"The name of Nancy E. Dawson, widow of Aaron Dawson, late of Company D, 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 Ina J. Densmore, widow of Harry M. Densmore, late of Company A, Thirtieth 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 Isabel J. Estes, former widow of Henry Johnson, late of Company B, 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 Bell J. Adams, widow of George S. Adams, late of Company E, 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 Rose A. Fernan, widow of Franklin W. Fernan, late of Company H, First Battalion, Twelfth 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 E. Foster, widow of William J. Foster, late of Company B, Fourth 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 Clara A. Phelps, widow of Allen Phelps, late of Troop M, Twenty-sixth 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 Hannah L. Robbins, widow of Frank Robbins, late of Company D, 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 Mary E. Daniels, former widow of William Roach, late of Company D, Seventeenth 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 Anna M. Walbridge, widow of Lysander E. Walbridge, late of Company E, Eighth 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 A. Dittman, widow of Frederick Dittman, late of Troop E, Second 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 Mary H. Keck, widow of John S. Keck, late of Troop G, Fourth 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 Josephine Stombaugh, widow of Henry Stombaugh, late of Company C, Ninety-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Lona Wright, helpless child of Allen Wright, late of Troop F, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Lucrecia Aydelotte, widow of John Aydelotte, late of Company H, 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 Martha E. Goble, helpless child of Francis M. Goble, late of the Twenty-second Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Dora Klinger, widow of David Klinger, late of Battery C, 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 A. Long, widow of Mansford Long, late of Company H, Thirty-second 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 Permella J. Long, widow of Jasper N. Long, late of Company H, Thirty-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 Malinda Sprague, widow of Charles Sprague, late of Battery A, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Rachel J. Johnson, widow of Childes B. Johnson, alias Charles B. Johnson, late of Company B, Sixty-ninth 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 Wesley, widow of John Wesley, late of the 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 Ada F. Williams, widow of Jeremiah Williams, late of Company H, Seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry,

and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Emily J. Moore, widow of Thomas A. Moore, late of Company D, Seventy-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 Nancy Maskel, widow of Ellis V. Maskel, late of Company A, 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 Gertrude Cox, widow of Thomas Cox, late of Tenth 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 Ellen J. Owens, widow of Nicholas A. Owens, late of Company A, One hundred and seventeenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Martha A. Pyle, widow of William H. H. Pyle, late of Company K, Eighty-first 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 Carrie D. Patton, former widow of Elias Dandridge, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Catharine Beach, widow of Joseph Beach, late of Company K, 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 Mertena Swaidner, helpless child of Emanuel C. Swaidner, late of Company D, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Rosa A. Woodrum, widow of Abraham Woodrum, late of the Thirteenth Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Elizabeth Burris, widow of Simon Burris, late of Company I, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Rosanna Kellogg, widow of Francis N. Kellogg, late of Company K, Seventy-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 Rose L. Bard, widow of Isaac Bard, late of Company C, Twenty-sixth 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 Floretta Knopf, widow of Andrew Knopf, late of Battery I, Second Regiment Connecticut 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 Sarah E. Smith, widow of Chandler Smith, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Maryland 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 Nannie Curry, widow of George W. Curry, late of Troop L, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky 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 Fannie Lou Cate Harmon, helpless child of James F. Harmon, late of Troop A, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Jane Soulsby, widow of Edward Soulsby, late of Troop D, Second 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 Eliza H. Bagley, widow of Moses O. Bagley, late of Company I, Third 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 Morehouse, widow of George W. Morehouse, late of Company E, Second 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 Mary J. Johnson, former widow of Leonidas Johnson, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-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 Lorena White, widow of Charles R. White, late of Company A, Fifty-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 Jane McArthur, widow of Henry McArthur, late of Battery K, Fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of E. Helen Barkley, widow of James H. Barkley, late of Company G, One hundred and fourteenth 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 Church, widow of William Church, late of Company N, Sixth 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 SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand from the reading of the amendments

that the Senate amendments are merely changes in amounts, or do they include names of additional beneficiaries who are to receive gratuities of the Government?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They are analogous to House cases and are Senate bills added to this bill as amendments.

Mr. STAFFORD. I came in just a minute late when the original bill was presented by the gentleman. Will the gentleman kindly forecast what the policy of the committee is going to be as to granting special pension privileges to certain designated beneficiaries?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am unable to state at this time the attitude of the committee except to say that in all probability the policy pursued in past Congresses will be the policy in this Congress in reporting out various omnibus pension bills.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I understand, so far as the Senate amendments are concerned, the amounts there stated are conformable to the rule as adopted by the House in granting special pensions in certain cases.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I may say that they are.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF 6-HOUR DAY ON RAILROADS

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up for immediate consideration joint resolution (H. J. Res. 252) to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to make an investigation as to the possibility of establishing a 6-hour day for railway employees.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and is hereby, directed to investigate what would be the effect upon operation, service, and expenses of applying the principle of a 6-hour day in the employment of all classes and each particular class of railway employees because of such application.

Sec. 2. The commission is further directed to report its findings to the Congress on or before December 15, 1932.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why should this come up at this time?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas permit the Chair to make a statement? It has not been the policy of the House and it is not going to be the policy of the present occupant of the chair to recognize gentlemen to call up resolutions or bills by unanimous consent. In view, however, of the peculiar conditions existing in the country at the present time with reference to railroad employees and the executives of railroads, and in view of the unanimous request from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as well as the leaders on each side of the House, as the Chair understands it, the Chair agreed to grant this recognition. This recognition, however, is not to be considered as a precedent.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I doubt the wisdom of inaugurating any precedent that would indicate that Congress entertains the sentiment that we should establish a 6-hour workday in any line of industry. The American people are workers. They are not idlers. If we should establish a 6-hour workday for railroad employees, we are going to open the door for a 6-hour workday for all Government employees and for one-half of the United States and about an 18-hour workday for the other half of the people of the United States in order to support the others. On account of this being a very unwise proposal I am forced to object.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Texas will reserve his objection. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] can make a statement that would convince my colleague he ought not to make the objection, at this time especially.

Mr. BLANTON. Is my colleague from Texas in favor of a 6-hour workday for clerks in stores and a 6-hour workday for farmers, and the other millions of employees in the United States?

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman's colleague from Texas is committing himself on nothing by the report and the support of this resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it a mere gesture, Mr. Speaker? Is it just to spend funds and waste time on an idle matter? Is this starting another Adamson law? I shall vote against a 6-hour workday for anybody in the United States, Mr. Speaker. I have worked 10 and 12, 14 and 16 hours a day all my life, and I am not hurt by it. I am in pretty good fix mentally and physically, and I expect to work that way all the rest of my life. [Applause.]

Mr. CROSSER. If the gentleman will withhold his objection a moment, this is not an attempt to establish a 6-hour day. This is simply a resolution asking the Interstate Commerce Commission to report to the Congress what the effect would be. It may be this will confirm the gentleman's views.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this would be a bad precedent. At least it would indicate to the Interstate Commerce Commission that Congress would stand for a 6-hour workday. I know that the American people are against establishing a 6-hour workday. There are about 100,000,000 people who will not stand for it. I therefore object.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business in order to-day be dispensed with.

Mr. CROSSER. I object to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio objects. The Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk called the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution No. 252.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio calls up a House resolution, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I raise the question of consideration.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House consider House Resolution No. 252?

The question was taken; and the House voted to consider the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. BYRNS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk reported the resolution, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 252

To authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to make an investigation as to the possibility of establishing a 6-hour day for railway employees

Resolved, etc., That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and is hereby, directed to investigate what would be the effect upon operation, service, and expenses of applying the principle of a 6-hour day in the employment of all classes and each particular class of railway employees because of such application.

Sec. 2. The commission is further directed to report its findings to the Congress on or before December 15, 1932.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, it will require only a minute or two for what I shall say on this very brief resolution.

This resolution is a very important one at this particular juncture.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman elaborate on the extent to which this does not commit Congress?

Mr. CROSSER. It does not commit Congress at all. It would not make any difference what the Interstate Commerce Commission might report to us, Congress is still free to do as it likes. I trust that there is not a substantial number of Members of the House so narrow that they are afraid to have the opinion, or rather findings, of a technical body like the Interstate Commerce Commission. That is all that is proposed by this resolution. And yet you are actually asked to believe that this is an attempt to enact legislation. It is no such thing.

I think there is good reason for requesting that the Interstate Commerce Commission make a study of the subject for the purpose of advising Congress. The resolution does not provide for the employment of additional help to make the investigation. All that the resolution provides is that the commission shall investigate the facts and report the same to Congress.

There is a serious effort being made in Chicago for an adjustment of difficulties between the railroads and their employees. Everyone hopes for an amicable adjustment.

It is the opinion of some who are familiar with the situation that provision for an investigation such as is proposed by this resolution would help to bring about an adjustment.

We believe that in urging this resolution we are serving the public interest. One who is not overly impressed with his own importance ought to be pleased beyond measure to have an opportunity to receive a report as to the probable effect such a change might make if applied to railroad operation. We can do as we think best with such report.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In the open forum of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, would the gentleman grant me five minutes? He has all the time in his control. This is an open forum. Would the gentleman give me five minutes?

Mr. CROSSER. I yield the gentleman five minutes and reserve the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Texas opposed to the resolution?

Mr. BLANTON. I am.

The CHAIRMAN. Is any member of the committee opposed to the resolution? If not, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas for one hour.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no. I want only five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman to claim recognition.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no. The gentleman from Ohio yields me five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is entitled to one hour if he wishes it in opposition to the resolution, under the rule.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a very definite recollection of just how the Adamson 8-hour law was railroad through Congress. We all know something about the burdens it placed upon all of the people. Its war-cry slogan was 8 hours' work, 8 hours' recreation, and 8 hours' sleep. We found that passage was simply a wage-increase proposition. The railroad employees, in fact, did not want to be limited to eight hours' work. They merely wanted the double wage for the hours of overtime. And they got the double wage. And the American people paid dearly for it.

Many instances occurred where freight trains were hours late when no real occasion warranted it. The entire crew got their double pay for the hours of overtime they worked. This added expense of railroads was passed on to the helpless people. Passenger trains were delayed. Passengers were greatly inconvenienced in arriving at their destination late. But the crews on the passenger train profited by receiving overtime double pay for the hours over eight they put in on the trip. And besides being greatly inconvenienced, these belated passengers had to pay the added expense the railroad suffered, because all railroad expenses are passed on to the people.

I am one who has not forgotten that during the war period, through threats of a nation-wide strike and tie-up,

the railroad employees forced Director McAdoo to give them an increase in wages of \$764,000,000 and date it back six months. And I have not forgotten that later these same employees, under like threats, forced Director Hines to give them additional increases of \$67,000,000. And we all know the result. Both freight and passenger tariffs were increased until many people have quit using the railroads. The Pullman fare from Abilene, Tex., to St. Louis used to be \$4.50. It is now \$10. From St. Louis to Washington it used to be \$4.50. It is now \$9. Poor people are not able to ride in Pullman cars. They have to take slow trains and sit up all night in day coaches.

It is the foregoing facts I have in mind when I view with alarm this proposal now before the House to ask the Interstate Commerce Commission to report to Congress of the advisability of a 6-hour work day for railroad employees. There is no move for hundreds of thousands of clerks in stores, offices, and banks to let them work only six hours. There is no move for a 6-hour work day for the several million farmers in the United States. There is no move for a 6-hour work day for the hundreds of thousands of day laborers in the United States. This is a move now for the railroad employees. If we give it this sanction, it will eventuate in establishing a 6-hour work day for them. For six hours they will be paid for a full day, and then for all hours over six they will receive double pay. And the poor, helpless people will pay the bill. And then a move will be made for all Government employees to work only six hours. And we will find our 700,000 Government employees then working only six hours.

Mr. Chairman, every bureau and department which has been before the Committee on Appropriations this session states that they can have printing done in private commercial printing shops for very much less than is charged them in the Government Printing Office. One department claims that it can save 40 per cent; that the charges of the Government Printing Office are 40 per cent higher than outside commercial printing offices. And the Government Printing Office pays no rent, taxes, or overhead. When we investigated the matter we found out that it is because of the higher salaries and the special privileges that all of the employees of the Government Printing Office have over private employees. They do not have to work so long, they have longer vacations, they have longer sick leaves, they have more holidays and Saturday vacations, and things of that sort. And the whole people pay for all of these increases. I am thinking about the interests of the whole people of the United States, the 120,000,000 people of the United States. If you are going to grant a 6-hour work-day for railway employees, you should at the same time grant a 6-hour work day for all of the people of the United States.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will gladly yield in a few minutes. What is there about the employees of railroads that they should be granted all of these special privileges? We used to be told that they had a terrible job. As a matter of fact it is one of the easiest jobs on earth. They ride on a comfortable train, which is well equipped, safe, and convenient, with very little exertion required, and they get high salaries and regular hours. Take a man who is driving an automobile from San Francisco to New York. He is driving along the highways when every moment he might have an accident, while a railroad engineer is driving along a specially safeguarded highway which is protected by every kind of safety system known to the ingenuity of man. Yet they are paid higher than anybody else, and now we are expected to give them a 6-hour work day. This is just a start toward it.

Passing this measure will eventuate in giving them this special privilege, and then the first thing you know we will be called upon to give a 6-hour work day to the 700,000 Government employees all over the United States, and then to the industrial employees of the country, to the detriment of all of the other people in the United States. Is this a

move to grant a 6-hour work day to the clerks in your stores? Is it a move to grant a 6-hour work day to the employees on your streets? Is it a move to grant a 6-hour work day to the farmers and to all of the other workmen of America? No. It is just for one class, and I am against it. Idleness is the devil's workshop, and whenever you start a 6-hour day it will be a detriment to the people rather than a benefit. I am not in favor of it. I believe in the teachings of Abraham Lincoln, that a man should work, and work hard and keep busy and not be idle.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield in a moment. I am a Congressman, but I work all the time. My constituents expect me to work, and they do not want me to vote for a 6-hour work day.

I yield to the gentleman from New York first, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Under present working conditions in this country 75 per cent of the people can produce more than we can consume or find a market for. What are you going to do with the other 25 per cent if we do not regulate the hours of labor throughout the United States?

Mr. BLANTON. As soon as we can get a Democratic President we are going to lift this tariff wall from around the United States so that we can trade with the nations of the world and find a market for our products, and we are going to reopen factories in the United States and reopen factories in Europe and bring about good working conditions again. That is how we will solve it, and not by idleness.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Is it not a fact that out of this investigation there is liable to develop most important information that will enable us to do something for the millions that are now not working five minutes a day?

Mr. BLANTON. If it is anything more than a gesture, it will eventuate in a 6-hour day for the railroad employees. If it does not, then it is a mere gesture. It is wasting the time of the Interstate Commerce Commission on a gesture. I am not in favor of the principle. I wish you would go to your business men of the United States and ask them if they are in favor of a 6-hour work day. You would find them all against it. The sound business judgment of the business men of America is against it. I am not going to be coerced and led away by any such folderol as is contained in this resolution. I may be the only man in the House who votes against it, but I am going to back my judgment, which is based upon my knowledge of business affairs in the United States, and I am going to register this one vote against this proposition. That is all I want to say.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER of New York. Mr. Chairman, this resolution does not authorize any legislation at all. It simply authorizes an investigation. The older Members of Congress, of whom I happen to be one, will remember that there was brought before Congress an 8-hour bill for railroad labor, with no investigation, practically no hearings, and no information at all. There is no use fooling ourselves. We will be confronted by bills, perhaps not in this Congress but certainly in the next Congress, advocating a 6-hour day for railroad employees. Let us have the facts. That is all this resolution provides for. It empowers and instructs the Interstate Commerce Commission to get the facts as to what would be the effect of a 6-hour day with railroad employees.

I wish to state that this resolution was unanimously reported by the committee, both Republicans and Democrats voting for it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and is hereby, directed to investigate what would be the effect upon operation, service, and expenses of applying the principle of a 6-hour day in the employment of all classes and each particular class of railway employees because of such application.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] if he has any information as to how much time will be taken up by the Interstate Commerce Commission in getting these data together. In other words, will it be a matter of any considerable expense?

Mr. CROSSER. There is no additional expense provided for. In fact, the resolution provides against it.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman is sure the Interstate Commerce Commission will not require any additional money?

Mr. CROSSER. Of course, I can not bargain for the Interstate Commerce Commission, but my information is they have plenty of help.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman's answer is very satisfactory.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. I yield.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Would the gentleman desire to express an opinion as to what effect this may have on the conference which is now in progress in Chicago?

Mr. CROSSER. I can give the gentleman my own personal opinion, but that is all it is. My opinion is that it will be helpful toward reconciling the difficulties they are laboring under, which I think in itself is worth while.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The question here is not whether the Interstate Commerce Commission needs any money to conduct this investigation or not. If so, of course, the Congress will appropriate the necessary funds. This resolution is the first step to Congress taking heed and keeping pace with progress.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PARKER] referred to the 8-hour bill that was passed some 15 years ago. We have already outlived the 8-hour day. Machinery has made the 8-hour day too long in this country. We are out of that period now. We have arrived at a time where we must create the necessary spread of employment in order to give all of the people of the country the benefit of improved methods of production and of machinery. The only way to do that is to shorten the working day and shorten the working week. Otherwise only they who own the machines will enjoy the benefits of progress—at the expense of the workers.

Mr. PARKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. PARKER. Was the gentleman a Member of Congress when the 8-hour bill was passed?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. No. I came here shortly afterwards, in 1916.

Mr. PARKER. I intended to ask the gentleman a question if he was here at that time.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Now, we talk about getting out of the crisis. To get out of the crisis by appropriating funds for banks will not put a single man to work. We have to tackle this problem constructively, and the way to do it is to take the necessary production for the country, the capacity of existing machinery, and so shorten the day and so shorten the week as to give every willing worker in this country an opportunity to earn a decent living for himself and family.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] points out that business men will be opposed to this. Of course they will. Factory owners will be opposed to this. Of course they will; but we are not legislating entirely, I hope, for dividends and for profits. Our primary purpose here is to legislate for human interest and for the protection of the working people of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman from New York not know that when the work day is reduced to six hours every man who enjoys it will be found working six hours somewhere else in other lines of industry, competing with the balance of the laborers of the United States?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. We will find them devoting some time to wholesome recreation, to study, to travel, living decently and happily, and thereby creating more business. We found that we were at the height of our prosperity when the

American people were working and had substantial and real purchasing power. We went into a slump when we had unemployment. We can not remedy this by talking about it. The only way to do it is to get at the root of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman know that in the press gallery of the United States Congress the gentleman will find able men there who do not receive over \$75 a week, representing some of the largest newspapers in the United States, and those men work sometimes 10, 12, and 14 hours a day to earn that small salary?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That is no criterion. The gentleman from Texas does not believe that I believe that newspaper owners are infallible. I would just as soon legislate against newspaper owners as anybody else. In fact, the Daily News in my city and other papers have already established a 5-day week. We have to start right now. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. The commission is further directed to report its findings to the Congress on or before December 15, 1932.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BYRNS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 252) to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to make an investigation as to the possibility of establishing a 6-hour day for railway employees, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the joint resolution do pass.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DYER) there were—ayes 191, noes 1.

So the joint resolution was passed.

On motion of Mr. CROSSER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further business on Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, according to the new rule under which we are now operating, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce not asking for the consideration of any other bill under the call, their call is completed, and that we will go to the next committee on next Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. That is the new rule. Is there objection?

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object, because I wish to cooperate fully with the Democratic organization of this House—Calendar Wednesday is, in my humble opinion, one of the safeguards for the smaller committees of this House in legislating. It will probably be their only chance to be heard on controversial legislation. It being early in the session, I shall not object, but later on I will not consent to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday call of committees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BUCHANAN. 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. 7912) making appropriations for the Depart-

ment of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

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 agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. McCORMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. No appropriation under the Department of Agriculture available during the fiscal years 1932 and/or 1933 shall be used after the date of the approval of this act (1) to increase the compensation of any position within the grade to which such position has been allocated under the classification act of 1923, as amended; (2) to increase the compensation of any position in the field service the pay of which is adjustable to correspond so far as may be practicable to the rates established by such act as amended for the departmental service in the District of Columbia; (3) to increase the compensation of any position under such act through reallocation; (4) to increase the compensation of any person in any grade under such act through advancement to another position in the same grade or to a position in a higher grade at a rate in excess of the minimum rate of such higher grade unless such minimum rate would require an actual reduction in compensation; or (5) to increase the compensation of any other position of the Federal Government under such department. The appropriations or portions of appropriations expended by the operation of this section shall not be used for any other purposes, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury, and a report of the amounts so impounded for the period between the date of the approval of this act and October 31, 1932, shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next regular session.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LA GUARDIA: On page 91, beginning in line 16, strike out all of section 2.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will understand the purpose of this section. It means that all salary promotions, even though some of them may be automatically provided for by law, shall stop during the fiscal year.

This amendment is not germane to the bill; it is legislation, but a rule was brought in, and adopted by the House, which makes it in order. In addition to my opposition to the purpose of this section I also protest against such methods of legislation.

We have departments in which salaries are fixed by law providing increases in yearly increments. That is true of the Postal Service, the Army, and the Navy.

The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], I believe, served notice that if this amendment is adopted in this bill, a similar amendment will be offered and a rule brought in for every appropriation bill.

Not only is such a provision manifestly unfair but it puts Congress in the position of breaking a contract, solemnly written into the law, with thousands and thousands of employees and with the officers of the Army and Navy.

When we passed the postal salary bill we entered into a sacred contract with every postal employee that he would be paid a certain entrance salary and so much every year thereafter until the maximum rate was reached. I consider that a contract, a binding obligation, on the part of Congress with every employee in the postal department. There are other departments where salaries are not fixed according to grade or rank but according to years of service and that, too, is written into the law and it is binding.

It might be said that this is just an amendment written into the agricultural appropriation bill, but let me repeat that both the chairman of the Rules Committee and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee frankly advised the House that if this amendment is approved as to this bill, like rules and like provisions will be brought before the House with every other appropriation bill.

I submit, gentlemen, that with an accumulated deficit of \$2,000,000,000, the saving resulting from this policy will represent a very small saving. The saving which this amend-

ment would bring about would not amount to a decimal point. There are other ways in which we might economize.

After Congress has held out certain promises, written them into the law and appointments made thereunder, I say we should not run roughshod over existing law in this manner.

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. LOZIER. Does the gentleman contend that an employee of the Government, State, or municipality has a vested right in the office and that the Government, State, or municipality has no power to reduce the salary and even to abolish the office?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I contend that the Government has honor the same as an individual and that we are in honor bound to respect the contract we have made. As I have said, in several departments the salary is fixed by law and existing law provides for automatic yearly increases, and that being so, I say it is in bad taste for Congress to pass any such law as this.

I say that Congress could provide in these departments that any person employed hereafter would not receive increases, but to suddenly and abruptly in this manner break our agreement in respect to employees now in the service is unfair and contrary to good legislation.

I want to point this out. So far all the saving or so-called attempts to balance the Budget seem to be taken out of the pockets of the Federal employees, and that is not the way to balance the Budget. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LA GUARDIA) there were—ayes 26, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: On page 92, line 16, after the word "session," strike out the period and insert the following: "Provided, however, That no part of any money appropriated in this act shall be available to pay the salary of the dependent wife of any Federal employee who receives an annual salary in excess of \$2,500."

Mr. DE PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again read?

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, just one word. I am quite sure you gentlemen do not want to upset the present Government service. There are many instances throughout all the departments where husband and wife are employed in the service and this would simply cut all of them out who are married and receive a certain amount of salary. It would mean confusion worse confounded if this amendment should be adopted and put into effect.

If the Congress wants to adopt a policy to permit only the husband or the wife to be employed in the Government, then there ought to be a survey and an investigation made, the facts ascertained, and then we would be in a position to present a sensible resolution or bill to Congress. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. No appropriation under the Department of Agriculture available during the fiscal years 1932 and/or 1933 shall be used after the date of the approval of this act to pay the compensation of an incumbent appointed to any position under the Federal Government which is vacant on the date of the approval of this act or to any such position which may become vacant after such date: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply to absolutely essential positions the filling of which may be approved in writing by the President of the United States. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by the operation of this section shall not be used for any other purposes but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury, and a report of all such vacancies, the number thereof filled, and the amounts unexpended, for the period between the date of the approval of this act and October 31, 1932, shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next regular session.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 93, line 1, after the word "the," strike out the words "President of the United States" and insert in lieu thereof "Director of the Budget."

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, beginning with the election of Woodrow Wilson every President of the United States we have had, save one, has either died in office or left the Presidency broken in health. Woodrow Wilson left the Presidency, after carrying the burdens of that office, with his health ruined. President Harding died in office. President Coolidge seemed to carry the burdens of the job fairly well.

President Hoover is carrying the tremendous burdens of the Presidency apparently without detriment to his health.

You have here a proposal to take the time and the energy of the President of the United States and devote that time and that energy to minor administrative details, and that in a time when the energy and duties of the President ought to be devoted to the major problems of government.

What is involved in this situation? If the chairman of the committee [Mr. BYRNS] goes through with the proposal he suggested—and that is the obligation stated in this bill—it will require the signature of the President of the United States in an affirmative declaration that he considers it absolutely necessary for a charwoman to be employed in the Department of Agriculture every time one may quit and another be employed in her place.

If the same language is applied to the District of Columbia appropriation, you could not employ a man to fire a boiler in any of these heating plants in the District without the President of the United States affirmatively saying that he considered it absolutely essential that he be employed.

One Member stated—and it is a mere guess—that if the President did nothing but sign his name, it would require from 50 to 100 signatures a day.

The President of the United States can not personally make the investigations that this bill will require him to make in one department, let alone all of them, without taking his time that should be devoted to other things. If he does make these investigations, you are going to use his time and sap his strength and ability that ought to be devoted to more serious problems.

So I am appealing in all fairness to the President, that as a substitute, in lieu of the President of the United States in this amendment, the words "Director of the Budget" be inserted, and let that officer pass on the question whether or not the filling of these jobs is essential. It is fair and it is just. The purpose of the amendment can be accomplished by that means.

We ought to relieve the Presidency of this burden of minor administrative details, that even now is tremendous. In fairness to the President we ought not to put this burden on the President of the United States. I know the answer will be that he will not personally pass on all these things. I think that is making a charge in advance that the President will not obey an act of Congress. He will have to perform it; he will have to go through with the service and sign these papers, and he will do it if Congress requires it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this matter several times. I do not want to take up the time of the committee in repeating some of the things that I have already said. It seems to me a perfectly simple proposition. I say to you with all of the earnestness of my being that if you undertake to strike this item out and delegate this authority to some one else, you may just as well not adopt this section. If you want to bring about a real retrenchment, if you want to cut down the personnel in these departments, and it ought to be cut down in many of the bureaus or divisions, here is a chance to do it. You can do it without depriving anybody of a position, such as the gentleman from Nebraska proposes to do when he seeks to cut down the personnel 5 per cent in all of the bureaus and divisions of this department, without rhyme or reason. Why do I

say that? The gentleman undertakes by this amendment to designate the Bureau of the Budget. You know and I know that there is not a head of a department who is going to stand for one minute having a subordinate officer, whether he be appointed by the President or some one else, come in and undertake to exercise jurisdiction in his department.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. In every important piece of legislation that comes up in Congress carrying the signature of the Bureau of the Budget, it practically stands for the President's decision on that matter, does it not?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. That is recognized by Congress.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I am in sympathy with the gentleman in his efforts to make it as hard as possible to fill these positions, but in view of the statement of the gentleman the other day that he does not expect the President himself to give it attention, but that he must depend upon the subordinate officers for his information, it does seem to me that we could take the decision of his Budget officer or the man that stands for him, as we do on any proposition that is presented to Congress that takes money out of the Treasury.

