America held by foreign governments and by the subjects of foreign governments; that of that two billion and a half France had a free balance, that is, outside of its earmarked gold, of about $250,000,000. If that is correct, there is a potential menace to our gold reserve and, as a matter of fact, to our gold standard, under the present world condition. I would like to have the views of the Senator as to that possibility.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think myself there is a possibility of danger there. But, as I have said, this bill would be the law for only a year, and I do not believe it will be possible to decrease our supply of gold reserve within that time, at least under ordinary operations, so as to force us off the gold standard. The bill ought to be helpful, as we hope it will be, in that matter.

Mr. BLAINE. Interrupting further, Mr. President, I was going to suggest to the Senator that I expected to debate that proposition, and I was wondering whether the Senator has some accurate information upon the question.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am sorry I have not inquired about that in particular, and I do not find it discussed in the hearings, therefore I am not able to give the Senator definite information. I shall be glad to hear the Senator deal with it.

I was proceeding to state the situation of the banks. This is a statement of December 21, 1931. Deposits in all banks amounted to $56,864,744,000. In the national banks there were $19,244,347,000.

I would like to insert in the RECORD another statement I have just obtained from the Comptroller of the Currency, showing what protection depositors now have under our law. This statement would indicate that there is no need for this prevailing apprehension or nervousness on the part of depositors. It is a statement of the capital stock of all national banks, the surplus of all national banks, the undivided profits, and the deposits. I ask to have it inserted in the RECORD.

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

FEBRUARY 18, 1932.

Office of the Comptroller of the Currency advised that as of December 31, 1931—

Capital stock of all national banks (6,373)	$1,621,449,000
Surplus	1,381,612,000
Undivided profits	351,597,000
Deposits	19,244,347,000

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, there is one defect in our law, perhaps, and I think we ought to take steps to assure depositors in these banks that their money will be safe. Of course, we have no control over the State banks. We have a little indirect control of State banks which are members of the Federal reserve system through the regulation of the Federal Reserve Board. State banks which are members of the system have certain privileges and get certain benefits out of that association, and certainly to the extent that they are members of the system Congress has some effect over their operations. Outside of that, of course, we can not extend our jurisdiction as to the State banks. If we set an example here as to the national banks, the member banks of the system, the State banks will likely follow along wise and proper lines.

Here is one defect, I think, which we ought to correct. According to the statements which I have seen—and I have every reason to believe they are quite accurate—only about 60 per cent of the double liability of the stockholders of national banks is ever realized. In case of failure, or trouble, or liquidation, the double liability does not protect the depositors as it should. We ought to find some way whereby that entire liability of the stockholders of the national banks shall go to the protection of depositors in those banks. I think that can be done. We can so legislate, I think, as to give that additional protection, and it ought to be adequate protection to the depositors of the national banks.

That is one aim we must strive for, that is, to assure protection to the millions of depositors in the banks, some of them ruined forever, who lost all they have accumulated in their lifetime by reason of failures of banks, in recent years particularly. We ought to find some way to protect those people who trusted the banks and who placed with them their accumulations of a lifetime. I think we can do that. That is another step which I hope the Congress will take before we finish this entire program of legislation with reference to banking.

Mr. President, I wanted to get this much in the RECORD, and, as I have said, I would like to proceed as fast with the bill as possible. I suggest to the Senator from Virginia that if he is ready he should have the bill taken up first for committee amendments and then proceed with it to its final passage.

Mr. KEAN obtained the floor.

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, February 19, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 18 (legislative day of February 17), 1932

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

James H. Douglas, jr., of Chicago, Ill., to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, to fill an existing vacancy.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Second Lieut. Walter Edgerton Johns, Cavalry, with rank from June 9, 1928.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Merciful God, endue us with genuineness, with truth, with humility, with softness of speech, and with love. Bless us with this cluster of flowers from the heavenly garden. Do Thou crown us with high moral moods and quicken our spiritual instincts. Bless us with Thy unfailing guidance and give us the very best conceptions of life and duty. May we be patient under burdens, hopeful under difficulties, and inspire us with that supreme truth that we are the children of God. Bring out of our own natures a greater capacity to understand and a greater willingness to seek the whole truth. Purify our hearts, clarify our intellects so that the essential drift of our daily lives shall be away from sin and toward a higher and a better life. Bless every one of us with good thoughts, happy words, and cheerful hopes. 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 without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 81. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Catawissa Railroad Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near Catawissa, Pa.;