Mr. BYRNS. What we are trying to bring about now is this. We want something more than merely a perfunctory act on the part of the head of a department with reference to filling these vacancies. I say now, and I say it without fear of successful contradiction, I do not believe there are two departments in this Government whose heads give any attention to the filling of vacancies, although the law provides that the vacancies must be filled by the heads of the departments. They accept the recommendations of the bureau or division chiefs and approve them as a matter of form. What will happen if you adopt this amendment? You make the head of the Bureau of the Budget the man who is responsible, who will say whether or not a vacancy shall be filled, and you have exactly the same situation as obtains now. Whenever a bureau chief or division chief in the department recommends the filling of a vacancy to the head of that department you will find that he will pass it along to the Director of the Budget, and clutter up his bureau with it; but if you will provide that the President of the United States shall approve this, I do not care whether he designates the Bureau of the Budget or the head of each department to act in respect to these vacancies that occur within the department, and I expect him to do one or the other, you will find the heads of these departments will not be certifying the filling of vacancies up there when they ought not to be filled. It will be something more than a perfunctory act when you make it necessary that it be approved by the President of the United States. I do not want to load down the President with additional duties. I remind you that there are thousands and thousands of matters that come before him that the President does not give his personal attention, and all he has to say under this provision to the Director of the Budget, if he wishes to choose him is, "You act for me," and then call in the heads of the departments in a Cabinet meeting and say that this responsibility has been devolved upon him and that he does not want them sending recommendations to fill vacancies to his representative, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, unless they are absolutely necessary. If he will say that, and say it with sufficient earnestness and force, to the members of his Cabinet, he can shut his eyes and approve anything that they send to him. I am not reflecting upon the heads of the departments, but I want to bring about a situation where the heads of the departments will investigate these matters, because that is the only way you will ever reduce the personnel.

I am not in favor of the proposition of the gentleman from Nebraska. He would come in and, with a knife, cut off 5 per cent of the personnel in this department—and if you do it here, you ought to do it in all other departments—without rhyme or reason or any information. If you will make this

provision applicable and permit it to go into the law and cut out the filling of these vacancies for the next year, they will come back the following year with revised estimates that will show you not a saving of thousands of dollars but a saving of millions of dollars, not only for the year but throughout the years to come. I regard this as a most important provision in the bill looking to economy. You have the opportunity to pass upon it. The gentleman from Nebraska said the President would have to sign his name fifty to a hundred times a day. Let us take the minimum, and that means that you are going to fill 15,000 vacancies during the next fiscal year.

Mr. SIMMONS. Are 15,000 vacancies an unusual amount out of some 670,000 employees in this Government?

Mr. BYRNS. In the name of Heaven, does the gentleman think that the President, who has already issued an order that no vacancy shall be filled unless essential, has it in his mind that 15,000 vacancies are going to be filled in 1933?

Mr. SIMMONS. No. But what I say is, and I repeat it, this will make it mandatory, placing a burden upon the President to require that many signatures. It is placing the burden on the President of filling the municipal jobs in the District of Columbia personnel, in all of the Post Office Department, all of the temporary employees on the Federal rolls. All of them must have the signature of the President of the United States, about 700,000 employees.

Mr. BYRNS. Well, the gentleman from Nebraska ought to know that is not correct. The gentleman knows that we pass legislation every day devolving certain duties upon the President, which we all know in all reason he can not possibly perform. Yet the gentleman who proposes to cut the employees 5 per cent, when it comes to talking about a vacancy already created, depriving no employee of any job, raises the objection he has raised here, on the theory that the President is going to be loaded down with duties. The gentleman from Nebraska, as a practical Member of the House, knows that every day things are done in the name of the President, by those who represent him and in whom he has confidence. All he will be required to do, and all that he will do, is to say to the heads of the departments, "Do not send me any vacancy until you have investigated it and until you are in a position to look me in the eye, if necessary, and tell me it is absolutely essential to fill that vacancy."

Mr. HASTINGS. And it will make the head of each department much more careful if he appreciates that the President of the United States is to be held responsible, and will be criticized if they go wrong?

Mr. BYRNS. Absolutely. The gentleman is right. I hope this committee and this House, when the Committee on Appropriations is making every effort it can to hold down the expenses of this Government and which in full committee approved this proposition with the exception of the gentleman from Nebraska, will stand by it and help it in this effort that it is honestly and earnestly striving to make. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do this largely for the purpose of asking the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations one or two questions for information.

As I understand, it is the purpose of the Committee on Appropriations, if this provision is carried in this bill, to suggest similar provisions in other appropriation bills, so that the same rule will apply to all departments. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRNS. That is the fact. Of course, it should not apply to one department without applying to all. I may say to the gentleman that with reference to the other bills we are attempting to write a blanket rule that will cover them all. There are possibly one or two bills in which different language will be required, but we are attempting to write a blanket rule to cover them all.

Mr. MAPES. It would then apply to the entire Government personnel throughout the United States, totaling something like six or seven hundred thousand employees, would it not?

Mr. BYRNS. Well, it will apply to all the personnel carried in these regular annual appropriation bills.

Mr. MAPES. How many employees are there in the United States?

Mr. BYRNS. I think something like 500,000.

Mr. MAPES. It has been stated by some one near me here that there are nearly 700,000.

Mr. BYRNS. Well, I stand corrected if that is true. I think there are about 70,000 in the District of Columbia and something over 400,000 in the field.

Mr. MAPES. Does not the gentleman think it perfectly absurd and silly to ask the President of the United States to sign an order of the kind contemplated here every time there is a vacancy to be filled in the Government service anywhere in the United States?

The gentleman says that at present the heads of departments pay very little, if any, attention to the filling of vacancies. Why could not the gentleman's purpose be served by requiring the heads of departments to sign an order of this kind? I certainly am in sympathy with the effort of the Committee on Appropriations to cut down expenses and to keep them down as far as it is reasonable to do so; but I do not want to be unreasonable, and it seems to me perfectly absurd and unwise to require the President of the United States to sign an order to fill every vacancy that is created in the Government service, which involves a personnel of something like 700,000 throughout the United States. I will say to the gentleman that, for one, unless the gentleman is willing to substitute "heads of departments affected" or some such amendment as the gentleman from Nebraska has offered I am in favor of cutting out this entire section.

Mr. BYRNS. I will say to the gentleman that when we substitute "heads of the departments" that is no more than the law now provides. There is no use saying "heads of departments." The law now provides that these appointments shall be made by the heads of departments. Why write it in the law? Why do a perfectly foolish thing, because the law provides that now? The gentleman from Michigan has missed the whole point that I tried to make. They have that authority now. If they are put to the test and have to recommend to the President the filling of vacancies, I say to my friend he will find something in every department that has not existed within my knowledge in any of the departments to any particular extent. The gentleman will find the head of the department giving some particular attention to the filling of these vacancies, and that is the only way we will ever get it.

I would like to ask the gentleman—and I will ask that the gentleman have further time—I wonder if the gentleman read a well-considered and well-written article in the Washington Daily News of yesterday on this very subject, in which the writer indubitably cites figures and points out that notwithstanding the order of the President that no vacancies be filled except those that are absolutely essential nevertheless vacancies have been filled, and that that order amounts to almost a nullity, corroborating a statement that I made here a few days ago.

Now, if the membership wants to do something to save money, adopt this section as it is proposed by the Committee on Appropriations and help us in our efforts to conserve the money of the people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I have not seen the article to which he refers, but it seems to me that the gentleman's argument that the President is going to take the recommendations of the heads of these departments and sign the orders which the heads of the departments recommend is an admission that the heads of the departments are going to determine the necessity for filling the vacancies.

If the President of the United States gets his Cabinet together, as the gentleman has suggested, and tells the members of it that they must keep down expenses and that they must not allow any vacancies to be filled except in cases of absolute necessity, it seems to me every purpose will be accomplished which the Committee on Appropriations desire to accomplish.

If we can not trust the heads of the departments, who are responsible for the administration of them, then we are in a bad way, and it seems to me perfectly unreasonable to load this duty on the President.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. At the bottom of page 92 this language is used:

That this inhibition shall not apply to absolutely essential positions the filling of which may be approved in writing by the President of the United States.

There is no specific requirement for his personal signature. The gentleman must know how many thousands of times the President's signature is attached to documents by somebody else who acts for him. Now, what will happen in this case? He will delegate a member of the Bureau of the Budget, one of his secretaries, or some other man to be at the head of this. It will be that person's duty to examine every application to fill a vacancy, and when any are approved he will sign the President's name, acting for him. The gentleman knows that the President could not possibly take the time to personally sign every communication he is required to sign. So it is all foolishness to say that the President will be required to sign 15,000 or 20,000 approval of appointments a day. All that is desired is the President's approval in writing. If that approval is given, then his name will be signed by his authorized agent. However, the adoption of the provision under consideration will put a restraint upon the departments and they will not, as heretofore, fill positions that are not absolutely essential.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I have been reading these debates rather carefully in the last few days and have noted the attempt to make a lot of trouble for the executive department. This is a matter which is exceedingly interesting to all of us. It is, perhaps, a rather small matter, but it brings to our attention the fact that we are overloading the President of the United States. If we desire to relieve him of this particular duty, the Director of the Budget seems the proper person to whom this ought to be delegated.

I remind the committee that for many years past we have found the Congress utterly unable to legislate fully in many complicated matters. We created the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and all sorts of commissions practically legislating for us. The President of the United States must make appointments to all of these commissions, and all their acts are subject to severe criticism in both branches of the Congress. Our forefathers little foresaw what is now happening in saddling these overwhelming duties upon the President of the United States. Although this item now being considered is supposedly a small matter, I think it is high time we called a halt. We all know that there is a tremendous number of these employees. If the President is compelled to sign his name, as contemplated in this act, even though he should call in the Director of the Budget to advise him, his duties will be greatly increased. I, for one, am unwilling to add such minor duties but am rather in favor of subtracting from his work.

As one prominent member of the Government recently said in a public speech, "How long are we going to kill our Presidents?" How long are we going to continue to let them commit suicide? The elimination of much of the detail work of the President is really an important matter in the public mind. These debates disclose the attitude of this Congress is to add to the burden of the President. I appeal for a lessening of his work whenever possible.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and the amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman allow me to have five minutes? In view of the fact I initiated this matter, I would like to close the debate.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and the amendment thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is possible that I would like to offer an amendment and speak on it after action is had upon the pending amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Then I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment close in 15 minutes.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have an opportunity at some point in the debate to ask two or three questions.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The request only applies to this amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the request does not refer to the pro forma amendments that have been offered, but to my amendment to substitute the Director of the Budget for the President of the United States in connection with this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The request applies to the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point on the impounding provision of section 3 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman already has the privilege of extending his remarks.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in my opinion one of the most important aspects of section 3 has not yet been discussed. I refer to the impounding provision of section 3 and its effect on the economical and efficient conduct of the work in the department during the last few months of the fiscal year 1932 and all of 1933.

The impounding provision of section 3 has the effect of setting up a reserve, contingent, frozen asset, or whatever you wish to call it, which can be used only for salaries. If not used for salaries, the unexpended portion must be returned to the Treasury.

And how is the amount of this reserve established? By a careful analysis of the work to be done; by a consideration of the proportions of the total which should be used for salaries and for other expenses; all considered in relation to the total amount of the reduced appropriation for 1933? No. The amount of this reserve is established by counting noses on the date the appropriation act is approved. The total of the annual salaries of all employees on the rolls is determined. To this is added the annual salaries of all positions which are vacant at that time. The total of the two represents this reserve which must be set up in each appropriation item for salaries.

You must remember that practically all appropriations have been reduced for 1933. Therefore, the work is being conducted on a larger scale at the present time than it will be in 1933, and this statement will also be true on the date the appropriation act passes. Yet by the provisions of section 3 the size of the salary reserve is established on the basis of the annual salaries of the personnel of the department needed to carry on the work on an entirely different basis than will apply in 1933.

Let us assume for the purpose of illustration that we have an appropriation item of \$1,000,000 in 1932. By careful analysis, based upon years of experience in handling his work, the bureau chief knows that the proportion of salaries to other miscellaneous expenditures should be, let us say, 80 to 20. In other words, in doing the work under a \$1,000,000 appropriation, he will expend \$800,000 for salaries.

Now, let us assume that the Budget and the House committee have reduced this appropriation by 20 per cent or down to a total of \$800,000. We will also assume, and it is a logical assumption, that, for the efficient conduct of this work, the ratio between salaries and other expenses should

be the same as it was under the \$1,000,000 appropriation, or 80 to 20. The total which should be expended for salaries during 1933 in this appropriation would therefore be 80 per cent of \$800,000, or \$640,000.

But this appropriation act is going to be approved in the fiscal year 1932, when the work is being done on a scale entirely different and much larger than it will be in 1933. The total annual salaries of the personnel engaged in this activity in the \$1,000,000 illustration on the date the bill passes will be right around \$800,000, and as I interpret the language of section 3, \$800,000 will be set aside to be used only for salaries or to revert to the Treasury. The total of the appropriation is \$800,000 and you reserve it all for salaries. Is that the way to bring about economy and efficiency in the Government service?

Of course, the example I have used will vary for different bureaus, but I venture to say that there will be cases like it in some of the items carried by this bill.

You may say that an alert bureau chief would see to it that the total annual salaries of the employees on the rolls on the day the bill is approved would be at the proper figure for carrying on his work on the reduced scale provided for 1933. Would a bureau chief be warranted in dismissing employees on the assumption that this bill is going to be approved in its present form?

In short this reserve for salaries is established on one basis and the work in 1933 will be performed on an entirely different one. If this bill is approved on a Wednesday the salary reserve will be a certain figure, if approved on Thursday, it will probably be entirely different; if approved on Friday it will be still another figure. This is not as far fetched as it sounds. If the bill is approved on the last day of a month the salary reserve will be entirely and widely different from the figure it would be if the bill were approved on the following day. You can easily see why this is true. When a person resigns he usually makes his resignation effective on the last day of the month. The amount of the salary reserve is established on an accidental, hit-or-miss basis.

I have not complicated this discussion thus far with any reference to the amounts which must be impounded for vacancies existing in positions on the date the act is approved. This brings up a swarm of troublesome questions for the administrative officers of the department. What is a position anyway? Is a position a position if you can not finance it? Is a position a position if you can finance it in 1932, but can not in 1933 with your reduced appropriations?

Who is going to decide which vacancies are to be counted and which are not? How long will a bureau chief have to wait to get an authoritative determination as to which vacancies are to be counted? What will be the extent of the additional records the department will have to set up to record and trace transaction by position on the new basis?

Now, going back to my example:

You have a reserve of \$800,000 set up for salaries in an appropriation item of \$800,000. Nothing is left for travel, supplies, equipment, telephone, telegraph, and other expenses. What is the bureau chief to do? He has \$800,000 to carry on a certain line of work, but Congress has informed him that he must spend this only for salaries. I can not see the wisdom of that.

Now, let us take another example:

Assume the 1932 appropriation is \$1,000,000 and the ratio between personnel and other expenditures is again 80-20. In this example, however, the reduction in 1933 let us assume is \$100,000, leaving an appropriation of \$900,000 for 1933. The reserve for salaries we will assume is identical with the figure used in the previous example, or \$800,000. The bureau chief will then have \$100,000 left for miscellaneous expenses other than personnel. I have prepared a tabulation which will indicate what the division between the two classes of expenditures should be under proper administration and what it will be under the provisions of section 3 of the bill:

	Under sec. 3, H. R. 7912	Under balanced manage- ment
Total appropriation 1933.....	\$900,000	\$900,000
Reserve for salaries.....	800,000	
Proper expenditure for salaries (80 per cent of \$900,000).....		720,000
Balance available for miscellaneous expenses.....	100,000	
What should be spent for miscellaneous expenses.....		180,000

In this example the effect of the provisions of section 3 are to reduce the amount of expenditures for miscellaneous expenses from \$180,000 to \$100,000, or 44 per cent, and to set up a reserve of \$800,000 for salaries, which is \$80,000 more than the bureau chief would expend if left to his own devices. Having set up this reserve for salaries, just what is the incentive for saving in personnel expenditure? There is none. You have ear-marked \$800,000 for salaries alone, and if any savings are made they go back to the Treasury. Why should a bureau chief—and I am casting no reflection upon the bureau chiefs when I say this—make an effort to save in personnel expenditures when the work of the bureau does not benefit? His reasoning may be something like this: "By a rearrangement of work in this division I could let one man go. But I won't be able to use the money which I save in this way to meet the new demand which has just arisen. It will go back to the Treasury. At the same time, if I let this man go I will have a great deal of difficulty in replacing him when normal times return. Some other man in the division may die or resign in the near future. I had better play safe and keep him on."

Other examples might be cited:

For instance, a man comes up for retirement. If this reserve for salaries and the prohibition against filling vacancies were not in effect, the man would apply for retirement. Knowing, however, that it would be difficult to replace him if he were retired, the bureau chief asks him to stay on the job for another two years.

Or you might have an employee who should be dismissed for inefficiency. It is realized, however, that it will be difficult to replace him, and although he is not a good employee he is better than none at all, and he is continued in his position.

I venture to say that the expenditures for salaries under this bill as it is now worded will be greater than they would be if the responsible administrative officers were left to work out their personnel and other problems without the arbitrary limitation and restriction imposed by this bill.

In the second example I have used, the maximum expenditure for salaries is \$800,000 and there is nothing to be gained by the bureau in reducing this. The proper expenditure, taking into consideration the amount of work to be done and the size of the appropriation, would be \$720,000. If a bureau chief were left to his own device, he would see that the total expenditure for the year for salaries would be right around this figure. At the beginning of the year the salary obligation for all employees on the rolls would undoubtedly be higher. He would have time, however, during the year to weed out the less efficient employees, to shift personnel from position to position in the event of resignations or deaths, and at the end of the year you would have a force of more efficient employees than you had at the beginning of the year, a force of the proper size and a force whose work throughout the year had not been handicapped by a shortage of miscellaneous expense funds.

Opposed to this, under the provisions of section 3 of the bill, you would have at the end of the year probably a larger force and a force which had been handicapped throughout the year by a shortage of expense money.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I must confess surprise at the serious manner in which some gentlemen on my left have approached the discussion of this very wise provision of the bill.

Perhaps I can relieve the apprehension of the gentleman from Nebraska, who has been very insistent in urging objections to this bill, by saying that after this provision was reported to the House it was called to the attention of a distinguished lawyer, who is the head of one of the great departments of the Government, by some official in his department who felt it might prove embarrassing since the department had on its pay roll temporary employees and some not in the classified service. The distinguished head of the department examined the provision and said to me, "I see no reason why my department can not operate under it. I will offer no objection and will operate under it." [Applause.] Why? Because, as a lawyer, he knew that the President could meet the requirements of this provision without signing his name to every appointment he may authorize and approve.

What will happen in the filling of vacancies? They occur and are not filled. Reasons why they should be filled can be filed with and considered by such official agent as the President may designate for that purpose, and appointments approved with the same dispatch and ease that many other like matters are disposed of which require the President's written approval.

The gentleman from Nebraska insists that we arbitrarily reduce the personnel in the Department of Agriculture 5 per cent. He may be right, and I would gladly support him if he could tell us what employees can be separated from the service and give reasons therefor. He is in the anomalous position of wanting to make a drastic reduction in personnel in the Department of Agriculture, but unwilling to make it difficult to fill vacancies which now exist or may occur in the future. I am wondering if he wants to get rid of some and make it easier to get some in who are now out.

One reason for this provision is because we felt the President was not being properly supported in his effort to prevent the filling of vacancies. Some of the hearings disclosed this information and suggested the necessity of this provision. There have been vacancies filled this year, and some will be filled next year, many of which should not be filled, and the committee felt that the provision now under discussion would insure that only essential positions will be filled when vacancies occur.

The chairman of the committee told the House of a conversation he had with the President, in which the President expressed appreciation of the assurance given that the Committee on Appropriations would cooperate in every possible way to keep down expenses.

Thus far we have refused to recommend to this House any increase in Budget items, which we will continue to do. On the other hand, substantial reductions have been reported, and you have approved the same.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Do we understand that that is coming out of the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin and myself?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that the debate on the amendment is limited to 15 minutes, and any extension will have to come out of that 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama have two minutes more, not to be taken out of the 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the action of the Committee of the Whole, the Chair feels constrained to rule that he can not entertain that unanimous request.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Let me say in conclusion we put this provision in to prevent abuses that we believed would occur in the absence of it. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if I thought that this proposal would be unduly burdensome to the President, as has been alleged and represented by some gentlemen in advocacy of the amendment to substitute the Director of the Budget, I would oppose this proposal; but conscious of the fact that there is only one instrumentality to make effective the nonfilling of these vacancies, I cordially rise to support the proposition of the distinguished economist, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. [Applause.]

If you read this proposal, you will see that it is not intended to have the President visa the filling of every vacancy which he might deem essential, but, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] says, it applies to a blanket order for a class or certain character of employment heads of the departments will deem essential to the service, no more and no less.

The Postmaster General will consider whether it should apply to the men in the letter-carrier service or other postal activity, and submit his determination to the President, and the President will accept it.

The chairman has said that the Executive order now in force is not workable to attain the end desired. He says the heads of the departments are not doing their full duty. That they are not scrutinizing the need of filling vacancies when they occur. The best we can do in this emergency in trying to curtail extravagant appropriations is to subscribe to this amendment in toto.

It is similar to the head of a manufacturing corporation filling subordinate positions. To the heads of the departments he would say, "Wherever you have some vacancies to be filled which you regard as essential, you must secure from me a blanket order." That is all there is to this. To my colleagues on this side of the aisle I wish to say that this can not be objected to by the President; he should welcome it, as it fulfills his purpose. I say come to the support of the President, who wishes to curtail the expenses of Government, and thereby relieve the taxpayers. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman says that this applies to positions generally?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes. That is the wording of the provision, that this inhibition shall not apply to absolutely essential positions, referring to a class, which the heads of the departments will submit to him. The President will say to the heads of the departments, "If you say that is essential, all right; I will visa it." It does not refer to every little subordinate position or that the President is going to pass upon the necessity of six or seven hundred thousand such jobs. That is straining at a gnat. It is a meaningless complaint. It can not come within the category referred to by the gentleman as being an absurd provision.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to complete my question?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. How does the gentleman account for the language in the main part of the section which provides:

No appropriation under the Department of Agriculture available during the fiscal year 1932 and/or 1933 shall be used after the date of the approval of this act to pay the compensation of an incumbent appointed to any position under the Federal Government which is vacant on the date of the approval of this act or to any such position which may become vacant after such date.

Does not that apply to each individual position?

Mr. STAFFORD. That applies to each individual position, but the proviso conferring on the President the right to O. K. positions in general applies to a class, and it is the proviso under which the President is to act, and not the main part of the section.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I have been accused of so many things during the last few days on the floor of the House that I am not surprised when gentlemen try to confuse the minds of Members by mixing up the 5 per cent proposal that I expect to submit to the House in a few minutes with this proposal. They have absolutely no connection whatsoever except to arouse certain prejudices it is

hoped might be aroused. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER]—and I have considerable respect for his mental ability—attempts to confuse my proposal, which merely limits the number of people who will be on the Federal pay roll in the city of Washington, with a proposal that requires the President of the United States to act upon the filling of a vacancy that might occur anywhere under the American flag. I submit the gentleman's mind is too clear to ask the House to make that comparison. Then he comes in with a great volume and tells us that some unnamed lawyer has said that they could operate under this law. Nobody has said that they can not operate under the law. My appeal to you is that you do not require the President of the United States to do these things. His burdens are heavy now in caring for the great fundamental problems of the Government to require him to take on these administrative details. It is one thing to come in here with language that says that whenever there is a vacancy now or hereafter in the Government service the President of the United States shall approve the filling of that position in writing, and then defend it upon the ground that you do not expect the President to perform this function. I submit this is the net result of the argument of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], who says that the President will assign it to somebody else.

My good friend and colleague on this subcommittee, Mr. BUCHANAN, says that the President will assign it to somebody else, and then the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] suggests that the President will assign it to somebody else. Why put the mandate of law upon the President and then say to the world in advance that you do not expect the President to obey the law? I have sufficient confidence in the President of the United States to believe that if the Congress places this mandate upon him, he will fulfill it, and he is giving every ounce of energy and strength and ability in now serving the American people. The President of the United States must personally approve the employment of men under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Out in the forest this summer fires will break out. The men employed there are Federal employees. They have the benefit of the United States workmen's compensation law, and the President must sign the order employing men to fight fires. We employ all over the United States in the summer months great numbers of per diem employees. They are Federal employees. Those positions are now vacant and they will be filled after this act becomes a law. The President of the United States must personally approve the employment of those men. It is not a question as to whether or not he can perform this duty, it is a question of whether or not the Presidency ought to be encumbered with minor administrative duties of this kind at a time when of all times the mental ability and strength of the President ought to be devoted to the major and fundamental problems of the Government.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman refers to fighting forest fires, where thousands of persons are employed for a few days. Under the law the Secretary of Agriculture must make every appointment of that kind. Does the gentleman think that the Secretary of Agriculture makes those appointments? Does not he authorize those in charge out there to employ the necessary men temporarily to do the work, and is not that exactly how this will work? The gentleman, it seems to me, is putting up a man of straw and then knocking him down.

Mr. SIMMONS. The gentleman says the Secretary of Agriculture does that now. Let us admit that he does. Then the gentleman says that he is going to do it hereafter, but you are fastening that burden by law onto the President of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired. All time has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendments are withdrawn and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SIMMONS) there were—ayes 54, noes 131.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Page 93, line 1, after the word "states," strike out the period and insert the words "or his duly authorized agent."

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, there is no division of sentiment in this House as to the purpose to be accomplished; that is, to save Federal money by preventing the filling of unnecessary positions in the Federal service. There does seem to be much question as to whether the President of the United States, under the language contained in the bill, would be required to sign his name fifty or a hundred times a day in giving written orders for filling necessary positions. All that my amendment does is to add "or his duly authorized agent." It clearly leaves responsibility on the President of the United States, but relieves him of the necessity of examining applications that come before him and of signing his name.

That is the purpose of the amendment. It serves every purpose which we have in the language contained in the bill, and still does not burden the President of the United States with the actual examination of applications and attaching his signature.

I do not want to take the time of the House, but I do not believe the President of the United States ought to be authorized, while retaining the responsibility, to delegate the authority to sign his name and to make the actual investigation. Undoubtedly this authority must be delegated, so why not say so?

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington is even worse than the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS]. If that is done, there will only be an agent who will pass on this filling of vacancies, and we will have no one who is really responsible and to whom these department heads must look and for whom they must act.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, in support of the statement I have made two or three times, by incorporating at this point a well-considered and well-written article, published in the Washington Daily News of yesterday, in which are pointed out the actual figures to show that no department in this Government has paid any particular attention to the order of the President of the United States directing that vacancies be not filled unless they are absolutely essential.

I say to you in all seriousness that if we are to accomplish anything of value by a provision prohibiting the filling of vacancies and if the personnel is to be cut, this is the only way it can ever be done. I appeal to the membership to vote down not only this amendment but those that are to follow, and let us put in this real reform.

Now it has been said the President will be required to sign his name fifty or a hundred times a day. Are they going to fill that many vacancies from now until June 30 and during the year 1933? Is that the idea of economy on the part of my friend from Nebraska and my friend from Washington, that that many vacancies are to be filled, and the President of the United States will sign his name to that many requests? You know what will happen. If there were any vacancies in the Department of Agriculture to be filled, the Secretary of Agriculture would make a close and thorough investigation before he ever asked the President of the United States to approve. Then he would send them up in one batch. That is what he would do.

I dare say there will be the fewest certifications to the President if this section goes into effect.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing an excellent and timely article in the Washington Daily News.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PRESIDENT'S POLICY ON NONREFILLABLE VACANCIES NOT CARRIED OUT BY DEPARTMENT HEADS, ACCORDING TO FIGURES ON UNITED STATES FORCE IN CAPITAL

By C. A. F.

President Hoover told department heads nearly a year ago to stop filling vacancies, so far as possible, and thus bring down the Federal pay roll for economy. Chairman BYRNS, of the House Appropriations Committee, makes statements seeming to show that the policy has not worked out. Is that a fact?

The Civil Service Commission tabulates figures twice a year on the total number of employees the country over. The last set was for the end of last June, and showed a steady rise for several years. The figures for December 31 are not yet ready, because of the far-flung nature of the Federal establishment.

But there are some comparatively late figures for employees in Washington. In May the number in the Federal executive civil service here was 72,417. On November 30 the number had fallen to 69,894, a decrease of 2,523, which was fairly evenly distributed over the months in between. That indicated the President's policy was being carried out. But was it?

CENSUS MAKES BIG CUT

Nearly all of the decrease was registered by the Commerce Department, with a cut of 2,456, and was due almost entirely to dismissals of Census Bureau temporary employees, who could not have been replaced, anyway. The next largest reduction, 392, was shown by the Veterans' Administration, and most of that was due to employees being sent from Washington to other cities in that agency's program of decentralization. The War Department had the third largest reduction, 132, and the Shipping Board was fourth with 41. All other reductions were negligible.

GAINS BALANCE LOSSES

Outside of the Census Bureau the gains practically balanced the losses in Washington. The Government Printing Office added 127, largely because of increased work in getting out the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other printed products of Congress; the Agricultural Department added 122, many for seed-loan and other farm-relief work; the Federal Farm Board added 52; Justice, 78; and Post Office, 57.

The House vote of 152 to 24 for a special rule showed the volume of sentiment in that body for nonrefillable vacancies and the companion idea of no salary increases. Statements were freely made that adoption of these measures would help to head off threatened pay cuts.

How much money will be saved by a legal bar against filling vacancies? In recent years the turnover in all the Federal service has run around 33,000—retirements, deaths, dismissals, and resignations. Retirements and deaths can be expected to maintain their annual average of about 5,000 each. Dismissals and resignations will be fewer. Many "essential" positions will be filled. Some experienced figurers place the probable reduction in personnel at 20,000, perhaps less. The 20,000 estimate, with an average salary of \$1,800, would mean \$36,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAPES: Page 92, strike out all of section 3.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield for a preliminary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEAVITT. At what point in this bill is the amendment that is made in order by the adoption of House Resolution 120 to be offered? Is that not intended to take the place of the present sections 2 and 3? If so, what is the need of spending time and attempting to approve or disapprove of amendments to sections that are to be stricken out in connection with this resolution?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the language contained in the resolution is already in the bill, and the purpose of the resolution, as the Chair understands it, is that no point of order may be raised against this language. The matter under consideration now is section 3 of the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, in my colloquy a short time ago with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] I stated that unless some amendment like that proposed by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] to substitute

the Director of the Bureau of the Budget or the heads of departments directly affected for the words "President of the United States" that I would offer an amendment to strike out the paragraph. It is in accordance with that statement that I have offered the amendment which has just been read.

I realize, of course, that the committee has, in a sense, expressed its judgment upon the section, but I want to offer this amendment for the purpose of expressing my own conviction upon the desirability of having the section as it stands eliminated from this bill. I do not think this duty ought to be imposed upon the President of the United States, with an organization of something like 700,000 employees of the Government scattered over the United States. I do not think it is necessary. If it is necessary, if the President of the United States is the only man in the Government service that can be trusted to carry out the policy which the section contemplates, then certainly the Government is in a bad way. For one, I want to say that I favor having this section stricken from the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEAVITT: Page 93, line 1, after the words "United States," strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add "Provided, That the President may delegate this authority to meet emergencies."

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. BYRNS. I reserve it.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the point of order is good and, as I previously explained, I am offering this amendment for the purpose of asking two or three questions and getting into the RECORD some discussion that will clarify the interpretation of this matter when it comes before the Comptroller.

The amendment I have offered is to the effect that the President may delegate his authority to act on these requests in emergencies. On the floor the other day when this matter was up for consideration I asked what I thought were two or three important questions. I outlined some situations which I know to exist in connection with the national forest work and in connection with many other field activities of the Government. I asked definitely if it was the opinion of the members of the committee and the intention of the members of the committee that the President would have the power to delegate to others the performance of the acts that are required in this bill. I ask the chairman of the committee this particular question: Is it, in his judgment, within the authority of the President in advance in writing to delegate this authority to some one in one of the departments below the head of the department to meet an emergency in the field?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is my understanding that it is even contemplated that the President shall have authority to select his own agents, who will be personally responsible to the President, to review these applications and determine whether or not they are emergencies and are absolutely essential. He can delegate that authority to his personal agent and have the President's name signed by his personal agent, the same as is done in connection with other Government activities.

Mr. LEAVITT. Must it be the President's name that is signed?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Certainly. This is not a criminal statute. This is merely a contract, and he can do that by his agent as well as by his personal signature. The main thing is fixing the responsibility, so that his Cabinet members will

be careful not to ask for appointments that are not absolutely essential.

Mr. LEAVITT. The purpose has been explained time after time, but what I want is to have in the RECORD an interpretation of this particular point for the guidance of those who will have to pass upon any of these acts. I want to put a particular question. Here is an instance to which I referred the other day: A man on lookout in the midst of a national forest may be injured and it is necessary to replace him immediately. There is no time to come to Washington, to the head of the department, to the President, or anyone else. The forest supervisor, and even the ranger in charge of the district, ought to have authority to act in such an emergency. Now, the question I want to ask some of the lawyers on the committee is whether it is the opinion of the committee, and, therefore, if the Congress passes this bill, the opinion of the Congress, that the President in advance of such a situation could delegate to the forest supervisor authority to fill that place?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think he could.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The President already has his Budget as an agent to be used in this very matter.

Mr. LEAVITT. I understand that; but here is a case where we are putting into the law a definite statement; we have put in certain inhibitions, and then we have stated that those inhibitions shall not apply to absolutely essential positions, the filling of which may be approved in writing by the President of the United States. The question I asked has been satisfactorily answered, and the answer was that the President of the United States may give that authority in advance in writing so that the situation may be immediately met.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, I do not think there is any doubt whatsoever but that the President may anticipate conditions under the proviso just read.

Mr. LEAVITT. That should be made very plain, otherwise it is entirely unworkable.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is nothing here negating that position.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 4, line 23, for the purpose of offering an amendment to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from having and operating two automobiles instead of one as all other departments are doing. I am stating the substance of the proposed amendment, so that anyone can object if he wants to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to return to page 4, line 23, for the purpose of offering an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: Page 4, line 23, strike out the word "four" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Three, including one for the Secretary of Agriculture, one for general utility needs of the entire department, and one for the Forest Service."

And on page 5, strike out the word "two," in line 1, and insert in lieu thereof the word "one."

And on page 5, in line 2, strike out the word "vehicles" and insert in lieu thereof the word "vehicle."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 87, line 13, for the purpose of offering an amendment to prevent the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads from having, operating, and maintaining two vehicles instead of one, as the heads of other bureaus are doing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to return to page 87, line 13, for the purpose of offering an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: On page 87, line 13, strike out the word "two" and insert in lieu thereof the word "one."

And on the same page, in line 14, strike out the word "vehicles" and insert in lieu thereof the word "vehicle."

And on the same page, in line 24, after the sum of "\$500," insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That not more than one such vehicle shall be maintained for use in the administrative work of the Bureau of Public Roads in the District of Columbia."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, why not go far enough to adopt a sweeping provision to take away all of these Government owned and operated automobiles used by these bureaucrats to run around here day and night? I wish the gentleman would take every one of them away from them.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object to ask the gentleman from Florida if he would take away all the automobiles from the Prohibition Bureau as well? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the Prohibition Bureau is using 1,200 automobiles that it has confiscated from rum-running bootleggers. Is it the gentleman's wish that we should also take away the airplane of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] so he can not have any more pictures taken with the Bingham beer group?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, that airplane is not operated at Government expense.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct totals in accordance with the amendment adopted to the bill under the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LUCE: Amend section 3 by striking out the part of the sentence beginning in line 24 thereof and inserting in place thereof the following:

"That this inhibition shall not apply to absolutely essential positions, but the filling thereof shall not be consummated until 10 days after the names of proposed appointees have been submitted to the Director of the Budget, who shall forthwith investigate as to the necessities of the case and make report thereon to the President."

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I will recognize there is small chance that this amendment will be approved. I present it, however, with two purposes: First, this provision will be further considered and it may be useful elsewhere to have accompanying it suggestion of all the ways that might be followed to accomplish the end we all desire without giving to the President a mandate to do a thing we know he can not do.

Also I would put on record the fact that it is evidently the intention of the majority of the House to say in one breath that the mandate is perfunctory, that we do not expect the work will be performed by the President, and in the next breath to require that he shall give his approval in writing to between one and two hundred appointments a day. Assuming that the provision will be in all the appropriation bills, we are to announce to the President, to announce to the Secretaries in his Cabinet, to announce to all employees of the Government that the House neither intends nor expects the President to perform the duty specifically, definitely, positively imposed on him by the language of the bills we are about to pass.

The word "perfunctory" was used in defending the proposal. This puts us in the position of saying in effect: "Mr. President, we are making a gesture; we are telling you to do a thing that we expect will not be done by you,

that you are to hand over to somebody else, and that as far as you are concerned will be purely a pretense, a sham."

This contradiction deserves to be enshrined in the immortal pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. For that purpose I submit the amendment, with the consciousness that it will get short shrift.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LUCE) there were 92 ayes and 126 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Nebraska whether he desires to discuss his motion to recommit which he intends to present? At first I thought I wanted to discuss it, but I ask him now what he desires?

Mr. SIMMONS. I would suggest a brief presentation of the motion to recommit. I know of no way that we can do it unless we do it now under agreement. We might discuss it for 20 minutes, 10 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas and 10 minutes by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. That can not be done in committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska realize that his motion includes the entire Agricultural Department, and it could not possibly be covered in that time?

Mr. SIMMONS. I assume that the membership of the House is anxious to have the bill out of the way.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Some of the Members were detained by committee work and are not familiar with the provisions of the motion to recommit. I understand it involves a proposal for some reductions and replacements.

Mr. SIMMONS. A plain reduction.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But we ought to have some statement as to the effect of it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], I ask unanimous consent that we have 40 minutes in which to discuss the motion to recommit—20 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that can not be done in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas should not interrupt the gentleman from Nebraska until he has completed his request.

Mr. BLANTON. But he had gone far enough to make the point of order lodge.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Texas has no right to interrupt.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, he can not recognize any unanimous consent to control the time. The Chair will recognize a unanimous-consent request that debate shall close at a particular time, but the Chair will reserve to itself the right of recognition.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I have absolute confidence in the fairness of the Chair. I ask unanimous consent that we may discuss the question of the motion to recommit for 40 minutes, the time to be controlled by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the unanimous-consent request that debate on the section close in 40 minutes, without regard to the motion to recommit.

Mr. SIMMONS. I make that request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that debate upon this section close in 40 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the committee out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, we have heard the gentleman from Nebraska for about three days. I object.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last line of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to unduly prolong this discussion. My colleague, Mr. BUCHANAN, from Texas, has desired that the committee understand, as I do, what would be in the motion to recommit when it is made. The committee will find on pages 3, 4, and 5 of the committee's report a series of something over 100 different items in the bill that have been reduced in contingent expenses 5 per cent by the committee, which has now been approved. That saving of \$470,000 will be in traveling expenses, in the purchase of equipment and supplies, and matters of that kind. No matter what happens to my motion to recommit, I am pleased that we have been able to save, at my suggestion in the subcommittee, \$470,000. My motion to recommit will be to take 5 per cent out of the total appropriations for salaries carried in practically all of these items, but not all of them, because some of them have practically no salary rolls in the District of Columbia. I think some 80 items in the bill will be reduced by 5 per cent of the amount that the breakdown carries for salaries in the District of Columbia if my motion to recommit should prevail. The amendment will not reduce the salary of any individual who remains on the Government pay roll. It may result, and in my judgment should result, in the removal of employees whose services are not absolutely essential from the Government pay roll in the city of Washington. The Budget that came to us called for a reduction of only 73 employees in the District of Columbia, while it called for a reduction of 407 employees in the Department of Agriculture in the field.

The Budget that came to us calls for 343 more employees in the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1933 than this Congress authorized in the fiscal year 1931. So that the Budget recommended to us a decrease in the District of Columbia of salaries of 1½ per cent, and a decrease of 2½ per cent in the field. My proposal would remove from the pay roll of about 80 expending agencies in the District of Columbia 5 per cent of the appropriations that those agencies have for salaries. The bill carries approximately \$12,800,000 for salaries in the District of Columbia. My proposal will take \$495,000 out of the \$12,800,000, leaving approximately \$12,300,000 for salaries in the District of Columbia. I take it that that will not essentially cripple any activity. I propose only to reduce those salary appropriations in the various items that the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee of the Whole have now approved through a reduction of 5 per cent in personnel where there has been a reduction of 5 per cent in the contingent fund. You have approved the \$470,000 of saving in the contingent fund. I ask that you approve an additional cut of \$495,000 in personnel, saving in the main in those same items. The two cuts are companion cuts. One of them should not be made without the other being made. They were proposed by me as companion cuts in the subcommittee. One cut which results in the saving of \$470,000 has been accepted, and I ask that the House accept the other. I think that is as clear a statement as I can make of the issue in five minutes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will this cut any salary in the District of Columbia?

Mr. SIMMONS. Of those that remain on the Government pay roll; no. It may result in taking a number of them off the pay roll entirely.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman's motion to recommit restore any items to the bill recommended by the subcommittee that were taken out by the full committee because not recommended by the Budget?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; and I am very glad the gentleman has called that to my attention. As originally contemplated I had expected to ask the House to put back into this bill \$230,000 of items that the subcommittee originally approved; but due to the feeling that is obvious in the House that some of these items should not be increased, and at the direct request of some men whose items are concerned, I have eliminated from the motion any restoration of items

which our subcommittee originally approved. It will be a direct cut in salary appropriations and no increase anywhere along the line.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McCORMACK, 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. 7912) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SIMMONS. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska offers a motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SIMMONS moves to recommit the bill H. R. 7912 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 2, line 7, strike out "\$806,547" and insert "\$767,793," and in the same line strike out "\$821,547" and insert "\$782,797."
On page 4, line 13, strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$118,750."
On page 7, line 12, strike out "\$410,800" and insert "\$391,300," and on page 7, line 13, strike out "\$387,560" and insert "\$368,060."
On page 10, line 1, strike out "\$106,100" and insert "\$103,400," and on page 10, line 2, strike out "\$74,120" and insert "\$70,420."
On page 20, line 3, strike out "\$136,180" and insert "\$119,690," and on page 20, line 12, strike out "\$2,483,218" and insert "\$2,467,318";
On page 21, line 4, strike out "\$1,457,440" and insert "\$1,453,000";
On page 23, line 11, strike out "\$184,025" and insert "\$175,275";
On page 26, line 15, strike out "\$673,400" and insert "\$665,050";
On page 27, line 11, strike out "\$422,950" and insert "\$417,250";
On page 31, line 16, strike out "\$69,380" and insert "\$66,080";
On page 31, line 22, strike out "\$648,068" and insert "\$635,318";
On page 32, line 21, strike out "\$209,966" and insert "\$199,716";
On page 33, line 3, strike out "\$60,500" and insert "\$57,650";
On page 33, line 14, strike out "\$196,400" and insert "\$194,850";
On page 34, line 18, strike out "\$52,060" and insert "\$49,900";
On page 35, line 2, strike out "\$550,785" and insert "\$541,535";
On page 35, line 25, strike out "\$218,440" and insert "\$215,840";
On page 36, line 3, strike out "\$37,720" and insert "\$36,320";
On page 36, line 15, strike out "\$262,005" and insert "\$257,755";
On page 36, line 22, strike out "\$203,325" and insert "\$199,475";
On page 37, line 8, strike out "\$220,436" and insert "\$217,636";
On page 37, line 16, strike out "\$97,820" and insert "\$93,220";
On page 37, line 19, strike out "\$36,220" and insert "\$34,620";
On page 38, line 3, strike out "\$1,431,560" and insert "\$1,406,250";
On page 39, line 25, strike out "\$113,932" and insert "\$112,282";
On page 40, line 12, strike out "\$75,500" and insert "\$72,750";
On page 40, line 22, strike out "\$385,462" and insert "\$380,612";
On page 40, line 25, strike out "\$90,600" and insert "\$89,450";
On page 43, line 20, strike out "\$352,580" and insert "\$336,830";
On page 49, line 20, strike out "\$523,980" and insert "\$525,890";
On page 50, line 3, strike out "\$613,640" and insert "\$610,990";
On page 50, line 5, strike out "\$170,280" and insert "\$169,630";
On page 50, line 7, strike out "\$70,240" and insert "\$69,390";
On page 53, line 7, strike out "\$96,720" and insert "\$92,370";
On page 54, line 3, strike out "\$453,699" and insert "\$440,849";
On page 54, line 7, strike out "\$90,160" and insert "\$86,460";
On page 54, line 12, strike out "\$117,300" and insert "\$112,925";
On page 54, line 17, strike out "\$36,190" and insert "\$34,690";
On page 54, line 21, strike out "\$68,406" and insert "\$67,556";
On page 55, line 3, strike out "\$358,535" and insert "\$343,535";

On page 55, line 9, strike out "\$61,190" and insert "\$58,340";
 On page 55, line 13, strike out "\$307,705" and insert "\$298,705";
 On page 55, line 22, strike out "\$43,355" and insert "\$41,755";
 On page 56, line 4, strike out "\$206,980" and insert "\$203,380";
 On page 57, line 5, strike out "\$147,460" and insert "\$140,760";
 On page 57, line 9, strike out "\$447,645" and insert "\$445,795";
 On page 57, line 15, strike out "\$421,490" and insert "\$419,690";
 On page 58, line 2, strike out "\$209,790" and insert "\$208,800";
 On page 58, line 5, strike out "\$529,820" and insert "\$528,470";
 On page 58, line 8, strike out "\$145,000" and insert "\$143,950";
 On page 58, line 12, strike out "\$147,320" and insert "\$146,120";
 On page 58, line 15, strike out "\$234,930" and insert "\$226,430";
 On page 59, line 7, strike out "\$82,935" and insert "\$79,035";
 On page 59, line 22, strike out "\$82,313" and insert "\$81,663";
 On page 60, line 5, strike out "\$104,810" and insert "\$102,810";
 On page 60, line 16, strike out "\$62,455" and insert "\$59,355";
 On page 61, line 8, strike out "\$214,240" and insert "\$211,290";
 On page 63, line 19, strike out "\$318,000" and insert "\$316,600";
 On page 63, line 23, strike out "\$118,000" and insert "\$116,600";
 On page 68, line 5, strike out "\$39,800" and insert "\$38,000";
 On page 69, line 12, strike out "\$478,890" and insert "\$473,640";
 On page 69, line 25, strike out "\$288,090" and insert "\$275,090";
 On page 71, line 3, strike out "\$812,320" and insert in lieu thereof "\$783,220";
 On page 71, line 3, strike out "\$812,320" and insert "\$783,220";
 On page 71, line 15, strike out "\$785,020" and insert "\$771,070";
 On page 72, line 14, strike out "\$356,790" and insert "\$352,690";
 On page 73, line 12, strike out "\$537,796" and insert "\$533,221";
 On page 73, line 24, strike out "\$1,380,808" and insert "\$1,368,758";
 On page 74, line 5, strike out "\$372,500" and insert "\$369,900";
 On page 74, line 13, strike out "\$24,400" and insert "\$23,700";
 On page 74, line 19, strike out "\$175,100" and insert "\$170,950";
 On page 75, line 16, strike out "\$289,060" and insert "\$280,960";
 On page 75, line 24, strike out "\$833,370" and insert "\$830,720";
 On page 77, line 8, strike out "\$43,800" and insert "\$42,150";
 On page 78, line 18, strike out "\$27,900" and insert "\$26,650";
 On page 79, line 2, strike out "\$205,465" and insert "\$196,115";
 On page 79, line 19, strike out "\$87,230" and insert "\$83,230";
 On page 80, line 5, strike out "\$737,970" and insert "\$731,420";
 On page 80, line 22, strike out "\$430,400" and insert "\$429,750";
 On page 82, line 15, strike out "\$218,838" and insert "\$216,538";
 On page 83, line 7, strike out "\$104,800" and insert "\$99,800";
 On page 83, line 23, strike out "\$1,265,219" and insert "\$1,246,819";
 On page 84, line 8, strike out "\$41,630" and insert "\$40,030";
 On page 84, line 11, strike out "\$37,200" and insert "\$36,700";
 On page 84, line 19, strike out "\$212,358" and insert "\$208,008";

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. BUCHANAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

GENERAL DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up House Joint Resolution 251, making an appropriation for expenses of participation by the United States in the general disarmament conference at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1932, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee calls up House Joint Resolution 251, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That for the expenses of participation by the United States in a general disarmament conference to be held in Geneva in 1932, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including transportation and subsistence or per diem in lieu thereof (notwithstanding the provisions of the subsistence expense act of 1926 or regulations prescribed pursuant thereto); personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without reference to the classification act of 1923, as amended; stenographic and other services by contract if deemed necessary without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); rent of offices and rooms; purchase of necessary

books and documents; printing and binding; official cards; entertainment; hire, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; the reimbursement of other appropriations from which payments may have been made for any of the purposes herein specified; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated; the sum of \$390,000, to remain available until June 30, 1933.

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

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8397) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes. Pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally divided, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] and one-half by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8397, the Interior Department appropriation bill. Pending that motion he asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally divided, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] and one-half by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY]. Is there objection?

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee about the length of time he expects to consume in general debate.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I may say that I have requests for something like three hours on this side.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I have requests for about one hour and a half so far.

Mr. KETCHAM. I shall not object, provided there can be some reasonable limitation imposed upon general debate. The reason I am making this statement at this time is because of our experience in connection with the last bill.

In my experience of 10 years in the House I think I have never seen what I believe was as good consideration of an appropriation bill as that which was given the bill which has just been passed by the House. It has seemed to me that we could very well, indeed, sacrifice considerable of the time that is ordinarily taken up in general debate and use it in debate under the 5-minute rule. I do not want to consent to any proposition that is going to run general debate along for three or four days and then unduly limit or hasten consideration under the 5-minute rule. If general debate were going to run only for to-day, or possibly an hour or two beyond that time, there could be no objection, but it does seem to me we ought to get to the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule and repeat on this bill the fine work which has been done on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, the best discussion I have heard upon an appropriation bill in 10 years of membership in the House. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. Does not the gentleman attribute part of the wonderful success, which we had in the consideration of that bill, to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], who was Chairman of the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. KETCHAM. I joint most heartily in the compliment paid to the Chairman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consid-

eration of the bill H. R. 8397, the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, with Mr. O'CONNOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I will endeavor to tell the House, briefly, what this bill is and what it does.

I may say that this subcommittee began hearings upon this bill on the 15th of December, and with the exception of a few days during the holiday week, we have been considering it nearly all the time since.

The 1932 annual appropriation bill for the Interior Department carried an appropriation of \$69,342,606.73. This bill appropriates \$50,431,432.33. This bill is a reduction of almost 30 per cent. I am wondering whether the other 12 large supply bills will make as good a record for economy as this.

The Budget cut about two-thirds of this amount and this committee has reduced the amount recommended by the Budget \$6,273,920.

We have not put an item in this bill that was not recommended by the Budget, and we have not increased one item in the bill as it came from the Budget; in other words, it is a Budget bill minus the \$6,273,920 that we have reduced from the estimates of the Budget.

So, while it may seem to skimp the Interior Department, the committee believes that these reductions will not in the slightest interfere with the proper functioning of the Government or with the necessary activities of this department.

I feel it is appropriate to itemize these reductions a little so that the Members may know where and how these cuts have been made. Our hearings make a volume of 1,200 pages. They are quite full and complete, and I would suggest that anyone who desires to know the effect or the reason for any of the reductions should consult the hearings. We believe they will explain all of the changes and the ideas of the committee and of the department chiefs affecting these matters.

In the Interior Department proper we have made no change. We made a transfer of four positions from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Office of the Secretary of the Interior. That did not make an increase in the amount, the salaries are the same as they were, and they are performing services in the Secretary's office that are very necessary, and it was mutually agreeable that they should be transferred. In the making of the transfer we have brought about the absorption of two offices, so that in reality it is a saving.

On the subject of printing and binding, the Budget recommended an increase of \$5,500 over the current year. We disallowed that and left them the same sum as it was last year, \$172,000. We felt there was no necessity for increasing this activity in that department at the present time.

In the General Land Office we have made quite a reduction. A year ago the appropriation was \$2,239,400, and we have reduced it to \$1,958,300, making a reduction of \$281,000 from last year's bill.

There is a reduction for the survey of public lands and reductions of \$10,000 for contingent expenses, and a reduction of \$25,000 for protection of the public domain, and so forth.

The report on the bill itemizes these reductions.

I will next refer to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The total appropriation for the Bureau of Indian Affairs a year ago was \$24,989,496. We have reduced that to \$21,758,339. The reduction below last year's bill is \$3,231,000. This reduction covers quite a wide field.

As you know, the Bureau of Indian Affairs of our Government covers practically 200 tribes of Indians scattered

pretty nearly all over the United States. Our Government has different tribal relations, different treaties, different contractual obligations, various kinds of obligations with each tribe, and each is different from the other.

So it requires an enormous amount of individual investigation and personal visits to those tribes and reservations and agencies and the careful studying of their conditions so as to intelligently treat all of them fairly.

No one can actually learn anything about them without going and seeing them and learning on the ground the conditions as they exist among the various Indians.

The committee feels confident that these large reductions will not seriously injure any Indians. A large amount of the reduction is due to the discontinuance of a wide program of construction for the benefit of the Indians that has been carried on in recent years.

There are reductions of \$8,000 for salaries in the commissioner's office, \$2,000 for general expenses, and \$50,000 for the purchase and transportation of supplies. Owing to the reduction in the cost of supplies and food and other things for the maintenance of the Indians, we have figured that these reductions can be safely made.

We have cut off \$5,000 from the item of determining the heirs of deceased Indians. We thought that might be reduced.

We took \$10,000 off the survey and allotment on various reservations. We made several reductions in the industrial-assistance items in many cases.

In the water-supply paragraph, the Budget recommended \$141,000, and we cut \$41,000 off and left them \$100,000.

The Indian irrigation and drainage item we have reduced somewhat, because we felt that some new projects that have been contemplated might well be put over until a later date.

There is one feature of the bill at that point that I want to call attention to. I do not believe it is legislation; it is a limitation in the interest of economy, and the Secretary of the Interior and both the Reclamation Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs are in favor of giving the Secretary of the Interior the authority wherever there is some new irrigation project to be inaugurated, to allow a survey and estimate for that to be made by the Reclamation Service engineers rather than by the Indian Bureau.

We have a splendidly equipped, experienced, and high-class set of engineers in the Reclamation Service, and they can do that work much more efficiently and at less expense and delay to the Government than it can be done in the Indian Service.

Mr. LEAVITT. That does not apply to the administration of the reclamation project.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, no. It is for preparing the plans and specifications and making preliminary estimates and for new construction work. So that we have inserted a clause giving the Secretary that discretionary authority.

In regard to the education of the Indians, the 1932 appropriation bill carried \$11,843,000. We have reduced that, including the items of the Budget, \$1,265,000. We think that reduction will not injure the education of the Indians. Some of the reductions are: \$10,000 for rent, \$20,000 for nonreservation boarding schools, \$36,400 for education of natives in Alaska, and so forth. We decided that the Bureau of Indian Affairs could, if necessary, get along without that item in Alaska.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Is there any provision in the appropriation bill for Indian affairs for the payment to counties where Indians go to county schools, and to reimburse counties for other expenses on account of Indians?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. There is nothing in this bill in the way of new legislation on that matter or any other subject.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Or of appropriation?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. We have not appropriated anything here that is not authorized by existing law.

I think the matter the gentleman refers to is fully cared for. We have not changed the law in that way or mate-

rially reduced the allowances authorized under existing laws or treaty obligations.

Mr. LEAVITT. Is there a reduction in the amount carried in this bill below the amount in the previous bill for payment of tuition of Indian children in public schools?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. My recollection is there is no change in that.

Mr. HASTINGS. At boarding schools?

Mr. LEAVITT. No; I refer to the payment of tuition for Indian children in the public schools.

Mr. HASTINGS. There is no change in that. In the boarding schools there is a \$10 per capita per year reduction.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. We have cut off \$10 per capita per year on the boarding schools because of a great reduction in the present cost of supplies and everything else.

Mr. LEAVITT. But no reduction in the amount of money available to pay tuition of Indian children in public schools?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No.

Mr. LEAVITT. My information is that they were short \$60,000 in the last fiscal year in the amount necessary in that particular.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. For support and administration the appropriation is \$226,000 more than last year. This increase over the current appropriation is due to the seriously depleted condition of the funds of many tribes of Indians and the uncertainty as to future income. It is necessary, therefore, in cases where tribal funds are sufficiently depleted, to transfer the appropriations for support and administration, which are necessary expenses, to gratuity appropriations. Transfers of appropriations from tribal funds to gratuity appropriations to the extent of \$240,700 have been made in the pending bill.

Last year we appropriated \$375,000 to build a sanatorium and hospital at Albuquerque, N. Mex. We also appropriated the same amount to build the same kind of an institution at Sioux, in South Dakota. The Budget allowed an item of \$45,000 at each one of these places for maintenance of those institutions. The truth of the matter is that they have not yet title to the land for one of them, and have not even agreed on the specifications. They have no sanatorium or hospital to maintain, so that we have cut off that \$90,000. It will, of course, be appropriated next year or whenever they get these hospitals built. But there is no necessity to appropriate it at this time. We also take off \$7,000 allowed by the Budget for the construction of a physician's residence at one of those prospective hospitals. We felt that that could wait until they had the hospital. There are a number of items of that kind running through the bill, appropriations that are not necessary.

Under the general support and administration from tribal funds, we have reduced that amount \$469,000, because the tribal funds are being greatly reduced. The Indians do not have the money and we were compelled to make a reduction for that reason.

On the subject of roads through reservations the Budget reported a year ago \$250,000. Our committee raised that to \$500,000 in the 1932 bill. This year the Budget reduced that to \$400,000 and we have left it at that amount. I believe and I am sure all of the members of the committee feel that that money is well expended. If the Budget had seen fit to leave it at \$500,000, the same as last year, we would have been quite content to let it remain at that figure, because that money is required to be expended to furnish the Indians labor in building roads that are necessary. It is really a wise, humane, and beneficial expenditure of money. We therefore made no reduction on that.

Coming to the reclamation fund, last year the bill carried \$6,971,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation. This bill reduces the amount to \$3,881,640. In other words, we recommend only about half of last year's item for reclamation throughout the West. That is because the revolving fund which the Reclamation Service is supposed to be maintained

by is revolving very slowly. They are not getting the receipts which they had anticipated, and in our judgment they are not going to get enough to warrant a large appropriation. We feel that it would be useless to make an appropriation in excess of the amount of money that it appears to us they are likely to have, and for that reason we have made that reduction.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. How seriously will this interfere with existing contracts where work is now being prosecuted?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It would not interfere with any work that is now being carried on. We are letting them go ahead with those, but we are cutting off two or three quite good-sized projects where the contracts are not yet let, because we think there will not be money enough for them. We do not feel that we are in a position where we would be justified in asking Congress to loan the reclamation-fund money again at this time. For that reason we made this reduction.

I could itemize that by saying that we cut \$20,000 off the Carlsbad proposition in New Mexico. We cut \$674,000 off the Vale project in Oregon. We cut \$500,000 off the Yakima project in Washington for construction of what is known as the Cle Elum Dam. We took \$10,000 off the Riverton project in Wyoming because we did not feel it was necessary to have as much of an appropriation as they have. They only have a few settlers on that project, and, while we do not want to discourage them, we do not think it is at all necessary to give them these additional amounts of money. We took \$75,000 off secondary and economic investigations, and made available unexpended balances of appropriations. We felt that some of these economic investigations which are carried on are not very practical. They are largely theoretical and hypothetical, and in the present condition of the Budget some of them might be deferred a while.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Does that reduction include the investigation of the uses of the water of the Colorado River and its tributaries?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not think it does. These secondary and economic investigations are what are referred to. The Colorado River has a very large appropriation.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Has it anything to do with the studies in connection with the use of the waters in connection with Boulder Dam?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; I do not think so. All the Boulder Dam construction is covered by the \$165,000,000 we authorized to be expended on the Boulder Canyon Dam, and those activities to which the gentleman refers are paid out of that fund.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Then there is an appropriation here for a continuation of all the work in every phase of the Boulder Dam that is on the regular program to continue for the ensuing year?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; I am coming to that Boulder Canyon Dam next.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. LEAVITT. Is not this \$50,000 item that has been cut out an amount that covers investigations that are made by the Reclamation Service of proposed new projects and matters of that kind?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; very largely. But we did not think that this was any time to be spending a large amount of money for investigating possible new projects. We have not put the money in there for that purpose.

Concerning the Boulder Canyon Dam, there is over a \$1,000,000 left in the fund now that was appropriated in the 1931 bill. We appropriated \$15,000,000 in the bill of 1932. None of that has been expended yet. So they have \$16,000,000 heretofore and available now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

The Reclamation Service went before the Budget Bureau and got an authorization for \$10,000,000 more. We felt that it was wholly unnecessary to have that much money available for them at this time. I understand they figure that the utmost amount they could spend would be \$2,000,000 a month. They hope some time this coming spring to reach that stage of development. They have, by this addition of \$8,000,000 which we are giving them now, \$24,000,000 that they will have available all the time.

In reality we do not believe that they will spend that during the coming fiscal year, and as the Congress adjourns next year on the 4th of March, and the bill for 1934 will be enacted and will be law long before they can possibly expend the \$24,000,000 that has been authorized, we do not feel that we have in any way jeopardized that work.

I may say that the friends of this project, particularly the Congressmen from that district, have no objection to this reduction.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the progress that is being made in the work on Boulder Dam what is the estimated date of completion?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. They can not estimate that definitely yet. They are ahead of their schedule of work now, and I think they figure it will be about five years.

Now, taking up the Geological Survey, as all of the western Members know, the Geological Survey has been growing like a mushroom in recent years. The appropriation last year was \$3,141,000. We have recommended \$2,279,000. The Budget made a little reduction, and we have increased that considerably, so that the total reduction is \$862,000.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TILSON. In our efforts to economize, has it ever occurred to the gentleman or to the members of his committee to consider using our Army engineers in this work? Every Army officer should be able to make maps. It is a most important part of the instruction of an Army officer expecting to command troops in the field. Our Army engineers, of course, make a special study of making maps. Has it ever occurred to the gentleman that it might be an excellent schooling for our military officers, who must be paid and supported anyway, that they might be used in carrying on this work? I think it one of the most important works in which any of our departments is engaged and a work that ought to be accomplished at as early a date as possible.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I thoroughly agree with what the gentleman says, but that is a matter for the reorganization of the departments here in Washington. We hear about such reorganizations, but nothing is done about it. This committee has no authority to legislate or make any reorganizations or to change those conditions. I think that work has been carried on in a wasteful way.

Mr. TILSON. It seems to me that Army officers would receive a wonderful schooling if they were permitted to do this work. For our national defense an efficient officer personnel must be maintained anyway, and we have been making progress in this map making all too slowly, in my judgment, although the expense of doing it has been rapidly rising.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I think if the House will pass a bill which is now under consideration in the Expenditures Committee, there may be a chance of using them.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I feel that the committee of the gentleman from South Dakota is the one to handle that.

Mr. TILSON. I hope the gentleman's committee will work out something along that line, because I think it would result in economy and at the same time be very useful training for the Army officers engaged in it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes. I will mention only a few of the

items we have reduced in the Geological Survey. We took \$250,000 off topographic surveys. We felt that the work of topographic surveys over the country at the present time was not urgent at all and that we might, without serious injury to anybody, save some money that way. We took \$50,000 off geologic surveys, which we thought could be at least temporarily dispensed with to that extent.

We took \$50,000 off fundamental research into geologic science. We thought that was too theoretical and hypothetical to spend so much money on under the present condition of our Treasury. We also took \$11,000 off volcanological surveys. We thought that work need not be increased at this time.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. That is a 33 per cent decrease and it will practically mean a reduction of personnel in that instance.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not just now remember the particulars. We felt that more money was being spent on that work than was necessary. We felt it could be reduced without injury.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Last year the personnel item was \$19,000 and according to the gentleman's figures it must be reduced this year to about \$14,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the gentleman will look at the report he will see the definite figures. We took \$17,000 off the investigation of the mineral resources in Alaska.

They have been spending a very large amount of money on the investigation of the mineral resources in Alaska. We have left them a large sum and we feel this economy may well be practiced. We took \$119,500 off gaging streams. That is a large item, but after investigating it and considering the large amount they still have we thought that was a good place for the Geological Survey to practice some economy.

When our Federal Treasury is somewhere between two and three billion dollars in the red, and the President and nearly everybody else from Plymouth Rock to the Golden Gate is appealing to Congress to cut down expenses and reduce appropriations, when the overhead expenses of our Government are breaking the backs of the taxpayers and ruining business, we have absolutely got to wield an ax on these bureaus and will of absolute necessity work many personal hardships. It can not be avoided.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. Under the item for gaging streams were some particular projects eliminated or just the general fund reduced?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the gentleman will read the hearings I think he will conclude that there is a large amount of work which is unessential and not warranted during these desperately depressed times. In other words, we think they are spending more money than should be spent under existing conditions. Members of the Appropriations Committee are expected to exercise our best judgment and we have done so.

Mr. LEAVITT. The committee has not designated any particular projects that are to be left out?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No. We have taken it off of the lump sum.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is my impression that in the matter of gaging streams the Army engineers, in some instances duplicate the work.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; practically so.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do the hearings disclose how much duplication takes place in this activity? I am asking that question anent the proposal of the gentleman from Connecticut. Here we have a definite instance where Army engineers are doing work that is performed by this service, so that it is a case of duplication.

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. If the gentleman will permit, I should suggest that a year ago, when it seemed there was not adequate reason for permitting the Army to continue to call upon the Interior Department to do the gaging of certain streams for purposes under charge of the War Department—navigation, flood control, and so on—the committee handling this bill had an understanding with the Geological Survey that this work would not be done further by the Interior Department but would be done by the War Department. Theretofore that department had turned over to the Interior Department money for these purposes. I think the amounts turned over annually aggregated from \$150,000 to \$190,000. This year it was urged that we had gone too far and that economy would result if the Geological Survey were permitted to do certain stream gaging upon the basis of money turned over by the War Department to the Interior Department for that purpose.

We were convinced that efficiency and economy would be served by this arrangement, and we believe the former practice should be resumed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Other than the value which comes to navigation, is flood control the only other activity that is now benefited by the gaging of streams?

Mr. FRENCH. There are other factors. Flood control and navigation up to the present have been the chief factors.

Mr. STAFFORD. I mentioned those two main factors. I said, in addition to navigation and flood control, is there any other advantage gained by the gaging of streams?

Mr. FRENCH. In addition to the foregoing, I should mention information for water-power development, information for municipal and domestic demands upon water resources, information that will be of greatest value for reclamation and for studies having to do with soil erosion—these are the chief interests served by stream gaging.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. In regard to the next item, which the gentleman skipped, for printing and binding, geologic maps, and so forth, is any amount included in any of the appropriations for editing the printed matter of the Geological Survey?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the gentleman will look at the hearings, he will see that they have a very large remaining appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I have the bill in front of me and the words are "printing, binding, preparation of illustrations, engraving, and printing geologic and topographic maps," but that seems to omit entirely the essential editing work before any of the maps are ready for printing.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not think the Geological Survey ever omits anything. My impression of 11 years on this committee is that in all the ramifications of our Government this bureau can devise more ingenious phraseologies upon which to base an appropriation than any other activity under our flag.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Except the word "editing."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes. I may say we took \$19,500 off of the item of minerals on public lands. As a matter of fact, there is not very much mining going on in the public domain of the West at the present time and we thought this item could stand a little cut.

For the national parks we appropriate \$8,140,620. We have cut under the 1932 appropriation by \$1,377,000 this year, but I may say that this cut is mainly in construction of roads and buildings where they have heretofore had a large program. We do not feel we are injuring the national parks. If you read the hearings with respect to the national parks you will find some very, very interesting data as to the value of our national parks to our country and the value of the parks to each of the States in which they are situated and the large increase in travel of the American people to see our parks. This is one of the greatest inducements to the slogan "See America first." We did not feel like crippling this service and yet we thought there were some places

where there might be some economy practiced and we cut nearly all of this off the item for roads and trails. But we have left them several million dollars for that purpose.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Do not these parks return a considerable revenue from admissions?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, yes.

Mr. TILSON. Is not this item increasing? It seems to me that each year more and more people are going to our national parks, and I think as the roads across the country improve, still more people will visit these wonderful parks.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes. I feel that the roads in the national parks are a wonderful and very wise investment for our country.

Mr. TILSON. And they are still collecting an admission fee for automobiles, which is returning a considerable revenue.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes. If you will permit a reference to some remarks of the Secretary of the Interior, which he made in the city of Denver last June, when we were there, he said in substance that in the years to come this generation of the American people would not be revered for its marvelous industrial development, its mass production, or gigantic growth but would be remembered and honored more because this generation is the generation that had the foresight to preserve for all posterity these wonderful scenic spots and gorgeous beauties of nature throughout our country and to preserve them in such a way that they would be handed down to the generations to come in the condition they were in in a state of nature.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Referring to the gentleman's discussion of the question of roads in the parks, I call attention to the action taken yesterday on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill in connection with the appropriation carried in that bill for forest roads and trails.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. The gentleman may recall that a point of order was made against certain legislation whereby that appropriation was increased \$3,000,000, and I am wondering if that was taken into consideration in connection with the limitations here or if it was not taken into consideration, whether it would be possible to still further reduce comparative items in this particular bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I really do not think so, because the Budget made quite a little cut in this bill, and we feel we can not induce the world to come to our national parks and to make a circular drive, visiting our system of parks, without having the finest possible roads. That is one of the things for which my predecessor, Mr. Cramton, as chairman of this committee, will be kindly remembered. He was of great help in inaugurating and carrying on our great park road development.

Mr. KETCHAM. It just occurred to me that when we consider the total amount of appropriations made in the agricultural bill for forest roads and trails amounting to something like \$12,000,000 and set that against the amount spent for all roads throughout the United States, which I think runs somewhere around \$80,000,000 or \$90,000,000, it is perhaps an undue appropriation to assign to this particular activity. Without any desire to cripple, I simply wanted to inquire whether or not all the factors have been taken into consideration by the subcommittee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; I think so. I think the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], who visited some of these parks last summer, and anyone else who has ever visited the parks, realizes that the splendid roads we have there are one of the very great attractive features of the parks.

Mr. KETCHAM. I may say it has been my own pleasure to visit some of them, and I know what the gentleman says is true. I am not in any wise unfriendly, but it does seem to me that if there is a place where we may apply economy in these road expenditures, we ought to give them pretty careful scrutiny.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. We figured that when we took off \$1,300,000 we were going about as far as we ought to go.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman having made a tour of some of the national parks last summer, as I did myself, and having had some experiences there with the roads in dry weather, I hope his committee has not cut off anything from any appropriation for oiling the roads in the parks.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; we have not.

Mr. TEMPLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TEMPLE. The gentleman from Michigan suggested that because large appropriations had been made for roads in the national forests that it might be cut in the national parks. They are entirely separate.

Mr. KETCHAM. Not entirely separate.

Mr. TEMPLE. They are as separate as Ohio and Michigan.

• Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. They are under different departments and have different objects.

Mr. KETCHAM. I understand the roads in the national forest are under the Department of Agriculture, but in many cases they adjoin these parks and make one continuous road, and one system must articulate with the other. Federal roads of Michigan and Ohio articulate, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE].

Mr. LEAVITT. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say that there may be some connection between the national forest and the national park roads in some instances, but many national-forest roads are nowhere near the national-park roads. It is necessary to have quite a high standard of highway construction in the national parks because of the wide difference in degree of experience in driving.

The representatives from all the countries in the world visit these parks, and the roads must be safe and properly built, built in a way to give the proper grade and proper width, and that costs money.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Last year the appropriation was \$510,000 for the Bureau of Education. We have cut \$85,000 from that. These reductions are \$5,000 for salaries in the office of the commissioner. They wanted to add a position which we did not think was necessary. Then there is a reduction of \$4,000 for expenses and \$50,000 for investigations of school finances. We thought that was comparatively useless. The country schools have no finances these days. We are, of course, all in favor of education, and feel kindly toward it, but I think our subcommittee felt that the showing made before us by that bureau was not very encouraging or satisfactory for the amount of money they are spending. They seemed to us so impractical.

Now, going to the government in the Territories. The amount recommended is \$1,262,000, which is the Budget figure of \$20,200 more than the 1932 bill.

This increase is due to the addition of a new item amounting to \$412,000 for the government of the Virgin Islands. The Virgin Islands have been transferred by proclamation of the President from the Navy to the Interior Department and are contained in this bill for the first time.

There has been only one of the committee, Mr. FRENCH, who has had personal knowledge of the Virgin Islands. We yielded quite largely to his judgment.

The committee concluded that the sums of \$46,000 for expenses of the legislature in Alaska and \$47,000 for the legislature in Hawaii were sufficient. They only hold their sessions every other year, and this appropriation bill is one that comes just before the session meets next January. So these items of \$46,000 and \$47,000 appear in the bill this year and did not appear in the bill last year, but they did appear two years ago.

There will be undoubtedly considerable discussion concerning the Virgin Islands later on.

Now, we come to St. Elizabeths Insane Asylum. The appropriation a year ago was \$2,779,000. We recommend \$1,245,000. In other words, we have reduced the appropriation, or recommend its being reduced, from the bill of last year \$1,533,000. That is brought about by reason of the fact that we are not continuing a very large building program that we had last year.

Mr. TILSON. Otherwise the appropriation is increased by \$41,000, is it not?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. What is the cause of this increase?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. St. Elizabeths Insane Asylum is a growing institution. It increases about 100 a year. There is a regular amount allowed for each patient by law. We simply have to take care of the increase. But we have cut out the building program.

The next is the Columbia Institute for the Deaf and Dumb. Last year the appropriation was \$125,000, and the Budget recommended adding \$3,000 more this year. We have accepted that. As a matter of fact, there did not seem to be any place to reduce on the Institute for the Deaf and Dumb. It is not a very large institution.

The next is Howard University. We made some reductions there. The bill last year carried \$1,560,000. This bill is \$485,000 less. The reductions that we made are \$25,000 off for salaries. That is not a reduction of salaries so much as it is preventing them from enlarging the number of the personnel. We have taken off \$50,000 of general expenses because we thought under present conditions the university could stand that amount.

If the gentlemen will look at the tabulation in my report, they will see these items set out fully. There are two large items, a reduction of \$160,000 on the proposed new heat, light, and power plant, and the other is a reduction on the library. A year ago we authorized them to build a new library. The Budget this year recommended \$800,000 for a library. We felt from our investigations that that is more than is necessary. We have reduced that amount to \$500,000. They recommended \$460,000 for a heat, light, and power plant. We felt that is larger than is needed, and we reduced that amount to \$300,000.

Our information is that the cost of materials and everything is reduced about one-third from the costs three years ago. We investigated the matter as fairly and earnestly as we could, and we feel that a suitable library can be built at this time for that university for half a million dollars. That is our judgment, and we are authorizing that amount. In the same way we felt confident that a proper heat, light, and power plant for that institution can now be put in for \$300,000. The reductions represent our deliberate and painstaking judgment in the matter. Comparing this university with other colleges, we submit our judgment to the approval of the House. Some Members may feel that it ought to be reduced much more, but with the reduction in the cost of everything at present—the Budget estimates that were made some time ago—we felt that we are not at all injuring that university or preventing them from having the wonderful library that they need nor are we preventing them from having the proper heat, light, and power plant which they need.

Last year for Freedmen's Hospital the bill appropriated \$487,000. We have cut under that \$93,000. That decrease is due to the fact that there is no new construction contained in the pending bill. Otherwise it remains the same. That is the institution where the District of Columbia pays 50 per cent of the cost of operation.

My colleagues, in assuming the chairmanship of this subcommittee, I did so with profound appreciation of the very great honor and also of the great responsibility. The activities of the Interior Department extend almost from the North Pole to the Equator, from our interests in the Eskimo schools above the Arctic Circle down to the Virgin Islands in the Tropics. I think the Department of the Interior touches the human side of life possibly more than any other department. We have all of the Indians of our country under our care. We have 22 national parks,

34 national monuments. We have 35 reclamation projects. Most all of these activities are in the West, and they go a long way toward the upbuilding of that country. While we have made a reduction of almost 30 per cent from last year's bill, we have tried not to cripple anything.

I call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS], and I have lived in that country practically all of our lives and are vitally interested in these matters. It comes home to us. We must gratefully acknowledge the wonderful services that my predecessor, Mr. Cramton, rendered to our country during the 10 years he was chairman of this committee. He could not have made the success he did without the splendid cooperation of our colleagues on this subcommittee. Mr. FRENCH and Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. MURPHY and I have personally investigated all these matters for many years. There has always been the utmost good feeling, good will, and hearty cooperation. In all these 10 years there never has been a minority report filed. We have always gone down the line shoulder to shoulder. I know the West highly appreciates having this cooperation in this Interior Department Committee, Mr. Chairman. I reserve the remainder of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I notice in the synopsis at the end of the bill, apparently there is a new estimated expenditure for the Alaskan Railroad of \$1,291,000, over and above what there was in the year 1932, and a reduction in the amount appropriated from \$1,000,000 to \$500,000. Is it true that there has been some new legislation that permitted a regular annual expenditure of \$1,290,000?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, no; there has not been any expenditure of that kind.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. The gentleman will find the item I refer to on page 34 of the report.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Colonel Ohlson, who is the superintendent of that Alaskan Railroad, has made wonderful economies.

He has cut down the expense of administering that road and has saved our country something like a half million dollars and that is the reason we can reduce the amount. He is a splendid railroad man, a great executive official, and we are proud of him.

Of course, that railroad was built to develop that country, we have been up there and examined it, as the gentleman from Colorado was with us last summer. While it is true it is not now a paying proposition, financially; nevertheless, it is a development proposition for that territory and it would be a great tragedy if we should discontinue it. For that reason we have given it encouragement, and are providing in this bill to have it properly maintained. [Applause.]

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need to make my statement.

Our Chairman, of whom I am wonderfully proud and for whom I have a sincere personal affection, has so well covered the details of this bill that it will not be necessary for me to take up very much of your time.

I have been a member of this subcommittee for 10 years, and this is the first time I have felt it necessary for me, as a member of that committee, to register a protest. I do it without controversy or feeling of any kind. I protest, in the name of members of the Committee on Appropriations, against the rule that we are now observing in the appropriating of money for the operation of this Government in its various activities. I feel, as a member of the great Committee on Appropriations, elected by the people of my district, that I would not be fair to them if we were to relinquish, willingly and without protest, the rights which are justly theirs, as represented by me as a member of this committee, to exercise my own personal judgment as their representative on this committee in appropriating the people's money.

We recognize and respect the Budget law of our country; but, as members of the Committee on Appropriations, at no time have we as a committee agreed that the judgment of the Bureau of the Budget was superior to the judgment of the duly elected representatives of the people of this country. [Applause.]

Those of you who are quite familiar with the procedure of appropriating money realize that the heads of the various departments of the Government make out a list of their needs. They carry this list to the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget conducts hearings and passes on the needs of the departments that are represented at that particular time before the Bureau of the Budget. Up to the present time I think the representatives of the people on the Committee on Appropriations have cut under the Budget estimates almost \$500,000,000. So as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I want to register at this time my protest against the adoption of a rule that would say to the Committee on Appropriations they can not, within the total figures of the Budget, if you please, allocate or reallocate money, as their best judgment may decide.

Please bear in mind that six months elapses between the time of the hearing before the Bureau of the Budget and the time when that Budget comes before the Committee on Appropriations. Many things can happen in six months' time, and we, as members of the Committee on Appropriations, feel that the judgment of five members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations is superior to the judgment of one man, serving as a judge in the Bureau of the Budget, holding hearings on the needs of a department of the Government.

We recognize that these are strenuous times. We recognize that the Treasury of the United States is in such condition that we are willing to go to almost any length to balance the Budget. So temporarily the members of this committee are acting as one man to seek to balance the Budget. Acting that way, we have not attempted to appropriate one cent of money for any individual item embraced in this bill over and above the figure which has been settled by the Bureau of the Budget. However, in the days that are ahead, our committee will again function in a way so that every Member of Congress may rightfully come before that committee and present the claims of his district for the allocation of money here, there, or yonder, within the limits of the total appropriation allowed by the Budget.

I make this statement because I daresay there is not one member of our committee who does not feel exactly the same as I do. So we are meeting the situation in our work in this House in an honest and sincere endeavor to balance the Budget.

I do not know how many Members of the House have ever stopped to seriously think about the activities of this subcommittee. We recommend appropriations amounting to somewhere between fifty million and eighty million dollars. We have a wider range of activities for which we recommend appropriations than any other subcommittee of Congress. Indeed, without fear of being contradicted, I feel that it is the most interesting work of any committee in the House, because we deal with the welfare of people. We deal with the welfare of a race of Indians who are our wards. We have taken on a new responsibility recently. We have a group of people, 22,000 of them, living on three little islands out in the sea. They are not able to take care of themselves, and Uncle Sam is going down into his pocket to the extent of almost \$500,000 a year to take care of that group of people, of whom you will learn more as the bill is read and the debate continues.

We have a wonderful activity in the far North, in Alaska, wonderful land that it is. There are only about 28,000 white people there, and yet we have about the same number of Indians and Eskimos. Perhaps the Members will be surprised to learn that we are spending twice as much money educating the children of the Indians and the Eskimos in Alaska as is being spent to educate the children of the 28,000 white people who live there.

We have made some reductions as to Alaska. Uncle Sam owns a railroad in Alaska 400 and some odd miles in length. It has been costing us about \$1,000,000 a year over and above the amount of money they receive for the transportation of freight and passengers.

The 28,000 people who live in this Territory are wonderful folks. They are unusual men and unusual women. The finest type of American pioneers is to be found in Alaska. They are undergoing severe hardships in an honest endeavor to develop that land. That is a frozen land. You only have to go down 12 inches from the surface and you strike solid ice everywhere after you leave the seacoast for about 50 or 100 miles, and yet we have up there two agricultural activities. One of them is looked after by an agricultural college and the other, I think, has been dropped.

Mr. Ohlson, the superintendent of the railroad, is truly a wonderful executive. They have taken away from Mr. Ohlson about \$500,000 and he has been able to operate the railroad without any further deficit.

However, there was a committee from another body that visited Alaska about a year ago. That committee, I am told, held hearings. They were seeking to find some way to wipe out the deficit of this Government-operated railroad.

There is a railroad in Alaska owned and operated by a great copper company. The copper company built this railroad for its own purposes and for its own convenience, never expecting to carry nor did it care whether it carried a passenger or not, save only those who might be employed in their mining activities.

The Government built this railroad for the purpose of opening Alaska so that settlers might go there and establish themselves in a home and that our Government might there build up a new State and give opportunity to splendid American citizens to go forward and make a home for themselves. There are about 12,000 American citizens who live in the small towns and country adjacent to this 400 and some odd miles of railway.

After this committee visited Alaska they came back to Washington and made a report to the great Department of the Interior that they thought the rates on that railway should be advanced. They did advance those rates, and every dollar of advanced rates was a wet blanket on ambition and on the pioneer spirit of the bright, ambitious American men who wanted to go to Alaska to make their homes.

Alaska is a wonderful country. We have a wonderful park there. We are spending some money in building a road so that those who have the time and the treasure to spare may travel there and see what to me is the grandest spectacle I ever saw in all my life. Never did I see anything that equaled the first view I had of marvelous Mount McKinley. I wish it were possible for all patriotic Americans to see that wonderful mountain. I have not the time to describe it to you.

But I am talking of Alaska. We have a great many officials in Alaska. I thought, perhaps, my chairman might talk to you about them, and he may before the bill is concluded.

Yes; this is a wonderful bill. We deal with 200 tribes of Indians, and each tribe is a separate problem. Oh, men of the committee, if you could understand the tremendous responsibility that rests on the shoulders of that wonderful, God-loving man who is at the head of the Indian Bureau, I am sure that at no time would you ever criticize an activity of the Indian Bureau; for if there ever was a bureau of this Government that was honestly, conscientiously, and God-lovingly administered, the Indian Bureau at the present time is that place. [Applause.]

As one studies the Indian problem, as I have sought to study it for 10 years, he sometimes wonders what the outcome will be, with changing administrations, with changing policies, and all that thing.

In 10 years' time, gentlemen of the committee, in the various studies and investigations we have made, our committee last April found one man, an unusual man, in charge of one of the Indian agencies and schools, who knew where he was starting from and was well aware of where he was going. If he could carry along with him and his program

the Indians in his care, the Indian problem would be solved within a generation. Yes; it is a serious problem, and we are appropriating about \$20,000,000 for the Indians.

Mr. PEAVEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. PEAVEY. Could the gentleman tell us whether or not those Alaska Indians are all in the position of Government wards or not?

Mr. MURPHY. The Alaska Indians are largely self-supporting. They are quite different from the ones we have in the rest of the country. Through our laws and regulations we are interfering with those Indians in Alaska. When we were there last summer some Indians told our committee that by reason of existing law in Alaska they were not permitted to kill game with which to feed their children, and that is one of the things we talked to the Governor of Alaska about when we went back to Juneau, after having been in the heart of Alaska.

Mr. PEAVEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. PEAVEY. I might say to the gentleman that my purpose in asking this question is that the point was raised in the Indian Affairs Committee this morning as to whether or not all of the Indians in Alaska were Government wards or whether there were Indians there who are American citizens.

Mr. KNUTSON. They are all American citizens under the act of 1921.

Mr. PEAVEY. But not under the control of the Government.

Mr. KNUTSON. Are they wards?

Mr. MURPHY. I would not know just how to answer that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the Indian Affairs Bureau treat the Indians of Alaska as wards?

Mr. MURPHY. Unless we watch the Indian Bureau very closely, which we are trying to do, they will make them wards. They will teach them up there to do the same thing that the Indians do in the gentleman's State whenever we allow them to do it.

Mr. THATCHER. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MURPHY. Certainly.

Mr. THATCHER. What is the basic difference between the treatment of Indians in continental United States and in Alaska under the law?

Mr. MURPHY. The Indians of Alaska have been self-reliant and have depended upon themselves in their trapping to be able to secure food and clothing for themselves.

Mr. THATCHER. Is the basic law the same?

Mr. MURPHY. By reason of some of the laws of our country they have been denied the privilege of hunting the things they need to furnish them meat and clothing, and some of them are every poor. We found in the Indian Bureau some wonderful teachers in Alaska. We found one woman up there that gave away practically all of her salary to buy food to give these little Indian children something to eat at noontime. We found this same woman teaching the Indian children how to plant beans and raise a little crop of beans here and there wherever they could do it. Farming in Alaska—well, the least we say about it the better I think it will be for the cause.

Mr. THATCHER. Will the gentleman answer my question? I do not know that I am quite clear about it. Is the law applicable to the Indians of Alaska the same law that is applicable to the Indians of the United States, and is there the same question of relationship, and so forth?

Mr. MURPHY. The law is very liberally construed with reference to the various tribes of Indians. We find the Indian Bureau to be very considerate and very gentle with these people, but we have a responsibility in Alaska, because we have taken away from these Indians the means of making a living in their own way.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. Is it not also true that this is practically the first year that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has administered matters in the way of health and education for the

natives of Alaska? Previously they have been under the Bureau of Education.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. And the Indian Bureau now is beginning to take over, under the appropriation bill brought out by this committee a year ago, the health and educational activities among the Alaska natives, and this is the first year of that work. Just how far the Government is going to go in extending its paternal assistance to these natives has not as yet been determined, because it is a new field they are entering, so far as the Indian Bureau is concerned.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the gentleman for his statement, because it is very clear and concise.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think it is a fact that the Government has never negotiated any treaties with the Alaska Indians.

Mr. MURPHY. I think not.

Mr. KNUTSON. And, of course, the Alaska Indians would be subject to the same State game laws that the Indians of the several States are subjected to. In Minnesota the Indian is treated exactly like the white man.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman allow me to answer the inquiry propounded by the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MURPHY. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The third section of the treaty of purchase by which we acquired dominion over Alaska provides that the natives there shall be treated exactly as they are in the United States; that they shall be governed by and be subject to the same laws, and all that, as the Indians in the United States.

Mr. THATCHER. But as a practical matter—

Mr. WICKERSHAM. As a practical matter, they never have been.

Mr. THATCHER. They have been more self-supporting than the Indians in the United States.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. They are much more self-supporting than the Indians in the United States, especially the Indians in southeastern Alaska. They are a very high-grade people.

Mr. THATCHER. And if they are not restricted too much they will become more self-supporting?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. They are a very high-class people. They are boat builders and they live in community houses, and they have built their own towns and their own boats and their fishing apparatus, and look after themselves, and have always done so.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LEAVITT. Is it not also true in that same connection that they have a certain degree of self-reliance which it is our duty to maintain? As we extend the benefits of government to them, we must be careful that we do not deprive them of the ability that they now have to take care of themselves; but at the same time there is this difficulty that has been touched upon, and that is their previous manner of living, when they were entirely self-dependent, has been to a great degree interfered with in many parts of the Territory, and this has something to do with the matter of game laws. There were no game laws applying to them years ago, but now being brought under the same sort of game laws to a great extent that the white people are under, and with the white people moving in along their trap lines and coming in competition with them, they are not able in all cases to support themselves as they were previously. One of the things that the Government must be very careful about, in my judgment, is to see that the rights of these Indians to live upon the resources of that country are not unduly interfered with, so that they may remain self-supporting, and in the meantime we must carry on health and educational work among these people.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The Indians of far eastern Alaska are fishermen, living very largely on salmon that run into those streams. Unfortunately for them, Congress has passed

salmon laws that has prevented them from taking the fish, as they have heretofore done, and shipping them for transportation or sale, or anything of that kind. They have been limited in that way, to their great detriment, more than I think they should.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Can not you properly say that the administration of the laws of the United States have been directed to teaching the Indians to depart from their old tribal customs and take their food out of a tin can, eat it, and like it? [Laughter.]

Mr. MURPHY. Well, the gentleman was in Alaska while I was there, and I am sure he is well informed and understands conditions there.

The thing I want to emphasize is that we must be careful as we take over these responsibilities and not rob these primitive people of that which they now have, namely, self-reliance. We should, Mr. Delegate from Alaska, in some way impress on the authorities in Alaska the need of differentiating between activities of the white poacher or white trapper as against the needs of the native population. That was the impression that our committee had when we visited this wonderful country, which is a game paradise and a paradise for fishermen.

This railroad that we own and operate in Alaska is said to be running through or to operate through extensive coal fields in Alaska.

The Geological Survey has had many people in Alaska this summer knocking off with their hammers bits of stone here and digging little holes yonder, seeking to find out about the minerals in Alaska. We were told that there is much coal there. We were told that there was anthracite coal there. If any member of the committee found one lump of anthracite coal, I should like to have seen it. We did not see any, although it may be there.

There is some coal in Alaska, and it is being mined. Now, the coal there does not lie in flat beds like the coal that we mine here, but it runs diagonally up in the hills, and it is very difficult to mine. However, they are mining it; and to our amazement we found that there was no way at tidewater for ships to take the coal shipped on this railroad, as there were no facilities for loading, so our committee took the matter up while there with the very efficient manager of that railroad, and when he appeared before our committee a few weeks ago he told us he was in favor of building coal bunkers at Seward. He said it would cost \$65,000 to build the bunkers and he thought he could find the money to do it with out of the money he has which is unexpended.

Now, think of it—they imported into Alaska some years as much as 100,000 tons of coal; and where do you suppose they bring the bulk of it from? They bring it from Utah, and we have a railroad in Alaska that goes through the coal field. They should have provided facilities to load coal on the small boats that ply here, there, and yonder through the peaceful islands off the coast of that splendid country long, long ago.

So if we did nothing else last summer during our visit there than to open up the coal fields and give them a chance to sell their coal and give the railroad a chance to haul it and to reduce these exorbitant rates they have placed on the people, then, indeed, it was worth while for our committee to make the little investigation we did make at that point.

Mr. THATCHER. Who was it that failed to provide these facilities? A Government agency?

Mr. MURPHY. We are not here to make any charges or to find any fault. We are happy to report to the House today that they are going to provide bunkers there, and it is the unanimous hope of the committee that there will be coal in these bunkers sufficient at all times to supply the need of boats that may come into Seward short of fuel.

Mr. THATCHER. Whose responsibility is it to supply the bunkers?

Mr. MURPHY. The railroad management, but with a million-dollar deficit running every year, they hesitated to

spend the money to do this. There are only 28,000 white people up there, widely scattered. There are only about 12,000 white folks, and when I say white folks I mean the kind of folks who live in cities and towns and in the country adjacent to this railroad, that must pay this additional freight, and it does not seem right to penalize 12,000 pioneer people to make good a deficit on a Government-operated railroad.

We have 200 tribes of Indians. We have some that are very fine, we have some not so fine, some that are not fine at all, and some that disgrace the name of Indian by reason of their helplessness. We spend \$20,000,000 for these folks besides the hundreds of thousands of dollars of their own money.

A number of the tribes are very well to do, but their money is dwindling. We found one tribe of Indians that is very wealthy. Here a lot of white folks had fastened themselves onto the Indian activity, were using 27 automobiles and the Indians were paying for the automobiles and for the gasoline and everything else. The job of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to whom I alluded a moment ago, is a hard one. It is the most difficult place in the Government. He is criticized and found fault with and rarely commended. Yes; we have uplifters for the Indians. Oh, what a tribe of uplifters we have in the United States! They fasten themselves onto every activity—for a fee. They are to be found trying to help the Indians, and they are always busy in some sections of the country disturbing the mind of the Indian, leading him to believe that his Government is not fair with him. I shall not touch any further on that, because I think our chairman, when the debate proceeds, will probably give it attention.

Then we have the irrigation problem. I do not know how many of you have ever visited the great West, which has been turned from a desert to prolific farms. The transformation has been wonderful which has come about through irrigation. That activity of the Government is in this bill. Our committee last summer visited almost every reclamation project in this country. Last summer was a dry summer. We found that every irrigation project in this country had not made adequate provision for water supply to carry through an ordinary dry season the acreage that was being farmed under the ditches of the irrigation projects.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. How could that be provided for, in view of the fact that we have had a dwindling of rainfall and snowfall for six years. It reached its climax last year with a 40 per cent precipitation, resulting in the condition that the reservoirs on most of these projects were empty when the irrigating season started. The human mind could not contemplate what was going to happen. Here came along June and July when the crops were beginning to grow well, and there was no water for the crops. It was particularly so on the Indian reservations, where the Federal Government has permitted white settlers to come in, has invited them to come in and take up 160-acre tracts and told them that they could not have a patent to that amount of acreage until they showed a water right, and the only place they could get the water right was by taking it away from the stream that was supposed to be inviolate for the Indians themselves and no one else. It can not be done.

Mr. MURPHY. Ten years ago, when I was honored by the great chairman of this committee that handles the finance of our Government by being placed on the interior subcommittee, with Mr. Cramton, he said to me, "You do not know anything about the Indian problem. You do not know anything about the irrigation problem, you do not know very much about anything that is in the West." I said, "You are right, Mr. Madden." He then said, "That is why I want you on this committee. These fellows from the West want everything, and unless you watch them real close, they will get it too." [Laughter.] So I say to my good friend from Nevada [Mr. ARENTZ] that I have been with Mr. Cramton always.

I remember when the West could not find ugly words enough to condemn that great man from Michigan who was chairman of this subcommittee for 10 years. I lived long enough and remained on this committee long enough to see the same West speak kindly of him and recognize his great ability. But I am digressing. We found you did not have water enough. We also found, at least it was the judgment, I believe, of our committee, that before any more irrigation projects are commenced anywhere in this country, those already built should be supplied with sufficient water to carry them through a period like that which they encountered last year. How can they do it? By building an auxiliary water supply, by building dams and holding back the flood waters. Your engineers told you the same thing. So we believe and we hope that the wisdom of this House will be not to undertake the building of any new irrigation projects in the West until those already constructed are sufficiently supplied with water to meet the needs of the splendid American pioneer people who have gone out there with their savings and paid good money for land under these ditches.

What a wonderful thing water is in our country. What a wonderful thing it is everywhere, and how little it is appreciated among the people of this part of our country.

In that great and wonderful State of California there is a great valley which extends from Bakersfield north to Sacramento, bounded on the east by a mountain range and on the west by another mountain range; a great valley that was once one of the most prosperous pieces of land out of doors, with its olive orchards, with its orange groves, with its vineyards.

The land was so valuable, because of its productivity, that a man with an average bank account could not go in there and buy a home site. Eight years have passed since they have had much rain or much snow in those mountains bounding the east and west of this once-favored land. Eight years ago they advertised this land as the most productive land to be found anywhere. They advertised that this land was just on top of a great underground reservoir of inexhaustible water, and at that time they only had to go 15 feet into the ground to find that precious water. What has happened? We zig-zagged across that valley from Bakersfield, on north from one mountain to the other, and there we saw the failing of water. We saw what were once prosperous orchards, prosperous vineyards going back to desert. We learned that that 15-foot water level had gone down to 200 feet, where it was too expensive for them to pump to irrigate with. Land values disappeared. We found a great wide-awake governor of that State who had appointed a commission to study that problem of the precious water, and he appointed members of the legislature, engineers, and men who could think.

They have been thinking. And they have been spending money to find some way in which they might save that great fertile land, the once prosperous central portion of that great State. Irrigation is failing because the water is failing. Strange to relate, our scientific men who deal with those things could give us no information as to how long it would require for that underground supply of water to be replenished. When we talked with them on the ground, they told us that it may have been centuries, eons of ages ago when the water first began to come into that stratum, and they did not know how long it would take to replenish it.

In speaking to a Member from California recently I said, "How is your water supply? I understand you have had a lot of snow and a lot of rain." He said, "We have had a lot of snow and a lot of rain." I said, "How about the water table in central California?" He said, "It has not risen an inch." Scientific men can not give any information about things of this sort.

This is an interesting bill. There is so much to think about, there are so many activities that it can not all be covered in the length of time I have taken, and I fear I am tiring you, but perhaps as the bill goes along we may touch on these matters a little more fully.

I thank you for your splendid attention. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES], a member of the committee, such time as he may desire.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that it is getting late and there are several who wish to speak, I shall be as brief as possible. I shall proceed on the theory that all of the Representatives in Congress from oil-producing States or sections of the country are interested in getting relief for the independent oil industry; in other words, in saving, if possible, an industry that is at this time practically paralyzed.

In the last session of Congress the Representatives from such oil-producing States as Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and California worked harmoniously endeavoring to get the relief sought, and at no time were there any bitter, partisan speeches made. We were in hopes that the same course would be pursued at this session of Congress. So far there has been but little of this partisan spirit shown. Partisanship does not help the cause in the least.

There should be a unanimity of action on the part of all Representatives from these oil-producing States, and this regardless of party affiliations, in order to bring about the relief we are seeking for this industry. With such cooperation we may entertain hopes of success. Without it, we shall surely fail. If success does not crown our efforts it will then be time enough to make speeches of a partisan or critical nature in condemnation of the political party or the individuals held to blame for preventing this needed assistance to our oil industry.

Mr. Chairman, there have been several bills introduced by various Members of Congress providing for a tariff on foreign petroleum and refined petroleum products. It goes without saying that the Member introducing such a bill entertains a feeling of pride in his own proposed measure. I know that I do, and I am willing to concede the same to others. On the 19th day of January I introduced a bill, H. R. 8028, which is based upon the report of the Tariff Commission made recently, and which report shows conclusively the difference between the domestic and foreign costs of production of crude petroleum, fuel oil, gasoline, and lubricating oils, and further shows that an import duty upon the foregoing products is necessary in order to equalize the cost of production between such domestic articles and the same foreign articles. The bill introduced by me provides that rates of duty of \$1 per barrel shall be levied upon crude petroleum and fuel oil, and a duty upon gasoline, lubricating oils, and all other products of petroleum of 50 per cent ad valorem. Let me say that this bill was prepared and introduced after a careful study of the recent report of the Tariff Commission. I feel safe in saying that, in my opinion, the rates provided for in that bill are reasonable and justifiable.

On the same date and, for that matter, the same hour, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SANDERS], a member of the Ways and Means Committee, introduced a bill exactly the same as mine, except that his bill is based upon the report of the Tariff Commission made in 1930 as well as the report made recently.

In view of the fact that the Sanders bill would have the same effect as the bill proposed by me, namely, protection to the independent oil industry, and the further fact that this legislation must be considered by the Ways and Means Committee, it is far better to have a bill proposed by a member of that committee than one from a Member of Congress who is not a member of that committee. In other words, I am more interested in getting the desired relief and protection at an early date for the independent oil industry of this country than I am in being the author of any measure that might be passed to that end. So it is my intention to drop all consideration of my bill and do all within my power for the passage of the Sanders bill.

At the beginning I said that there should be a unanimity of thought and action on the part of all Representatives from the oil-producing States regardless of party or politics. Therefore, I am hoping that all Members who have intro-

duced bills providing for a tariff on foreign petroleum and its refined products will take the unselfish and logical view of the situation and forget their bills or the consideration of them, to the end that we can all concentrate our efforts on the Sanders bill. I am exceedingly anxious to do all within my power to revive one of the most important of American industries and one of the most essential industries of the Middle West. I am anxious to make possible the full-time employment of over a million workers who are at this time idle, many of them with their families depending upon charity. I am anxious to restore to the 22,000,000 people in the oil States of this Nation their old-time purchasing power.

Mr. Chairman, the representatives of the independent oil industry, though broke and on the verge of bankruptcy, with their industry prostrate and with obligations to meet, are not here asking their Government to grant them a moratorium costing the Government \$250,000,000. They have not come to Congress asking for a finance corporation to be financed by the Government to the extent of \$2,000,000,000. They are not asking for a penny to be taken from the United States Treasury to help them but are advocating legislation that would put millions into the Treasury. All they are asking is that they have the same chance as has been given to other industries of this Nation. It is a well-known fact that practically every industry of this Nation, except the independent oil industry, receives protection under the present tariff law.

It has been said by many members of the Ways and Means Committee that framed the present tariff law that no industry or business appearing before that committee during the hearings on that measure made a stronger or better case for a tariff than did the independent oil industry; but, notwithstanding that fact, for some reason or cause which no one to this date has been able to explain, this protection was denied to this great and essential industry. Therefore, it is up to this Congress to see that justice is done.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that there are some who claim that should Congress pass a measure giving protection to the oil industry the President would not approve it. In answer to that statement I want to say that the passage of an act to give protection to the oil industry of this country is the responsibility of Congress. It is our responsibility, and the question as to whether or not it will meet with the approval of the President is his responsibility, and no Member of Congress can escape his responsibility by offering as an excuse that the President will not approve any measure of protection to the oil industry if passed. I will go further and say that in my opinion the President will not veto such a measure. President Hoover has gone on record, as I shall show later, as advocating the creation of a Tariff Commission with power not only to investigate but to recommend. He was provided with such a Tariff Commission upon whose investigations and recommendations this proposed legislation is based. That commission has investigated, it has reported facts justifying a duty on foreign petroleum and its refined products. To say that a measure based upon that report and recommendation would be vetoed by the President would be nothing short of saying that he is willing to stultify himself. Let me say to those who make the claim that the President will veto such a measure, "Help us pass the Sanders bill, which is based solely upon the report and recommendations of the Tariff Commission and see what the President will do." If he should veto it, then will be the time for criticism, and not until then.

In view of what I have just said about the position taken by President Hoover regarding a Tariff Commission, it might be well to show just what the position of both parties has been on this question. First I am going to call on my Democratic friends to listen to what was said in the Democratic platform of 1916.

The Tariff Commission.

Two years of a war which has directly involved most of the chief industrial nations of the world and which has indirectly affected the life and industry of all nations are bringing about economic changes more varied and far-reaching than the world has ever

before experienced. In order to ascertain just what those changes may be, the Democratic Congress is providing for a nonpartisan Tariff Commission to make impartial and thorough study of every economic fact that may throw light either upon our past or upon our future fiscal policy with regard to the imposition of taxes on imports or with regard to the changed and changing conditions under which our trade is carried on. We cordially indorse this timely proposal and declare ourselves in sympathy with the principle and purpose of shaping legislation within that field in accordance with clearly established facts rather than in accordance with the demands of selfish interests or upon information provided largely, if not exclusively, by them.

It might be of interest to recite what President Wilson said in his speech of acceptance, September 2, 1916. He said:

The tariff has been revised not on the principle of repelling foreign trade but on the principle of encouraging it, upon something like a footing of equality with our own in respect of terms of competition, and a tariff board has been created whose function it will be to keep the relations of American with foreign business and industry under constant observation for the guidance alike of our business men and of Congress. American energies are now directed toward the markets of the world. * * *

The Tariff Commission ought to substitute facts for prejudices and theories. * * *

The Tariff Commission completes the machinery by which we shall be enabled to open up our legislative policy to the facts as they develop.

And again in his message to Congress, May 20, 1919, President Wilson called attention to means of properly protecting the United States trade when discriminated against by foreign nations and said that—

This subject has fortunately been exhaustively investigated by the United States Tariff Commission. A recent report of that commission has shown very clearly that we lack and that we ought to have the instruments necessary for the assurance of equal and equitable treatment. The attention of the Congress has been called to this matter on past occasions, and the past measures which are now recommended by the Tariff Commission are substantially the same that have been suggested by previous administrations. I recommend that this phase of the tariff question receive the early attention of the Congress.

Even as late as 1928 the Democratic platform provided that the—

Tariff * * *

(c) Abolition of logrolling and restoration of the Wilson conception of a fact-finding Tariff Commission, quasi judicial and free from the Executive domination which has destroyed the usefulness of the present commission.

(d) Duties that will permit effective competition, insure against monopoly, and at the same time produce a fair revenue for the support of government. Actual difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, with adequate safeguard for the wage of American laborers, must be the extreme measure of every tariff rate.

Now I want to call the attention of my Republican friends to the fact that in 1916 their platform provided:

We favor the creation of a tariff commission with complete power to gather and compile information for the use of Congress in all matters relating to the tariff.

President Hoover, in his message to Congress on April 15, 1929, had this to say:

That the Tariff Commission should be reorganized and placed upon a basis of higher salaries in order that we may at all times command men of broader attainments. Seven years of experience have proved the principle of flexible tariff to be practical, and in the long view a most important principle to maintain. However, the basis upon which the Tariff Commission makes its recommendations to the President for administrative changes in the rates of duty should be made automatic and more comprehensive, to the end that the time required for determination by the Tariff Commission shall be greatly shortened. The formula upon which the commission must now act often requires that years be consummated in reaching conclusions which should require only months. Its very purpose is defeated by delays. I believe a formula could be found that will insure rapid and accurate determination of needed changes in rates. With such strengthening of the Tariff Commission and of its basis for action many secondary changes in tariff can well be left to action by the commission, which at the same time will give complete security to industry for the future.

It would seem to me that Democratic and Republican Members of Congress could vote for a bill which is based upon the findings and recommendations of such a commission without in the least disqualifying themselves as members of their respective parties.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention at this time to go into detail and discuss the question as to what has resulted

to millions of people in these oil-producing States because of the paralyzed condition of this industry. I could stand here for hours and relate how thousands upon thousands of workmen who received good wages, in fact enough to provide properly for their families, are at this time dependent upon charity; how thousands of mercantile institutions have gone into bankruptcy for the lack of purchasers of their goods and wares, because these thousands of oil-field workers are no longer purchasers, their purchasing power having been completely destroyed; how many banks have had to close their doors and are now in the hands of receivers because those who were once safe customers and borrowers are now unable to meet their obligations. These customers are broke and all because their business has not had protection the same as other industries. This will all be detailed when this bill is reached for consideration.

Many times have I heard the remark that if a tariff measure were enacted putting a duty on oil such as we are asking, it would not protect the industry, nor would the industry be helped in the least. My answer is, give us a chance to try it the same as you have other industries. Besides at this time when Congress is called upon to produce revenue to help balance the Government Budget, and the Ways and Means Committee at this very moment is hearing from the various industries of this country why they should not be further taxed, why overlook a source of revenue which at the same time would give protection to a great American industry? I am in hopes that the committee will include in its revenue bill a provision that a tax be levied upon petroleum and fuel oil imported into this country of 2½ cents per gallon, which would be about \$1 per barrel; and upon gasoline, lubricating oils, and all other products of petroleum imported into this country a tax the equivalent of 50 per cent ad valorem, and thus collect anywhere from \$75,000,000 to \$118,000,000 revenue.

If the tariff on oil and its refined products would not stop its importation, as is claimed by some, then why not pass this bill to raise revenue? Reliable and correct statistics for 1930 show that there were imported into this country 62,129,419 barrels of crude oil. Suppose that we had a duty of \$1 per barrel on that oil—it would have produced revenue to the extent of \$62,129,419. There were also imported into this country in 1930, 26,080,000 barrels of fuel oil. A duty of \$1 per barrel would have produced \$26,080,000. There were also imported into this country in 1930 petroleum refined products, such as distilled and topped oils, gasoline, kerosene, lubricating oils, and paraffin, in such quantities and of such value that if we had had a 50 per cent ad valorem duty on the same it would have produced a revenue of \$769,759, or, all told, \$118,271,277 would have been collected as duties or revenue on such importations. If the tariff should not cause a decrease in importations of petroleum and petroleum refined products, as claimed by some, then why not have the revenue that could be collected?

On the other hand, should a tariff cause a decrease in importations of oil, the increased value of domestic oil, coal, and allied industries will provide an equal amount of Federal revenue. Thus it can be seen that the Government will be the gainer in either event. The question is, Shall we continue a virtual subsidy of a few large importing oil companies and search everywhere to find a place to tax invested capital in our States?

The Internal Revenue Bureau can furnish some startling details as to the loss of income from various phases of the oil business, from the leases to the marketing of the oil. A search of those records will show that thousands of oil operators were among the big income-tax payers who to-day are not paying a penny of income tax; in fact, many of them can not even pay their local taxes on their holdings. The Federal Government is deprived of that revenue simply because of its neglect to protect this industry.

Yesterday I read in the Washington Post of that date a statement issued by the Revenue Department to the effect that the Federal Government collected \$1,018,911,438 less tax in the fiscal year 1931 than in 1930, and that the decrease

in the total return is to be found almost entirely in reduced income taxes, which alone fell off \$964,932,926.81, and that in the face of the fact that the tax rates were 1 per cent higher than in the previous collection year.

Knowing that many of my friends and acquaintances in the oil industry of Kansas who were large income-tax payers now pay no income tax, I thought it might be interesting and informative to find out just how much the revenue paid to the Federal Government had fallen off from the States of Kansas and Oklahoma. The figures furnished me by the Bureau of Internal Revenue show that in 1927 Kansas contributed to the Federal Government in revenue \$19,626,805.68; that this revenue decreases year by year, the last available report, which is for 1931, showing a revenue of only \$13,339,596.77, or a decrease of more than \$6,000,000 in the five years. The State of Oklahoma contributed revenue to the Federal Government in 1927 in the amount of \$23,266,879.35, which revenue decreased yearly, the last available report, which is for 1931, showing a revenue of only \$14,657,487.68, or a decrease in the five years of over \$8,000,000.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. I trust the gentleman will permit me to say that my State is very, very deeply interested in the legislation which the gentleman is discussing. This morning before the Ways and Means Committee of the House a discussion was made by Mr. Franklin, of Ardmore, Okla., which, in my judgment, is unanswerable, showing that there should be some legislation enacted here to meet the oil situation.

Mr. AYRES. I will say that I heard that statement from start to finish and I agree with every word the gentleman has said.

I feel confident in saying, and I think the gentleman from Oklahoma will agree with me, that the decrease in the amount of revenue from these two States to the Federal Government is largely due to the paralyzed condition of the oil industry in these States, as most of the large income-tax payers in these States were engaged in the oil industry. Is that not a fact?

Mr. HASTINGS. I will say that the oil industry, next to agriculture, is the chief industry of my State of Oklahoma.

Mr. AYRES. It is the same in the State of Kansas. It would seem that this alone would be sufficient to attract the attention of those who are calling upon Congress constantly to tax everybody and everything to get revenue.

In 1926 the United States produced 770,874,000 barrels of oil. This was not sufficient at that time to meet the demands. At that time our oil sold at \$2.26 per barrel. By 1929 the United States produced 1,007,323,000 barrels. This was slightly in excess of the needs of the United States, so it was necessary for the excess to be stored. By this time the imports had become a great factor in lowering prices, and the oil was reduced in price to about \$1.45 per barrel. At the present time the American fields are reduced under their normal amount of possible daily production, it is estimated, about 100 per cent. In other words, we could easily produce twice our present needs, but we are importing oil from other countries. In 1931 we produced approximately 850,000,000 barrels of oil and probably consumed about 100,000,000 barrels more than we produced, this 100,000,000 barrels being made up by imports chiefly from South American countries. This South American oil, amounting to about 10 per cent of the needs of the country, is the greatest factor in destroying the value of the products of the mid-continent territory.

It is difficult to convince some that with only 10 per cent of the oil we consume imported it would make a difference. Any manufacturer knows that if his competitors have an advantage of low-cost raw materials that he must also pay low prices or quit. Several other reasons may be given why it does. One I can offer at this time is psychology. This seems to be a period in which psychology has more to do with conditions than at any other period in the history of the world. We are told to cease talking depression; that it has a bad psychological effect. We are asked to say that everything is coming fine for psychological effect. When asked

a few days ago of what particular benefit the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would be members of our committee were informed that the psychological effect on business would be wonderful, and we are authorized to pay \$2,000,000,000 for it. When we asked the representative of the Treasury Department why it was necessary at this time to appropriate the entire \$500,000,000 to start this Finance Corporation, we were told that, while the entire amount would in all probability not be needed soon, it would have a wonderful psychological effect to appropriate the entire amount at this time. So along with many other reasons more tangible I might add that to pass this measure protecting this industry against unfair competition would have a wonderful psychological effect.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, as well as the opinion of thousands of men better informed on this subject than I am, I feel that if we should pass this measure, which will lift up and protect the now prostrate petroleum industry, which has in the past carried a burden of taxation unequalled by any comparable group, it will again produce revenue, as it did before, of which we are sadly in need. In view of our present financial condition as a Nation, facing at this time a deficit of billions of dollars and resorting to most any kind of a tax to raise revenue to meet this deficit, I can not understand why this Government will permit cheap foreign oil to be imported into this country duty free. No burden of production tax disturbs it. It escapes many of the levies which fall upon our American product and does not pay one cent into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. AYRES. I will be very glad to do so.

Mr. SNELL. I am very much interested in the statement of the gentleman's position with reference to a tariff on oil. As a protectionist of every article that needs protection in this country I am very much interested in oil, and I can see no reason why it should not have protection. The quicker it comes the better it will suit me.

Mr. AYRES. I am glad to hear the gentleman feels that way about it.

It has, in a measure, destroyed one of the greatest sources of revenue to many States of this Union, and has destroyed one of the greatest sources of revenue to the Federal Government, and yet Congress takes no action to prevent all of this. Provincialism and prejudice should no longer keep us from doing our duty by this, as well as other industries. So, as I said in the beginning, let us all unite in getting behind the Sanders bill and pass it, and thus do justice to this great industry. [Applause.]

Mr. FIESINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. Certainly.

Mr. FIESINGER. I do not know whether in his remarks the gentleman covered the number of barrels of oil that are imported into this country daily.

Mr. AYRES. I did, both as to crude oil and as to the finished product.

Mr. FIESINGER. Does not the gentleman think that a great deal of the prejudice against a tariff on oil comes from the fact that people think the benefit will go to the larger oil companies, whereas there are tens of thousands of farmers in this country who produce as little as 10 or a dozen barrels of oil a day and are producing that quantity at a loss?

Mr. AYRES. There is no question about that.

Mr. FIESINGER. So that a tariff on oil would benefit a great many farmers of this country.

Mr. AYRES. It certainly would, not only in that respect but by receipt of lease money and of the royalties received by a great many landowners.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Ludlow] such time as he may desire.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, the speech I shall try to make to-day will not be addressed to Democrats or Republicans, as such, or to politicians of any party, but to the trustees of the American people in Congress assembled.

It will be a feeble effort of one Representative of the people to make articulate a voice that is crying in the wilderness, a voice that rings out in myriad tones of despair the heart-aches of our beloved America; a voice in which but recently the dominant quality was patience and long-suffering but whose murmurs of yesterday that echoed in subdued tones around the homes and hearthstones of the people have swollen into rising cadences of disappointment and indignation that now beat against the throne of power at Washington—the voice of a nation in travail.

We who sit in these seats of honor and responsibility are the trustees of the American people. To us they come seeking relief from the woes that beset them in this black night of American history, and to us they have a right to come. On every one of us rests the duty to conduct himself in these trying times as a trustee and not as a mere partisan. The Representative or Senator who for sheer personal or political advantage would betray the interests of the people in times like these should be driven from the Halls of Congress and forced to eat the husks of repentance until he realizes the truth of Grover Cleveland's immortal saying that "a public office is a public trust." Justice, if she did her duty by him, would sear him with a flaming scar of shame.

Sitting in this Chamber, therefore, as trustees of the American people and as nothing else, let us take note of the state of the Union. At the head of our table is a statesman from the Lone Star State, who is as truly a man of the people as was Abraham Lincoln, a worthy successor in philosophy and in action of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. Like Jefferson, his heart beats in everlasting sympathy with the under dog and he fights exactly like Andrew Jackson. The trustees of the people are fortunate in having at the head of their table a man of his fearlessness and rugged honesty, an umpire in whose righteousness and resolute adherence to the public interest both sides of the Chamber have implicit confidence.

A CITIZEN'S JOB

Under the guiding ægis of a spirit of cooperation that is capable of rising far above the level of petty politics, banishing gross and selfish thoughts and merging all efforts into the common good, let us then as trustees seek to find the causes of present ills and apply the remedy. This is the spirit of our Speaker, JOHN N. GARNER—this is the goal to which he is leading us. To do this is not the task of Democrats or Republicans, but it is a citizen's job, and it is not exaggeration to say that it is the biggest citizen's job of our generation. To this supreme task let only men come who love their country above all things else, to give to it the best there is in them of inspiration and of effort, conscious of the limitations of finite vision and realizing that the evils from which the country is suffering are of such long standing and so deeply seated as almost to defy corrective measures.

I believe we are really approaching this high ideal of public service, when I see Members of the House, as so often I have witnessed them at this session, cast aside narrow partisanship and political sharp practice to the end that with combined forces and unity of effort this branch of Congress may fulfill its obligations to the country by doing the work the people expect it to do.

Never in my life was I prouder of the Democratic Party than I am to-day, and I am especially proud of it now because it has shown by the program that already has been put through this House of Representatives since December 7 and by the contemplated program for the remainder of the session that it is capable of being an instrumentality of service. [Applause.]

PROUD OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Under this far-seeing leadership, the House is doing a big job in a big way and is vindicating the truth of the saying that "He serves his party best who serves his country best." Carping criticism has been noticeably absent. There has been no tendency to reject worthy measures just because those measures originate at the other end of the avenue. On the contrary, the Democratic House has cooperated with

the Republican President unreservedly and sincerely on paramount measures of public interest, as for instance the moratorium and the rehabilitation program. It does not lie in the mouth of anyone to charge that the House has played politics, because everybody knows such a charge would be false and would fall of its own weight. The people appreciate the record of constructive achievement that is being made by the House. It is a subject of comment in the editorial columns of the leading newspapers and of private discussion everywhere. Let no one doubt that because of the splendid record made at this session the House is in higher esteem throughout the country to-day than it has been for many a year.

CHAIRMAN BYRNS A REAL LEADER

At the head of our great Committee on Appropriations in this critical period when conservation of our national finances is so vitally necessary is a man who is doing a noble and effective part in promoting this program of cooperation in the public interest. Chairman BYRNS is proving himself to be truly a servant of the people in all the term implies. [Applause.] He dwells on the heights and never descends to the depths, and by precept and example he lifts others up to his plane of thought and action. And "off the record," I want to tell the House that I am proud of the Republican members of that committee, because as a rule they are sincere and helpful in working with the chairman to hold down the appropriations. The effectiveness with which this is being done is demonstrated by the fact that appropriation bills are coming out of the committee with great cuts below the Budget estimates. The deficiency bill was slashed \$13,443,900, the agricultural bill \$10,799,591, and the Interior Department appropriation bill \$6,273,920 below the Budget; and this is only a foretaste of what will be done to other appropriation bills.

I was assigned to a place at the appropriations-subcommittee table between two great political warriors, with Chairman BYRNS, of the Democratic National Congressional Committee at my right, and Chairman WOOD, of the Republican National Congressional Committee, at my left. "This is a perilous situation for an innocent bystander," was my first thought, but weeks have passed without any polemics and with only the finest spirit of friendly cooperation, and I now know I have nothing to fear. It has been a real inspiration to me to see these two leaders, one of my party and the other of the opposition, working shoulder to shoulder in perfect harmony to reduce the expenditures of the Government. [Applause.] The example they set, while striking, is not exceptional. So splendidly are the two sides of this Chamber fused in this period of distress that I like to think the time is near when we will bridge over this chasm called the "center aisle" and mingle and work together, not as politicians but as Americans, consecrated in a common cause—the welfare of the people. [Applause.]

CROSS SECTION OF DISTRESS

As trustees of the American people let us face courageously the horrifying picture of present conditions, investigate causes, and, in so far as constructive achievement is yet possible to men and women of honest purpose, let us seek to chart the way to brighter and happier days. These are appalling times. The office of every Member of this body is a cross section of the distress of his community. Every day we hear stories of suffering that touch the heartstrings and defy the descriptive powers of a Dickens or a Victor Hugo. To us are extended a thousand hands for help.

Into our ears are poured the woes of numberless people who are on the jagged edge of desperation, of upright and willing men who have hopelessly tramped the streets until life seems too bitter to endure; men who are cruelly denied what should be every American's fundamental right—the right to earn a living for himself and his loved ones by honest toil. We hear the plaintive pleas of women whose hands have never been soiled by toil but who in their extremity would gladly add to the vanishing family income by doing the chores of a charwoman, if even that humble work could be secured. We hear time after time of good people losing their homes, their most precious possession, where they

spent their happy honeymoons, where the children were born, and where, perchance, death came to bind with tighter ties the solemn covenant they assumed at the marriage altar, and the phrase "God bless our home," once so sacred to father and mother and little tots, has been changed to "God bless the home that once was ours." We know that in this land six or seven million men can not get any kind of employment, try as hard as they will, which means that 25,000,000 people, or one-fifth of our entire population, are without the incomes to sustain life. We know that countless thousands of our boys and girls, our precious jewels, are without clothing to enable them to make a respectable appearance at school. We know that millions of our citizens are hungry and millions more are undernourished; that untold numbers are without fuel, and we shudder when we think of the suffering they would have to endure if it were not for the goodness of the infinite God in tempering the weather to the shorn lamb.

These conditions ought not to be. If men had always been wise, clear visioned, unselfish, and guided by the spirit of Christianity, these conditions would not be. In this vaunted land of opportunity, blessed with nature's gifts in greatest redundancy, a veritable land of milk and honey, there is no real reason why anybody should go hungry. There is no real reason why anyone should feel the grinding heel of poverty. The fact that people are hungry, that they are poverty stricken, is symptomatic of something wrong in government. It is evidence that our statesmanship is not functioning as it should.

As trustees of the American people we would serve humanity well in our day and generation if we would lay the foundations to bring our country into closer harmony with divine law and with the precepts of the founding fathers of this Nation. At the very start of our investigation of the people's burdens we find that war's impress is on nearly three-fourths of our appropriations by volume. To be exact over 71 per cent of the heavy tax load resting upon our country, nearly 72 cents out of every dollar raised by Federal taxation, goes to pay for war and the effects of war. Of total Budget estimates amounting to \$3,824,062,695.22 for the fiscal year 1933, exclusive of the Postal Service which is largely self-sustaining, the stupendous sum of \$2,834,240,041, or 71.88 per cent, is the result of war. When we analyze causes of present conditions, we find that undoubtedly a large part of the present depression is due to the backwash of the World War and to the burden of taxation it fastened on mankind. The statesmanship of the world fell down lamentably when it failed to prevent that world conflict. The statesmanship of America as it faces the future can go far to correct that tragic breakdown if it will seek with high ideals and under the guidance that gleams from the pages of Holy Writ to lead the world into ways of enduring peace.

GREATER THAN ANY CÆSAR

But it is not my purpose, my fellow trustees, to dwell upon what might have been. The World War is past. Thirteen times the poppies have bloomed in Flanders Field since the recording angel dipped his pen in tears and wrote "Finis" at the end of the saddest chapter in the history of the world. In Rome sleeps the unknown soldier of Italy, a symbol of the nation's sacrifice greater in death than any Cæsar. In Paris sleeps the unknown soldier of France, a greater attraction in his last resting place than the magnificent sarcophagus where lies the body of the old Napoleon by the Seine, which he loved so well. In London sleeps the body of Britain's unknown soldier in the shadow of the towering parliament building that houses the representatives of the commons, from whose loins he no doubt sprang, though in death he is infinitely greater than any king that lies in nearby Westminster Abbey. In yonder Arlington sleeps America's unknown soldier where every day a fresh wreath, and often many wreaths a day bear testimony to a Nation's undying love and gratitude. The message from these sacred tombs is silent, yet it is more eloquent and impressive than any speech ever uttered by human lips and what it says is:

These things must never be again!

The sacrifices of the unknown soldiers and the millions of heroic dead whom they symbolize to the imagination of the world will be in vain unless we learn and profit by the lessons that have come to us out of the crucible of war, chief among which is that the corner stone on which a nation's security rests is its moral strength and its sense of justice and fair dealing among men. A Navy adequate to defend our shores and our commerce and an efficient Army nucleus capable of expansion to meet exigent needs are necessary and dictated by prudence, as the world is still the world and not the Utopia of our dreams:

When man to man united
And every wrong thing righted,
The whole world shall be lighted
As Eden was of old.

SHOULD BUILD UP MORAL BULWARKS

But while heaven remains far off where it can not be glimpsed by the toiling, moiling millions of the earth, the trustees of this Nation should not be deceived by the illusory notion that protection lies in bristling armaments. That notion was shot to death on every battlefield of Europe. For 40 years Germany prepared for war, and when she plunged into the conflict 17 years ago her military forces had attained the last finishing touches of perfection. Where is she to-day? Her erstwhile ruler, the supreme strategist of yesterday, is an exile, doomed never again to set foot on his native soil. Two million of her heroic dead, the flower of German manhood, sleep under the sod of the fatherland, and her leaders are pleading on bended knees for a moratorium of war debts to save Germany, formerly one of the most stable of governments, from utter collapse. Ought not that to be a lesson to the trustees of the American people?

To our veterans who came home with shattered minds and broken bodies, to the widows in distress, and the orphans of our soldiers we can not be too mindful or too generous, and we may as well be reconciled to the fact that on and on throughout the years to come, beyond the time when every person now living has gone to his reward, the expenditures for war and the effects of war will comprise the bulk of our appropriations. It will be 10 or 15 years before the peak of World War hospitalization will be reached. But while we know this burden will be a continuing one, let us hope that the trustees of this Nation may render a service of inestimable value to a world in turmoil by seeking every way to establish permanent peace on earth in harmony with the spirit of the Master. For the people all around the world are inexpressibly weary of war. They are weary of its heartaches, of its unspeakable terrors, weary of the pain it puts in the hearts of mothers, and they are craving the leadership into brighter paths which only America is capable of giving to the world. Let us build up our moral bulwarks and cultivate friendship among nations. That is sound sense and sound patriotism.

A COMMISSION TO END COMMISSIONS

My main purpose in asking the indulgence of the House to-day, however, is to present for your consideration the merits of a measure I have introduced to assist in clearing the way for better times, and which I might almost dare to hope the trustees of the American people would adopt by unanimous consent. It is House Joint Resolution 146, a resolution for the creation of a nonsalaried commission of 9 members, 3 to be chosen by the Speaker, 3 by the Presiding Officer of the Senate, and 3 by the President of the United States, to investigate the centralization of government and overlapping of bureaus, and to report back to Congress what steps, if any, should be taken to effect governmental economies, to check the centralization of power in Washington, to restore local self-government in so far as it may be done, and to redirect the course of government along lines charted by the founding fathers. There is nothing political about this resolution. It is a citizen's resolution and it is placed before you as trustees in the hope that you may find it to be a wise and salutary measure to adopt at this time. It is intended to furnish the governmental machinery whereby an investigation may be made by a small group representing the most competent brains that can be drafted to study governmental overlappings, extrav-

agances, and bureaucratic tendencies, and to report remedial measures to the only authority that has the power to correct these abuses—the Congress of the United States. It was Mark Twain who sapiently remarked that "everybody complains about the weather but nobody ever does anything about it." For a quarter of a century, and recently in increased volume and insistency, we have heard complaints about the concentration of power in a Federal bureaucracy which has been taking unto itself the powers rightfully belonging to States and local units, but nobody has ever done very much about it. I believe the resolution I have introduced is a much-needed step in the right direction; that its adoption would bring men down from the miasmatic clouds of paternalism and start them with their feet on the ground to thinking along practical and sensible lines, and that out of the undertaking, quite as much from the popular attention that would be directed to the subject as from the specific recommendations that would be made by the proposed commission, there would be a revival of interest in local self-government and in the reduction of Government expenses that could not be otherwise than wholesome and beneficial.

We have in Washington the great departments of Government through which all of the executive functions would be transacted under the scheme of the fathers, but while these are 10 in number we also have more than 40 commissions, boards, and independent establishments that have reached out in all directions and usurped governmental functions.

A MENACE TO FREEDOM

I do not think I need try to prove that centralization has already gone so far in this country that it constitutes a menace to freedom. It is not necessary here to rehearse the many expansions of bureaucratic power or to recall the multiplicity of commissions or how the independent establishments have increased until they now outnumber the Cabinet portfolios four to one.

There is a story going the rounds which well illustrates the preponderance of these extraconstitutional agencies in government. According to this story a man afflicted with amnesia was found by a policeman wandering in the streets of Washington. Cases of amnesia are not so rare as to be considered phenomenal, but this man was an extraordinary specimen because when he was interrogated he could not, for the life of him, remember his name, his address, or the commission he belonged to!

The cost of Government resulting from this multiplication of offices and centralization of authority has soared from \$1,000,000,000 per annum 20 years ago to \$5,000,000,000 in this fiscal year 1932. To put it in another way peace-time appropriations have shot upward from \$11 per capita in 1911 to \$38 per capita now. Taxpaying has become our great national industry. The question of taxation is to-day the all-burning question, both nationally and in State, county, town, and city. Do not think it is not. With it is a growing resentment of governmental intrusion into the rights of individuals and local communities, a bureaucratic expansion that has foisted an army of Government employees upon the country until to-day it is estimated that every 11 people have on their backs 1 man or woman on a public pay roll.

With the necessity of raising more and still more revenues to meet yawning deficits the wise men of our congressional board of trustees are cudgeling their brains to invent new methods of taxation that will squeeze more money from a people already bled white.

Somehow I can not escape the belief that we are tackling the problem of Government finance from the wrong end. While I know that some emergent taxation measures are necessary to meet emergent conditions, I believe our congressional trustees will do well if they will consider the abolishment or minimizing of tax-eating bureaus and the elimination of overlapping and waste, to the end that Government may be simplified and costs reduced, instead of racking their brains to devise ingenious new schemes of levying taxes.

DUPLICATION OF INSPECTION SERVICE

I shall not attempt in the brief hour assigned to me on to-day's program to go deeply into governmental extravagance under the wasteful bureaucratic system, but I would like to cite just a few vivid examples that have recently come under my observation as a working Member of this House. I might mention almost innumerable others if time would permit. Along 3,000 miles of border there is an overlapping of the customs-inspection service and immigration inspection, two sets of officers doing what one set could easily and efficiently accomplish. Let us consider a typical case. An American who has been in Mexico arrives at a port of entry on his return trip. A customs official steps up, hails him, and asks him some questions about his baggage. Then an immigration inspector steps forward and asks him where he lives, and when he replies that he lives in Cleveland or Indianapolis and satisfies the immigration inspector on that point, he is permitted to pass on. Now, the question arises, Why should not the same official ask the traveler both questions—the question about his baggage and the question about his residence? Yet we do the perfectly silly and indefensible thing of maintaining two sets of officers all along our far-flung border lines, one set to inquire about his baggage and the other about residence, when by having one officer perform both duties we could save a million dollars a year. That is just one instance of overlapping.

We issue permits to 48 industrial alcohol plants to manufacture alcohol. At each plant the Government maintains a force of employees whose total salaries amount to \$7,075 a year. The wildest imagination would not suggest that more than 10 of these plants, distributed throughout the country, are necessary to furnish all of the alcohol required for public use. Simply by withholding permits from 38 plants the Government could save \$268,850 per annum. Surveyors of customs also are "excess baggage" in the governmental scheme and could well be abolished, at a saving of \$75,000 more per annum.

WASTE IN PUBLIC PRINTING

The waste in public printing is a striking evidence of the necessity of an overhauling of our governmental system. I wish the trustees of the American people and the distinguished Texan who presides at the head of our table would take time to survey the monumental piles of obsolete, useless, and worthless documents that are accumulated in the basement of this Capitol and in the basement of the House Office Building. I fear your heavy tasks will not permit you to make this survey, so I have brought here a photograph of the accumulated volumes, which I am sure will interest you and perhaps will amaze you. If my friend, Representative JOHN BOYLAN, had succeeded in his efforts to make the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a pictorial publication I would have sought permission of the House to embalm this picture in its venerable pages along with the cow which once broke into the RECORD and which up to now bears the distinction of being the only illustration that ever graced its sacrosanct columns. Though barred from the RECORD, this picture is available to all who desire to get a thrill.

In this mountain of books there are now a million volumes that await the junkman. Without any offense being intended to anyone, it might not be inappropriate to name this heap of books "Mount Folly." Fully 50 per cent of the volumes are cloth bound. In 1911 a similar accumulation of a million volumes was destroyed or virtually given away to junkmen and the enormous stocks now on hand represent accretions since that year.

Under the time-honored method of distribution whenever the Government issues a book on "The Malformations of the Doodle Bug" all Members of the House are assigned exactly the same number of copies of the valuable work, though some may live in districts that never heard of a doodle bug. Those Members never draw their doodle-bug books out of storage and the unused volumes gather dust and stain in the Capitol basement and finally go to swell the intake of the junkman. The basement space is clogged with annual reports of heads of the Government depart-

ments which are valueless as a last year's bird's nest. Experience has shown that only about one-fourth of the total number of copies of an annual report are ever put in circulation. The remaining 75 per cent are dead for all time.

Take the Agricultural Yearbook, for further illustration. Every Member of Congress is allotted 677 copies of that precious volume, valued at \$1.50 per copy on the Government Printing Office sales list. The Tammany Member, in the heart of New York City, where a spear of grass is never seen, unless it is imported, gets exactly the same number of copies as the Member from the western range. There are approximately 200 Members of Congress from cities, who have no rural constituents. They are allotted annually 135,400 of these books, rated as worth \$203,100. Most of these volumes find their way to the junk pile. The actual cost of producing an Agricultural Yearbook is about 75 cents. Sold as waste paper it brings 2 or 3 cents.

WHERE SENTIMENT GOES AWRY

Another instance of extravagance that comes right to the doorstep of Members of Congress is the publication in beautiful memorial volumes of the addresses made in this Hall and the Senate Chamber in memory of departed Representatives and Senators. These addresses are all printed in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which would seem to be about all that could reasonably be asked in the way of recognition of the departed, but the custom has grown up of having the addresses collated and republished in book form for gratuitous distribution. In the Seventy-first Congress the amount spent for these unnecessary volumes was \$64,478.74. Deaths in the present Congress up to this date will add over \$30,000 to that amount. Under the pro rata plan of distribution many of the memorial volumes are never called for and go to swell the mountain of obsolete books in the Capitol basement. Sold as waste paper these books bring almost nothing. It is estimated that the waste in Government printing is, at the minimum, \$200,000 per year, and as the existing method of distribution has been in vogue 36 years the total estimated waste is \$7,200,000, which happens to be exactly the price the United States paid for Alaska.

What, in Heaven's name, do the trustees of the American people think of that? If the trustee of a business establishment needed a dozen blotters for his office, would he expect to be allotted enough to paper all four walls of his room? Or if he needed a stove for his office, would the company send him 4 new stoves, 1 for his use and 3 to be broken up as junk? Who can imagine any business concern doing such a crazy thing as that? The solution is in allowing each Member a certain fixed credit which he can draw upon for such documents as fill his particular requirements, and when that is done these mountainous accumulations of books that cost a lot to produce, and bring nothing as junk, will cease.

HONEYCOMBED WITH EXTRAVAGANCE

The Government is honeycombed with such extravagances, overlappings, and abuses as these, and I might go on citing similar instances for hours, but I hope I have brought forth enough evidence to show that an investigating body such as I propose can render a real service of the greatest constructive value in looking into matters of this nature in all branches of the Government and in carrying out with free and open minds the functions specified in my resolution as follows:

The duty of said commission shall be to make a study of government in all of its aspects and to report to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate not later than the opening of the regular session of Congress in December, 1933, (1) such recommendations as may seem to it advisable in regard to a reorganization of the administrative branch of the Government to eliminate duplications and to secure greater efficiency, economy, and dispatch in transacting the public business; (2) whether in its opinion the Government has departed from the concept of the founding fathers who wrote the Constitution of the United States; and, if so, in what direction or directions; (3) what steps, if any, should be taken to counteract centralization, to restore the Government to its original purposes and sphere of activity as contemplated by the forefathers, whose lives and sacrifices established a free and independent Nation, and to make secure to all coming generations the inestimable benefits and blessings of local self-government.

If I were alone in my view that the creation of this commission would be a wise and salutary action, I would indeed

despair. What I think about centralization and bureaucratic domination and extravagance is of little consequence, but the views of great men who have sent to me their indorsements since the first introduction of my resolution in the last Congress are of consequence.

In presenting my case I bring to you to-day as witnesses many of the mightiest spirits that have trod the soil of America in our generation. I am flanked with earnest supporters. I bring to you and hold in my hand the approving testimony of many of the best minds in this Republic. I bring as witnesses 17 governors and 8 ex-governors of States who have seen their State sovereignties sapped and weakened and all but emasculated through the onrush of Federal centralization, and they come here with me to protest. I bring as witnesses 17 supreme judges of States who are genuinely alarmed over the destruction of local government by Federal usurpation, and who come here with me to make their protest vocal. I bring as witnesses great inventors, great lawyers, great university presidents, great statesmen, great authors and diplomats, great political leaders of both parties who have written to me in defense of the rights of the States and in support of my resolution. I bring to you the approval of the chairman and secretary of the United States Civil Service Commission, who are always interested in good government. I bring to you editorials from many newspapers of high standing and character, published all the way from the Atlantic to the Pacific, commending my resolution to your favorable consideration. These letters furnish a great body of intelligent and informed public opinion, comprising a symposium of extraordinary force and persuasion that is worthy of consideration by Congress.

THOMAS A. EDISON INDORSED RESOLUTION

No one will contend that Thomas A. Edison, whose genius did so much to unlock the secrets of the universe, was lacking in vision: Mr. Edison indorsed this resolution. He thought it was in the interest of the welfare of the country that it should pass and that the study which it provides for should be made. His views were expressed in a letter from his secretary, William H. Meadowcroft, which was as follows:

ORANGE, N. J., February 14, 1930.

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter of January 17 and its inclosure were forwarded to Mr. Edison, who is at the present time in Florida. He requests me to say in his behalf that he is very much in favor of the resolution creating a commission on centralization, which you have introduced in the House of Representatives, and hopes that it will be passed. Mr. Edison further desires me to say that in his opinion we need information on this subject and it will be worth far more than it will cost.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM H. MEADOWCROFT,
Assistant to Mr. Edison.

I do not have time to read to you the text of approving messages that have come to me from leading lawyers, publicists, supreme court justices, governors of States, and men of eminence in every walk of life which in printed form would fill a book. Since I reintroduced the resolution on December 17 last I have received letters of cordial indorsement from 55 township trustees in Indiana. I am heartened by their approval, because these officials represent in a very marked way the last remaining vestige of local self-government.

I appeal to you, my fellow Members, as patriots and as trustees of the American people, to adopt the resolution creating this nonsalaried investigating body. I have faith to believe it will lead to worth-while results in eliminating waste, extravagance, and overlapping and in turning the minds of men back to the fundamental principles of the fathers which are still the hope and refuge of America. Under no conceivable circumstances can this investigation do any harm. It will cost nothing except a mere bagatelle for clerk hire. Just as no political party is solely responsible for the supergrowth of bureaucracy, so by the adoption of this resolution there would be no political advantage in tackling the evil which this instrumentality is intended to reach.

Indeed, if there were any political advantage at all in the set-up provided for in the resolution, it would accrue not to the party to which I belong but to the opposition, as President Hoover and Vice President Curtis would appoint six members of the commission to three appointments by Speaker GARNER, but I do not harbor the slightest apprehension that the President and the Vice President would allow politics to enter into their selections for this important task. I know they are far too patriotic for that. In fact, the provision in the resolution relating to an investigation of the overlappings of Government service was inserted at the suggestion of the President.

AN APPEAL TO BOTH SIDES OF THE CHAMBER

I appeal for the assistance of our leading Democrats, to the effulgent star from the Lone Star State, to the able spokesman on our side, the gentleman from Illinois; to the great Virginians, Mr. TUCKER and Mr. MONTAGUE, whom I am prone to think of as having imbibed wisdom at the feet of Thomas Jefferson, and I cross the center aisle and plead for the continued support of a great Republican, my friend from Indiana, WILL R. WOOD, who when I first introduced this resolution wrote to me:

I wish to say that I am in hearty sympathy with your scheme and will be very glad, indeed, to do anything that I can to help it along. If something is not done soon, the form of government proposed by the fathers and provided for under our Constitution will be a thing of the past; and we should bestir ourselves to relieve the canker that is now sucking the life out of our body politic—the bureau and the commission.

And I plead to all Members on both sides of the aisle to pass this resolution, calling to your attention that the platforms of both political parties have repeatedly declared for economy in Government and reduction of taxes and that here is a fine opportunity to show that a platform that is good enough to run on during a campaign is good enough to stand on after election. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, Hoover is writing a favored-commodity clause in the remnant of American economics. Like all converts, he is trumping the old reliables. He is so American he makes Big Bill Thompson look like a little stranger. So American has he become that it is almost painful. He follows Nordic immigration laws with a Verdun tariff and now sponsors a "Buy Only American" crusade. But his new nationalism is still tolerant of foreign liquor.

Scotch whisky has an import preference. Irish whisky still makes America safe for democracy. French wines are given the keys of the country, if Mabel Willebrandt is not looking. Gold must not leave the country unless it buys foreign liquor.

The American farmer can not sell his barley, hops, corn, rye, or rice to an American brewer or distiller unless he wants to reap bitter tears in the "big house." An American truckman can not convey American beer unless he wants to unhitch his horses in the jail yard. An American bottler can not pour an American distillation into an American bottle unless he wants to be bottled up in Atlanta.

An American soldier can not get an American bonus because, while he was saving Europe for American bankers to take, Bishop Cannon took away American taxes. While the soldier was fighting to keep democracy alive, democracy turned sour at home. An American workman can not get an American drink because the Anti-Saloon League was busy closing all the jails, poor houses, and insane asylums, so that the country could build mammoth plants for the same purposes.

An American can get a French, German, or British jag on; but he must not even get a microscopic American edge on. He can be un-American high or American low. American officials can attend exotically wet functions in foreign embassies, but the man on the street can not step from the street to buy a glass of beer. What is nectar for the goose is noxious for the gander.

An American can be swindled out of his hard-earned savings by foreign bonds approved by the State Department,

but he can not invest his money in an American brewery, where he can watch American grain from an American farm go in one door and come out another in barrels, to come back as checks to American brewers and farmers. The State Department helps to cheat Americans to support foreign governments and liquor interests, but an American can not, no matter how much he wants to, pay an American tax into an American Treasury to support an American Government.

An American citizen can see his regular Navy play second fiddle to the dry navy, and can build up foreign navies by moratoriums, and their ill-begotten child cancellation, but he can not help support American defenses by chipping in to a billion in revenue by excise taxes on American beverages. An American Federal employee must suffer a wage cut so that we can still tinker with the noble experiment with an ignoble experience. An American citizen must see his taxes reach a new high so that the drys can whine to the deaf skies "Hallelujah."

An American President in an economic trance will not take the short and happy cut to prosperity called modification lane. There are none so blind. Instead, Hoover would plunge more deeply into the economic morass by wage cuts, moratoriums, and excessive taxes. The old superman is in the soup. Uncle Sam is on the bread line, and now Hoover wants to take his clothes—and he can not find a barrel to shelter the bones of the once sleek old gentleman.

The dry leader is looking on a dying country. It has been sick ever since the dry pip was high-pressured into its Constitution. All it needs is a little stimulant, an economic snifter. Let us dismiss the dry undertaker and send for Doctor Barleycorn.

If, as, and when we get in this House a vote on prohibition, the scene will be replete with the higher or lower hypocrisy. The Republican drys will hope that the Republican wets will outnumber the Democratic wets, and the Democratic drys will "root" for their aquatic champions. The wets of both parties will hold the arena, and their respective drys will be in their respective cheering sections in the bleachers. There will be only one rule—"No bottles can be thrown by the bleachers." The rule is unnecessary—the bottles are all refillables. A quaking prayer will be offered in the White House that the Becks beat the Linthiums. In fact, Hoover is willing to bet on the Becks. He will wager a nice new report of the commission to investigate the social status of the boll weevil and ticks against a Wickersham report on the Hottentot subway system, in which the members severally report it is not "so hot" and jointly report "it is too damn hot."

Both the Republican wet team and the Democratic will require substitutes, so some of you boys better get off the old ivy-clad fence and start training to earn your letter "W," which will entitle you to a certificate of election this year. The voters have prepared a sign for the next Congress—"No straddlers allowed."

Some old familiar faces have left these pleasant pay-roll scenes, for they were more true to the Anti-Saloon League than they were to themselves. Do not join the mournful number. It is better to confess you were dry and wrong than to be an ex. You will not have to confess that—you will look it. Dry lame ducks will have no place to go in this era of economic aridity. Hoover will be too busy considering a commission about the future of Hoover to worry about the dry martyrs who called him chief. No longer can you depend on the desiccated superman—it took a superman to wreck America. In short time he will be chanting to the monotonous beat of the dead march that once joyous song, "California, here I come, right back where I started from." [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to remind the chief

justice, Mr. BLACK, of New York, that the vote on the Bingham beer bill was 55 to 15. And when it comes to a show-down in this House the vote against beer will be about in the same proportion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I rise to advance a thought or two to the members of this committee and to the Members of the House relating to the deficit in our Public Treasury, which in a great way is stopping the progress of the machinery of this Government.

As chairman of the Committee on Immigration I have had occasion to go through certain hearings pertaining to aliens who have entered the United States. I am referring particularly to the movie stars who are imported by the big film companies in Hollywood. I am informed that there are as many as 100 or more who have in the last 10 years taken from the public of the United States millions of dollars, and they have not been taxed any more than an American citizen. Their surtax was 20 per cent, as well as our own.

I do not see any reason why a 65 per cent surtax should not be imposed upon all of those aliens who come here for the sole purpose of making money, take it right back with them or sending it away, without even a nickel having a chance to come back here. That also goes for all prize-fighters and all other foreign professionals who for the last 10 years have taken away millions of dollars. [Applause.]

You take Charlie Chaplin. We all had a good laugh, it is true, but that man is not a citizen of the United States. He does not want to be a citizen of the United States, as you will find is true of hundreds of people of that kind who are brought here for amusement purposes, and who have, as I say, taken away millions of our money. We are just letting that money slip out of this country.

You could not as an American go to Great Britain or France and take one dollar away. As a matter of fact, they would not let you perform. An American actor or an American star can not even attempt to go into those countries, let alone try to seek employment and take anything out of those countries.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. Simmons University, of Abilene, Tex., has one of the finest cowboy bands in the world. It came to Washington to attend President Hoover's inauguration, and it went to Europe last summer, accompanied by many prominent men. While they were on the ocean, with passports to Paris and London, it had not yet been determined whether they could land either in France or England, because objections had been raised, because of the rules there.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is true.

Mr. BLANTON. And it took special effort on the part of the State Department to get all of those obstacles out of the way so that this cowboy band could land there and tour Europe.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. As a matter of fact, no American is permitted to go to these foreign countries for the purpose of performing, whether it be on the dramatic stage or as a movie actor. On the other hand, hundreds of these aliens come here and sing both in the Chicago Opera Co. and in the Metropolitan Opera Co., and outside of their music this country receives no benefit from the thousands of dollars that is taken away and put in foreign investments. Then one Max Schmeling is going to come to this country and take away \$1,000,000, and he is paying no more than you and I, who are spending our money in this country.

We are giving our neighbors a chance to live. I say the present arrangement is entirely unfair. For one, I hope when the time comes to offer such an amendment unless the committee itself sees fit to put it in the bill.

I could go on and recite a half dozen instances to illustrate how unfair the other countries have been to us and how fair we have been to them; as a matter of fact, we have been entirely too fair. Between the movie stars taking

money out of this country and the prize fighters taking money out of the country and our heiresses going over there and marrying these foreign dukes and counts I am surprised we have any money left in the Treasury at all. [Laughter.]

I am generally opposed to the sales tax, which deals with pennies and would affect the masses of poor people of this country while we overlook revenue from incomes that should rightfully be taxed. We should find some solution to wipe out our deficit by taxation on those who can well afford to pay and who would not be hurt in the raising of this revenue which is most vital to the country at this time. May I review before your body the history of taxation since the Wilson administration?

HISTORICAL

Our first income-tax law, passed in the Wilson administration pursuant to authority conferred by the sixteenth amendment, was purely a revenue measure designed to reinforce the Treasury on account of the anticipated drop in revenues due to the lowering of the customs tariff. It therefore imposed comparatively low rates, being 2 per cent over the minimum of \$3,000 for single persons and \$4,000 for married persons. The law made no distinction between citizens and aliens.

There was also a surtax under the original law applicable to incomes over \$40,000, and also making no distinction as between citizens and aliens. The surtax provisions imposed a graduated scale from a minimum of 1 per cent on incomes of \$40,000 to a maximum of 13 per cent on incomes up to \$3,000,000.

The war revenue act of 1917 imposed, in addition to the original tax as fixed in 1913, an additional tax of 2 per cent, making a total of 4 per cent as the rate of the normal income tax. It is significant, however, that this additional income tax did not apply to nonresident aliens, who continued to be taxed at the old rate of 2 per cent. The 1917 act, therefore, imposed a higher normal tax on citizens than on aliens.

On September 8, 1916, Congress passed an act increasing surtax rates equally against citizens and aliens. The increase in surtax rates was from the former rates to 1 to 50 per cent, and beginning with incomes of \$7,500. Incomes of a million dollars and more were made taxable at 55 per cent in addition to the normal tax of 4 per cent, and the highest surtax was 63 per cent on incomes of over \$2,000,000.

The acts of 1916 and 1917 were in force until amended in 1918, when the normal tax was increased to 8 per cent beginning with incomes of \$8,000 (the lower incomes being left at 4 per cent), and a surtax was imposed beginning with incomes of \$6,000, the highest surtax rate being fixed at 65 per cent on incomes of over \$1,000,000. No distinction was made in taxes payable by citizens or aliens.

The 1918 rates were the highest individual income tax rates in our history, and the 65 per cent surtax rate the highest surtax rate ever imposed by our Government.

From 1918 on, the rates begin to be lowered. The act of November 23, 1921, makes no change in the normal income tax, which continues at 8 per cent and 4 per cent up to an income of \$6,000, but the surtax is reduced to from 1 per cent to a maximum of 50 per cent, the lowest rate being imposed on incomes beginning with \$6,000 and the highest rate being chargeable on incomes exceeding \$200,000. Again no distinction is made in the rate of tax payable by citizen or alien.

The act of 1924, signed by President Coolidge on June 2 of that year, reduced the rates of the normal tax to 6 per cent, the first \$10,500 being reduced to 4 per cent, and the maximum surtax was placed at 40 per cent; this maximum rate being placed on incomes of over \$500,000. The same rate is payable by citizens and aliens. Incomes below \$5,000, if earned, were made to pay the still lower rate of 2 per cent.

The act of 1924, however, makes the normal rate of tax 6 per cent and gives the citizen and resident alien the benefit, which is the only benefit a citizen has against the alien, and even then it is a benefit shared both by the citizen and resident alien, that the first \$4,000 of his income is taxed

at but 2 per cent and the next \$4,000 at 4 per cent. Bear in mind that no benefit whatsoever is enjoyed by the citizen on any income in excess of \$8,000, and citizen and alien are taxed equally on the excess.

The same little preference in low income taxes given to a citizen and resident of the United States is continued in the act of 1926, which reduced the normal tax to 5 per cent, except that the tax payable by a citizen or resident alien on the first \$4,000 was fixed at 1½ per cent and the next \$4,000 at 3 per cent. The maximum surtax under the act of 1926 was fixed at 20 per cent on incomes in excess of \$100,000.

THE PRESENT LAW

Our income-tax rates in force to-day have been fixed by the revenue act of 1928. The act continues the maximum surtaxes of 20 per cent on incomes exceeding \$100,000. It fixes a rate of 5 per cent as normal tax, except that the first \$4,000 of incomes is taxable at 1½ per cent and the next \$4,000 at 3 per cent. No distinction is made between taxes payable by citizens or aliens, so that even the little advantage enjoyed by our citizens under the former income tax laws is done away with. If anything, therefore, the resident and nonresident alien is better off under the present law than he was under the acts of 1924 and 1926.

WHAT IS PROPOSED BY ME

There can be no question but additional revenue is needed. The only question is what source shall be used to replenish our Treasury. Is it not fair that resident and nonresident aliens deriving their income from American sources should be made to bear a large part of our tax burden? We at one time had a surtax rate of 65 per cent on incomes (the 1918 rates). Why not impose this rate on nonresident aliens?

An analysis of the tax acts which I have discussed in some detail shows that the rates of surtax have been continually made lower, so that from a maximum of 65 per cent in 1918 the rate is now a maximum of 20 per cent. It has been the contention of our Secretary of the Treasury that the reduction of surtax rates will stimulate business and make more incomes for our people by developing industry, commerce, and so forth. If that be so, clearly surtaxes to be paid by nonresident aliens can not under any circumstances hurt our business. They are aliens, have no interest or stake in our country, and their money is not invested in our industry, commerce, or anything appertaining to our finances. I am therefore firmly of the opinion that steps should be taken to bring about a fairer distribution of the tax burden, placing it on the shoulders of those best able to carry it.

Mr. Chairman, I shall ask the House at some future time to support me on an appropriate amendment to bring about a proper tax on those against whom it should be properly levied. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'CONNOR, 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. 8397, the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. HESS, for one week, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. WARREN (at the request of Mr. LAMBETH), indefinitely, on account of illness.

FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL

Mr. BYRNS presented the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6660) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 289).

ADDRESS OF HON. OGDEN L. MILLS

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting an address delivered by Hon. Ogden L. Mills on January 25 last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address of Hon. Ogden L. Mills, Under Secretary of the Treasury, at the annual meeting of the American Acceptance Council, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, January 25, 1932:

CREDIT AND CONFIDENCE

I appreciate the opportunity to discuss before so representative a gathering some of those problems which are pressing for solution and which tend to range themselves under the one main heading "Credit and Confidence."

The United States is passing through one of the most serious depressions in its history. There is not much profit in emphasizing the dark side of any picture, but as the physician must diagnose the character and extent of the malady before he can prescribe, so must the severity of the downward movement in business and the consequences which it has entailed necessarily furnish our point of departure.

Wholesale commodity prices have declined 32 per cent in the last two years; industrial production has declined 44 per cent. This precipitous drop in values and in production has been accompanied not only by a sweeping contraction of credit but by a very serious disorganization of credit facilities. The decline in the volume of bank credit has been the largest ever experienced in this country. Total loans and investments in the banks of the United States have declined more than six and one-half billion dollars during the past two years, in addition to a drop of more than \$6,000,000,000 in loans made to brokers by others than banks. Considering also the heavy shrinkage which has occurred in the amount of money borrowed currently to finance installment purchases of goods and in open book credit and similar forms of commercial advances, we have experienced a credit reduction of immense and unprecedented magnitude.

Some day it will be well worth while to examine critically the causes which have led up to such a catastrophic contraction. At present the immediate task is of greater importance. Suffice it to say that while an increase in our gold supply of about one and a half billion dollars over the past decade must inevitably have produced some measure of expansion, the speculative excesses which accompanied this expansion were bound to bring serious retribution; moreover, our banking mechanism, in part because of the excessive number of banks, contained elements of weakness which rendered it less able to stand the strain of drastic liquidation. Events have demonstrated that the increase in number from 10,000 in 1900 to 30,000 in 1920 was a source of weakness rather than of strength.

In any event, by the middle of 1929, from a variety of causes, of which, in my humble judgment, human nature was by no means a minor one, our whole economic set-up had reached a point where a sweeping decline was as inevitable as the downward course of the noonday sun toward the horizon. Economic excesses inevitably entail economic readjustments. When the economic pendulum swings much too high, its subsequent downward course is likely to be accelerated and will continue until the readjusting forces have spent themselves. At that point stabilization should take place and an upward movement would be resumed were it not for the imponderable factor involved in human nature itself.

From the middle of 1929 to September, 1931, wholesale commodity prices fell about 30 per cent; industrial production declined about 40 per cent; and all bank loans and investments by about \$4,500,000,000. After such a sweeping decline, accompanied by corresponding readjustments of all kinds, and the elimination of weak spots and elements of instability in the economic structure, it is not unreasonable to believe that the economic forces working toward contraction and deflation had by that time fairly well spent themselves.

And, yet, what do we find? Between September and December prices have declined further by about 4 per cent, production 7 per cent, and loans and investments of weekly reporting member banks more than a billion and a half dollars, or 7 per cent, while the deposits of these banks declined by no less than two and a quarter billions, or 11 per cent. I may be wrong, of course, and both elements are always present in situations of this kind, but I have the very distinct impression that whereas up to the last quarter of 1931, economic factors exercised the preponderating influence, from October up to the present time psychological influences have played the leading part. During the past three months the psychology of fear has been written in large letters on every step of the downward course.

Even after due consideration of the fact that in 1929 speculative expansion reached fanciful heights; that the country was living too much on credit; that many of the debts had to be eliminated before we could find a basis for recovery; that undoubtedly adjustments in particular fields remain to be made; that governmental expenditures—National, State, and local—are altogether too high; that costs in a number of industries must be further

reduced; and that adjustments of this sort must continue to be made—the outstanding fact to-day is that deflation has proceeded much too far.

Every additional decline in credit and prices and securities brings with it further bank failures, and bank failures in their turn lead to further contraction in credit and prices. The deflation has now reached a point where it feeds upon itself and where forces working for economic recovery are nullified by the psychological momentum of the downward movement.

One development to which I should like to call your attention particularly is the movement of bank deposits in its relation to bank loans and investments. For here it seems to me there are definite corrective steps that the bankers might take. Banks have been losing deposits in part because of currency withdrawals and gold exports; but, in addition to this, banks have themselves been destroying their own deposits. To make themselves more liquid, banks all over the country have sold securities and have called loans. Security holdings of reporting member banks alone diminished by about \$500,000,000 during the last quarter of the year. When banks sell securities or call loans bank deposits are in their turn reduced. Take a simple illustration. Assume a town with two banks—bank A and bank B. A wishes to increase its cash and so make itself more liquid. It accordingly sells \$10,000 worth of Government securities at an attractive price to a depositor in B. The depositor pays for them with a check drawn on B. B pays A \$10,000 in cash and its deposits are reduced by \$10,000. A's cash is increased \$10,000, but its deposits are not. B, finding its deposits reduced and its cash depleted, in its turn sells securities to a depositor in A, thus reducing A's deposits \$10,000 and restoring \$10,000 of B's cash. The net result is a decrease in the deposits and the investments of both banks and a reduction in the market value of their remaining assets but no improvement in their cash position.

In fact, the banks are, if anything, less liquid than at the beginning of the operation, since they have disposed of some of their best assets and have weakened the market for other securities. It is very much this kind of operation that has been going on in recent months in the United States, with a consequent tremendous decline in the prices of all investment securities. The situation has been greatly aggravated by this process of bank credit attrition, and yet this is a process which to a very great extent is within the control of the banks themselves.

While there has been an enormous decline in deposits in New York City banks, it is the banks outside of New York City that have suffered most severely. The pressure upon them has in turn reacted most unfavorably on industry and commerce. On January 13 Federal reserve discounts for account of member banks outside of New York City amounted to \$773,000,000, or about \$450,000,000 more than at the end of September, while discounts for account of New York City banks showed a relatively small increase and amounted to only \$45,000,000 in January.

If only this process can be arrested and the psychology of fear dispelled, there is real ground for the belief that the foundation is now sufficiently firm to justify our vigorously addressing ourselves to the task of reconstruction. There is ample evidence that economic readjustment has proceeded far in the affairs of individuals, business and financial institutions, and more recently of the Nation and its political subdivisions. The wholesale commodity price level has declined about 32 per cent.

Wages of all kinds are, on the average, down approximately 10 per cent, and so many of the smaller units in banking and business have been closed that there has been a reduction of 2,000, or more than 10 per cent, in the number of our banks and over 28,000, or, roughly speaking, 1½ per cent, in our business concerns during the last year. The weakest spots in our banking and business structure have been eliminated by the closing of these institutions. Meanwhile, the 1931 records of many of the strongest business units indicate that they have at last so adapted themselves to prevailing conditions that with some increase in activity their operations may now be carried on at a reasonable profit. The Nation, the States, and the cities are attacking the problem of budgetary equilibrium with increasing vigor. There is a surprising unanimity of opinion among industrial and banking leaders and among economists that liquidation has proceeded beyond the point of whatever benefits it may confer and that a healthy, progressive recovery is possible and, of course, desirable.

The essence of the problem is to arrest deflation, to make available the credit needed by American business, industry, and commerce, and to encourage its use. We require a vigorous, cooperative program. Such a program has taken definite shape. Its early operation is assured. There must be no holding back. We must press energetically forward all along the line toward the attainment of these definite objectives.

The Government of the United States is prepared to do its full share. The President laid down a program, with which you are doubtless familiar but which, because of its importance, I desire to summarize briefly.

The Government is to begin by putting its own house in order. Through rigid economies and increased revenues we propose to bring the Budget into balance in the sense that there will be no further increase after July 1 next in the public debt. This is essential not only to maintain unimpaired the credit of the United States Government, which is of supreme importance to all, but so that Government financing may not interfere with the normal operations of the security markets and divert capital essential to the revival of industry and trade.

In the meanwhile, to finance current expenditures for the balance of this fiscal year and to cover the President's emergency

program, it will be necessary for the Treasury to borrow over and above refunding operations approximately \$1,500,000,000. This is unavoidable. But if the Treasury, as it proposes to do, adapts its methods of borrowing to the current conditions of the market, these operations should not occasion concern, particularly as a large part of these funds are to be applied to reinforcing the credit structure and some portion at least to meeting the needs of industry and commerce. Moreover, it is to be hoped that subscribing banks, recognizing not only the value of the Government deposit held for a reasonable period of time but also the opportunity thus afforded of acquiring and keeping paper eligible for discount in case of need, will so conduct these credit operations over the course of the next four or five months as not to permit Government borrowing to restrict the flow of credit into business and commercial channels.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation should furnish a mobile reservoir of credit available during the period of depression for credits otherwise unobtainable and at the same time an adequate guaranty against unforeseen contingencies. Aside from the affirmative assistance which this corporation should render, I visualize it as constituting a solid wall under the protection of which men and institutions can carry on their normal operations without fear of sudden and devastating interruption. I know of no instrument better designed to lift that psychology of fear, which should play no part in American economic life.

The strengthening of the Federal land bank system will insure to the farmer the credit facilities to which he is entitled and maintain at the high point which the investor has the right to demand the credit of these institutions.

The creation of a system of home loan discount banks should serve the constructive purpose of partially liberating resources that are at present tied up and thus encourage new construction and permanently improve the facilities for financing this type of operation.

The liberalization of the discount provisions of the Federal reserve act will tend to bring our policies—modified, of course, to meet American conditions—more in line with the well-established practices of central banks in foreign countries, while a modification of the requirements governing collateral against Federal reserve note issues should establish a more rational and adequate use of our gold reserves.

The development of a program to assure early distribution to depositors in closed banks will not only mitigate the suffering inflicted on thousands of families but tend to have a direct effect on the general economic situation.

Finally, the Interstate Commerce Commission has recommended legislation which will strengthen our transportation system and restore confidence in the bonds of our railways. Indeed, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is intended to be particularly helpful to the railroads. In discussing railroads this evening, I am not approaching their problem from the transportation but rather from the credit standpoint. Railroad bonds have always been looked upon as one of our prime investment securities. As a result the savings of the American people are invested directly and indirectly to a greater extent in railway securities than in any other class except United States bonds. It is estimated that more than 70 per cent of all railroad bonds and notes are held by banking, insurance, and other institutions. The universal decline in the value of railroad bonds, aside from the influence which it has exercised on all other securities, has played a very large part in the general threat to the country's credit. I know of no more important factor looking to the restoration of confidence and the general strengthening of credit than the safeguarding of the financial structure of this great industry. The pool created from increased rates for the benefit of the weaker roads and the anticipated agreement between the executives and the leaders of railroad labor should further assist in materially improving the railroad picture.

Some overtimid critics claim to have detected in this program the germ of inflation. They fail to distinguish the unmistakable dividing line between inflation and the arresting of a deflationary process which has gone to extreme lengths. When reporting member-bank credit has been deflated by over \$1,500,000,000 in three months, or at the rate of more than 25 per cent a year, and when through fear the existing volume of credit is not used to anything like its capacity, I do not know of anyone, except perhaps the cartoonist Webster's Timid Soul, who could be seriously troubled by the specter of inflation.

The operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have been carefully safeguarded. They are designed to free rather than create credit. Increased Treasury financing is limited in amount and time. In the United States commodity prices, wholesale and retail, security values, wages, corporate and other business budgets, and now governmental budgets, have been and are being subjected to drastic readjustments. So that to-day credit expansion must be looked upon as constructive and desirable rather than inflationary and dangerous. Furthermore, leaving aside the all-important fact that the public temper was never more discriminating and conservative, history shows that a dangerous inflation does not follow upon the heels of a drastic deflation.

Here is a program that strikes at the very roots of our economic difficulties. It is intelligently conceived and should be vigorously carried out. But governmental leadership and action alone can not achieve complete success. They should be supplemented by a far-sighted and liberal Federal reserve policy, and above all, by the affirmative and courageous cooperation of our banks. In this connection, if I may be allowed to speak with complete frankness, a direct responsibility rests on the great banking in-

stitutions of the country. In the past in similar emergencies they have rendered tremendous service to the Nation. The opportunities for leadership and service are to-day even more imperatively here. Free from the spirit of competitive individualism they must establish a solid front and through a cooperative and unified program attack a problem which they above all others are best fitted to solve. The calamitous process of deposit and credit contraction must be arrested. The flow of funds from all parts of the country to the financial center should be reversed. The full use of available credit should be encouraged. Each bank should become a strong point, radiating strength and confidence. Resources are truly important only to the extent that they are used. Let me remind you of a familiar quotation from Bagehot's great book, *Lombard Street*.

"In opposition to what might be at first sight supposed, the best way for the bank or banks who have the custody of the bank reserve to deal with a drain arising from internal discredit is to lend freely. The first instinct of everyone is the contrary. There being a large demand on a fund which you want to preserve, the most obvious way to preserve it is to hoard it—to get in as much as you can and to let nothing go out which you can help. But every banker knows that this is not the way to diminish discredit. This discredit means 'an opinion that you have not got any money,' and to dissipate that opinion you must, if possible, show that you have money; you must employ it for the public benefit in order that the public may know that you have it. The time for economy and for accumulation is before. A good banker will have accumulated in ordinary times the reserve he is to make use of in extraordinary times."

After all, prior to the establishment of the Federal reserve system the banks in the large financial centers were, in essence, the central banks of the country and were fully conscious of their position and the responsibilities which it carried. It seems to me that it is a mistake to assume that the coming into being of the Federal reserve system has completely altered their relationship to our banking system as a whole. A large measure of responsibility still exists, with this fundamental difference, that with the facilities of the Federal reserve system available they should be able to act with greater initiative, courage, and resolution than ever before.

Our problems and difficulties, serious as they are, can and will be solved if we unite in attacking them resolutely and courageously, confident in ourselves and in our future.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in the House to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if he knew that in that Bingham resolution which he referred to a few moments ago, the Senator was trying to carry out the request of the new bishop and the new head of the Anti-Saloon League in trying to bring the question to a vote?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I did not know that. If he were a follower of Bishop Richardson, he would not be for beer. I rejoiced that the Bingham beer vote of 55 to 15 ought to be decisive.

Mr. GOSS. It was not a Bingham beer vote, I may inform the gentleman.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC-UTILITIES INVESTIGATION

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 115) from the Committee on Accounts and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 115

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution No. 59, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts, but shall not exceed \$50,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain just what is the purpose of the resolution? My attention was diverted while the resolution was being read.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the House passed a resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make an investigation, and this resolution provides the money for that investigation.

Mr. STAFFORD. And limits it to the sum of \$50,000?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes.

The resolution was agreed to.

A BREAD-AND-BUTTER ISSUE

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and to print a short editorial referring to a speech which I made last week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last week I addressed the House, and in my speech contended that prohibition had brought ruin to the American farmer. I quoted at length from Government records in support of my contention.

Sunday, January 24, there appeared in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* an article prepared by Mr. Charles G. Ross, chief correspondent of this paper's Washington bureau, in which he analyzed what prohibition had cost the people of the United States. This article was inserted in the *RECORD* by Senator HAWES on Tuesday, January 26, and was also referred to the Senate Committee on Manufactures.

In Monday's *Post-Dispatch* there appeared an editorial which refers to Mr. Ross's article as well as my speech, and under the permission granted by the House to-day I submit that editorial for printing.

The editorial follows:

A BREAD-AND-BUTTER ISSUE

Let us gather around the conference table, wets and dries, and reason calmly together. Let us put our emotions in the ice box and leave them there till the meeting is adjourned. Let no such word as fanaticism mar the discussion. Let the Constitution rest in peace. Let us look at our experience with prohibition in the cold, white light of arithmetic and calculate what it has cost us and decide, solely on the facts, whether we can afford to continue it.

The work of calculation has been done for us in an article by Charles G. Ross, Washington correspondent of the *Post-Dispatch*, which was published in yesterday's paper. According to Mr. Ross's figures, prohibition has been costing us—in loss of revenue and enforcement expenses—\$500,000,000 a year, or a total of \$5,610,765,620 in the 12 years of its operation.

That enormous sum is beyond the comprehension of most of us. But when we are told it is one-third of our national debt, we get at least an idea.

As a matter of fact, the annual cost of prohibition—\$500,000,000—can be understood by only a few specialists. Our correspondent, however, has reduced it to understandable terms. It is, he explains, 12½ per cent of the normal Federal Budget. It is approximately twice the yearly payments scheduled to be received by the United States on the foreign debt; it is more than half the amount of the Government's deficit for the fiscal year 1931; it is considerably more than all the taxes paid to the Federal Government on personal incomes of 1930.

This economic phase of prohibition was the subject of a talk made by Prof. Edwin R. A. Seligman, of Columbia University, at the annual dinner of the Institute of Consulting Engineers last week. He said that a tax on distilled and fermented liquors, plus the revenue to be derived from the high-license system, if the traffic were so conducted, would yield an annual revenue of \$1,500,000,000, or three times as much as is expected from the personal income tax next year. He also put it this way:

"If we could change prohibition, it would not be necessary to levy any of the proposed increased taxes, but we might do away entirely with our income tax."

Professor Seligman, it may be remarked, is rated by some as "the greatest tax authority in America."

Such calculations and conclusions, we submit, challenge the serious consideration of all citizens, particularly in the present distressing circumstances, when the Government can see no way of balancing the Budget except by drastically increasing taxes already burdensome. Every business is heavily taxed, but the industry hardest hit by prohibition is agriculture. Representative COCHRAN, of St. Louis, went into the statistics of farm values before and since prohibition on the floor of the House a few days ago. In 1900 the value of the country's farm lands and buildings was \$16,000,000,000. In 1910 it had increased to \$34,000,000,000; in 1920 to \$66,000,000,000. But in 1930 the value had declined to \$47,000,000,000, a loss of almost \$20,000,000,000. Quoting the Department of Agriculture, Mr. COCHRAN said that, during the year ending March 15, 1931, 21 of every 1,000 farms had been sold for delinquent taxes. He pointed out that where the farmer paid \$1 in taxes in 1913, he paid \$2.49 in 1929, an increase of almost 150 per cent. The farm income of 1931 was \$8,000,000,000 less than it was in 1919. Looking at the brewery industry strictly as an economic factor, Mr. COCHRAN showed that prohibition had deprived the farmers of a market for 1,296,000,000 bushels of grain since

1920. Farmers have lost \$54,000,000,000 in income in 10 years of prohibition.

That is the picture of prohibition presented by arithmetic. It will make some people mad, some people sad, but it will make every thoughtful citizen realize that, above everything else at this critical juncture of affairs, prohibition is an economic problem which must be faced earnestly, and for which a correct solution must be found.

Rhetoric can not stand in the same ring with economics. Emotion has to yield the right of way to facts. Prohibition has, in a word, become a bread-and-butter issue for every one of us, and we would not be a sensible people did we not seriously consider what can be done about it. The first thing to realize is that political parties are not going to extricate us from the dilemma. They are going to play politics with it, as they have been doing for a decade.

Since the people have the bill to pay, they must themselves throw off this insuperable burden. The best place to begin is at the polls this year. If they refuse to send to Congress any man favoring prohibition, they will in time marshal in Washington strength enough to submit the issue to the people.

It is a bread-and-butter issue.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution making an appropriation to enable the United States of America to make payments upon subscriptions to the capital stock of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 28, 1932, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. RAINEY submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, January 28, 1932, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

(10 a. m.)

Parcel-post matters (H. R. 4525; S. 621).

Mail matter for the blind (H. R. 6392; H. J. Res. 34).

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

(9.30 a. m.)

Revision of patent laws.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(10 a. m.)

H. R. 457; H. R. 5869; H. J. Res. 132.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10 a. m.)

Section 15a—H. R. 7116 and H. R. 7117, interstate commerce act (recapture clause).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Akron investigation.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

(10 a. m.)

National defense act.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

Commodity short selling.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

(10.30 a. m.)

Irrigation and reclamation (H. Res. 4650); Chicago World's Fair Centennial (H. Res. 4583).

COMMITTEE ON WAR CLAIMS

(10 a. m.)

Regular meeting.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

406. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated January 23, 1932, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of Columbia River at St. Helens, Oreg. (H. Doc. No. 235); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

407. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated January 25, 1932, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on Grand River, Mo. and Iowa (H. Doc. No. 236); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

408. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the draft of a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to discontinue certain reports now required by law to be made to Congress," approved May 29, 1928; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

409. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1932, in the amount of \$75,000, for the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs (H. Doc. No. 237); 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. GREEN: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the War Department (Rept. No. 285). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PARKER of New York: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 483. A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1897, authorizing the construction and maintenance of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River; without amendment (Rept. No. 287). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: Committee on Accounts. A resolution (H. Res. 115) authorizing the expenses of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (Rept. No. 290). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 5940. A bill for the relief of Florian Ford; without amendment (Rept. No. 286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PEAVEY: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 4244. A bill for the relief of Mrs. G. A. Brennan; without amendment (Rept. No. 288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7076) granting a pension to Fred Libbee; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5584) granting a pension to Mary A. Fay; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3179) granting a pension to Carrie J. Mealey; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOSS: A bill (H. R. 8492) to regulate the use and sale of wood alcohol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGG of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8493) to regulate the manufacture and sale of stamped envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARTER of Wyoming: A bill (H. R. 8494) to add certain lands to the Washakie National Forest in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 8495) providing for an emergency circulation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GOSS: A bill (H. R. 8496) to authorize promotion upon retirement of officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard in recognition of World War and Spanish-American War service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 8497) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the pensions of certain maimed veterans who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in the same, in line of duty, in the military or naval service of the United States; and to amend section 4788 of the Revised Statutes of the United States by increasing the rates therein for artificial limbs," approved February 11, 1927 (U. S. C., Supp. I, title 38, sec. 168a); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEAVEY: A bill (H. R. 8498) to authorize Federal contributions for the emergency relief of all needy Indians except those who are wards of the United States or who are members of an Indian tribe whose tribal funds are administered by the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 8499) granting pensions to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of soldiers and sailors of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition, who served 70 days; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 8500) to incorporate the Army and Navy Union of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 8501) to prohibit the transportation of any matter defamatory of a deceased individual in the mails or in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS: A bill (H. R. 8502) to transfer jurisdiction over certain national military parks and national monuments from the War Department to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 8503) to authorize the loan of War Department equipment to the Knights of Pythias; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 8504) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cancel restricted fee patents and issue trust patents in lieu thereof and to authorize deeds by natural guardians of Indian minors; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8505) to authorize natural guardians, or Indian Service superintendents, to execute deeds conveying the interests of minor Indians where title to trust or restricted lands must pass by approved deed; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 8506) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mahoning River at New Castle, Lawrence County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 8507) for the exchange of lands adjacent to national forests in Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: A bill (H. R. 8508) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved August 29, 1916; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ARENTZ: A bill (H. R. 8509) for the temporary relief of water users on irrigation projects constructed and operated under the reclamation law; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 8510) granting the consent of Congress to the Connecticut River State Bridge Commission, a statutory commission of the State of Connecticut, created and existing under the provisions of special Act No. 496 of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, 1931 session, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Connecticut River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLINTOCK of Ohio: Resolution (H. Res. 124) for the relief of volunteer officers and soldiers who served in the Philippine Islands under the act approved March 2, 1899; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 258) proposing an amendment to the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 259) to provide for levying and collecting an import duty upon copper in various forms, copper ores and concentrates, alloys or combinations of copper, and other copper products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAIL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 260) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish equipment, goods, and supplies to States, Territories, cities, and counties for use in aid of distressed citizens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 261) making an appropriation to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay for subscriptions to the capital stock of Federal land banks; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8511) granting an increase of pension to Jane Emery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 8512) granting a pension to Herman Samuel Coons; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOYLAN: A bill (H. R. 8513) for the relief of Benjamin Stern, and Melville A. Stern and Benjamin Stern, as the executors under the last will and testament of Louis Stern, deceased, and Arthur H. Hahlo, as executor under the last will and testament of Isaac Stern, deceased, all of New York City, N. Y., for compensation and in settlement of their damages and loss sustained by virtue of a lease, in writing, dated September 12, 1919, between the said parties and the United States of America, by Daniel C. Roper, Commissioner of Internal Revenue; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8514) granting an increase of pension to Mary Finn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 8515) for the relief of Otis Anne Lytle; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8516) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth M. Blue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 8517) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia Everett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 8518) for the relief of Otto E. Simpson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY: A bill (H. R. 8519) granting a pension to Annie J. Gonsalez; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOUTRICH: A bill (H. R. 8520) granting a pension to Josephine Gayman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8521) to provide for the carrying out of the award of the National War Labor Board of January 15, 1919, dockets Nos. 419 and 420, in favor of certain employees of the Lebanon (Pa.) plants of the Bethlehem Steel Co. and the Lebanon Valley Iron Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 8522) for the relief of Mrs. T. E. Perin Buel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 8523) granting a pension to Mary E. Grinnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARLAN: A bill (H. R. 8524) for the relief of sundry building and loan associations; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLADAY: A bill (H. R. 8525) for the relief of Rosemund Pauline Lowry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLLISTER: A bill (H. R. 8526) granting a pension to Anna Wehner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KARCH: A bill (H. R. 8527) for the relief of Joseph M. Verneuil and Alice G. Verneuil; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 8528) for the relief of John W. Shumaker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 8529) for the relief of Frank L. Norris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAJOR: A bill (H. R. 8530) granting an increase of pension to Joanna S. Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 8531) authorizing Spiro Sargentich, major in the United States Army Reserve, to accept the decoration of the Order of St. Sava, third degree, tendered him by His Majesty Alexander I, King of Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 8532) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Dubes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 8533) for the relief of James H. Green; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 8534) granting an increase of pension to Catherine C. Crippen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 8535) granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Lent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8536) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Diehl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 8537) granting a pension to Edward B. Kennedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8538) granting an increase of pension to Sarah H. Julien; 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:

895. By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of Beulah B. Potter and 21 other citizens of Cranston, R. I., opposing the repeal, resubmission, or any modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

896. By Mr. AYRES: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union and citizens of Hesston, Kans., opposing the modification or repeal of the eighteenth amendment or the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

897. By Mr. BACON: Petition of the membership of Sound Avenue Union of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Riverhead, N. Y., opposing any modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment, and urging full support and maintenance of the prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

898. Also, petition of sundry citizens of West Hampton Beach, opposing any modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment, and urging full support and maintenance of the prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

899. Also, two petitions of the National Guard Association of the State of New York, opposing curtailment of Federal appropriations for National Guard armory drills and restricting attendance at summer camps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

900. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Nassau County, N. Y., urging repeal of eighteenth amendment and prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

901. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution passed by Central Mercantile Association, 65 Fifth Avenue, New York, in favor of modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

902. Also, petition of land bank of the State of New York, inclosing list of savings and loan institutions of the State of New York who are opposed to Senate bill 2959, as amended, proposing to create a system of Federal home loan banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

903. Also, petition of National Guard Association of the State of New York, inclosing resolution protesting against any abridgment of our regular Military Establishment and disapproving any reduction in annual training duty or drill pay; to the Committee on Appropriations.

904. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Petition of the Lincolnton (N. C.) Chapter of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, requesting adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance, and opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

905. Also, petition of the South Fork Association Executive Board, representing 38 Baptist Churches of North Carolina, requesting adequate appropriations for law enforcement and education in law observance, and opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

906. Also, petition of Hornets Nest Post, No. 9, American Legion, Charlotte, N. C., for the repeal of interest on the loans on the adjusted-service certificates, and for the payment of the balance due on the adjusted-service certificates of veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

907. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of Elizabeth A. Peckham, president of Middletown (R. I.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and 19 other residents of Newport, Portsmouth, and Middletown, R. I., protesting against repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

908. By Mr. CHINDBLOM: Petition of Mrs. L. L. Maether and 34 other residents of Prairie View, Ill., in support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

909. By Mr. CONDON (by request): Petition of Elizabeth A. Godschell and several other citizens of Rhode Island, protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or any modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

910. Also (by request), petition of Alice F. Porter and several other citizens of Rhode Island, protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or any modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

911. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the National Guard Association of the State of New York, favoring the erection of a memorial to the World War National Guard of the United States at Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

912. By Mr. GARBNER: Petition of the Blackwell (Okla.) Milling & Elevator Co., urging support of House bill 48; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

913. Also, petition of the citizens of the eighth district and Enid, Okla., protesting against the proposed 10 per cent tax on theater admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

914. Also, petition of the International Association of Machinists, District Lodge No. 44, protesting against the adoption of sections 2 and 3 of the agricultural appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

915. Also, petition of citizens of Oklahoma City, protesting against the Navy bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

916. Also, petition of organizations of the eighth district of Oklahoma, urging the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

917. By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Jamaica, Vt., opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

918. Also, petition of the Orleans Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Orleans, Vt., opposing resubmission

of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

919. By Mr. HOCH: Petition of 45 voters of Emporia, Kans., urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

920. Also, petition of 44 voters of Severy, Kans., urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

921. Also, petition of the Frances Willard Chapter of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Emporia, Kans., urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

922. Also, petition of members of the Friends Church of Emporia, Kans., urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

923. Also, petition of members of the First Christian Church of Emporia, Kans., urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

924. Also, petition of members of the Presbyterian Church of Emporia, Kans., urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

925. Also, petition of members of the Second Presbyterian Church of Emporia, Kans., urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

926. Also, petition of members of the Free Methodist Church of Emporia, Kans., urging support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal, and that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

927. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Corsicana, Tex., opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

928. Also, petition of W. A. Wagner, of Kerens, Tex., favoring a tariff on oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

929. Also, petition of state-wide meeting of levee drainage and irrigation interests in Texas, urging passage of House bill 4650; to the Committee on Rules.

930. Also, petition of John J. Simmons, Dallas, Tex., urging passage of House bill 4650; to the Committee on Rules.

931. Also, petition of directors of Texas Building and Loan League, favoring passage of home loan bank bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

932. Also, petition of Lewis R. Ferguson, vice president Lone Star Cement Co., Dallas, Tex., opposing a tax on electric current; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

933. By Mr. PARKER of Georgia: Petition of Stanton B. Lee and 45 other citizens of Oliver, Ga., urging the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, and protesting against any measure looking toward its modification,

resubmission to the States, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

934. By Mr. PRATT: Petition of 128 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Chatham, Columbia County, N. Y., urging maintenance of the prohibition law and opposing modification, repeal, or resubmission to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

935. Also, petition of 53 residents of Liberty, Sullivan County, N. Y., urging maintenance of the prohibition law and opposing modification, repeal, or resubmission to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

936. By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of C. F. Crowder and 25 other citizens of Pike County, Ill., favoring the Glenn-Smith bill; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

937. Also, petition of Strother Grigsby and 51 other citizens of Pittsfield, Ill., favoring the Glenn-Smith bill; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

938. By Mr. ROBINSON: Petition signed by Mildred Jones, of Gilman, Iowa, and 15 other citizens of that community, urging the maintenance and support of the prohibition law and its enforcement, and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

939. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of Goad-Ballinger Post, No. 69, American Legion, Springfield, Mo., favoring the immediate passage of the widows and orphans pension bill; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

940. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Lone Star Cement Co. (Inc.) of New York, Albany, N. Y., opposing the proposed tax on electric current; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

941. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition signed by Lydia Watson and 12 other citizens of Gainesville, N. Y., opposing repeal, resubmission, or modification of the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

942. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution of S. J. Rexrode, president Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Marlinton, W. Va., opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

943. Also, resolution of the Catherine Chilton mission circle, First Baptist Church of St. Albans, W. Va., opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

944. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of residents of Moira, N. Y., relative to the prohibition law and its enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

945. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of members of the Baptist Missionary Society of Ness City, Kans., protesting against a change in the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

946. Also, petition of 20 members of the Prairie Club of Ness City, 37 citizens of Agra, and 22 citizens of Norton, and a resolution of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Norton, all of the State of Kansas, protesting against any change in the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

947. By Mr. SPENCE: Resolution adopted by citizens of Covington, Ky., against repeal or resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

948. Also, petition of citizens of Pendleton County, Ky., urging maintenance of the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

949. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of Johnstown Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union, opposing legislation to repeal or weaken the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

950. Also, petition of citizens of Corsica, Pa., and vicinity, favoring the prohibition law and its enforcement, and opposed to any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

951. By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wyoming, protesting against any measure looking toward the modification, repeal, or submission to the States of the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

952. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of 574 women of the Middlesex County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, asking support of the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

953. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Christina Lynch, of Denbo, Washington City, Pa., in support of House bill 7230, increasing the rate of pensions to widows of Spanish-American War veterans to \$40 per month; to the Committee on Pensions.

954. By Mr. VESTAL: Petition of S. W. Haynes and others, concerning proposed revision of prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

955. By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Petition of residents of Kentland, Newton County, Ind., urging the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, and against any measure looking toward its modification and resubmission to the States, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

956. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Floyd G. Hoenstine and various members of the American Legion, in regard to lack of facilities of hospitalization of disabled World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

957. Also, petition of Chandler Smith and others, disapproving the recommendation for Department of Public Works; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

958. Also, petition of members of the William Newton Clark Brotherhood, of Hamilton, N. Y., requesting an amendment to the Constitution of the United States be adopted as follows: "Art. XX. Aliens shall be excluded from the count of the whole number of persons in each State in apportioning Representatives among the several States according to their respective numbers"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

959. Also, petition of E. L. Mayer, Chicago, protesting against the new Army appropriation bill making no provision for the upkeep of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

960. Also, petition of New York Maryland women, urging defeat of Griffin bill, House bill 297; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1932

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 26, 1932)

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Couzens	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.
Austin	Cutting	Jones	Schall
Bailey	Dale	Kean	Sheppard
Bankhead	Davis	Kendrick	Shipstead
Barbour	Dickinson	Keyes	Smith
Barkley	Dill	King	Smoot
Bingham	Fess	La Follette	Steiwer
Black	Fletcher	Lewis	Stephens
Blaine	Frazier	Logan	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	George	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Glass	McKellar	Townsend
Brookhart	Glenn	McNary	Trammell
Broussard	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Tydings
Bulkley	Gore	Morrison	Vandenberg
Bulow	Hale	Moses	Wagner
Byrnes	Harris	Neely	Walcott
Capper	Harrison	Norbeck	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Hastings	Norris	Walsh, Mont.
Carey	Hatfield	Nye	Waterman
Connally	Hawes	Oddie	Watson
Coolidge	Hayden	Patterson	Wheeler
Copeland	Hebert	Pittman	White
Costigan	Hull	Robinson, Ark.	

Mr. JOHNSON. I announce that my colleague [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] is still ill and confined to his room. I ask that the announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. FESS. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent on official business. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senate resumes the consideration of the unfinished business, Senate bill No. 7.

DEPORTATION OF ALIEN SEAMEN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 7) to provide for the deportation of certain alien seamen, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. The junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has the floor.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in view of the discussion and the suggestions of a number of persons who are interested in securing proper legislation dealing with immigration and cognate questions, and in order that some of our friends, who I think have some misconceptions concerning the bill, may have an opportunity to confer with the committee further in regard to the matter and evince their good faith in the matter, we have concluded—and I am speaking for the committee—to move that the bill be recommitted to the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Immigration.

The motion was agreed to.

RELIEF OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, some days ago I gave notice that as soon as I could secure recognition following the disposition of the bill (S. 7) to provide for the deportation of certain alien seamen, and for other purposes, I would move to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3045) to provide for cooperation by the Federal Government with the several States in relieving the hardship and suffering caused by unemployment, and for other purposes. Since giving that notice many Senators have appealed to me not to press the motion this week in order that they might have an opportunity to study the bill and to read the hearings. Therefore, I now give notice that as soon as I can secure recognition on Monday next for that purpose I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3045, to which I have just referred.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks just made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] on the relief bill (S. 3045) I send to the desk and ask to have read a statement released this morning by President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, a front-page editorial of the Indianapolis Times of January 23, 1932, and a front-page editorial of the Chicago Daily News of January 23, 1932.

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

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. WILLIAM GREEN, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, REGARDING THE UNPRECEDENTED UNEMPLOYMENT CRISIS, BASED ON REPORTS RECEIVED FROM AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS—WINTER UNEMPLOYMENT

With city relief breaking down, with private charity totally unable to meet the needs of the unemployed, we are now face to face with an unprecedented unemployment crisis. Our reports from trade-unions show that as usual there has been a sharp increase in the number out of work since December; the weighted figures are: 21.8 per cent out of work in December, 23.1 per cent at the 1st of January.

Ever since October unemployment has been rising rapidly. Winter lay-offs on farms have cost the jobs of about 1,250,000 wage earners, and some 1,100,000 more have been laid off in industry and salaried positions. The army of unemployed has risen to 8,300,000 (approximately) at the 1st of January.

January and February are usually peak months of unemployment, but relief needs will continue at unprecedented levels throughout 1932. With relief provision totally inadequate for even the winter months, we must look ahead now to the needs of the year. Only thus can we prevent a fearful toll of human wreckage. A conservative estimate places the probable unemployment for 1932 between six and seven million as an average. It will cost between \$3,500,000,000 and \$5,700,000,000 to feed, clothe, and house the unemployed even at bare subsistence levels.

Already we are hearing from bankrupt cities and towns reports of unprecedented suffering they can not meet. Some are not even paying their school teachers. Community chests, after a valiant effort to collect funds from private sources, report their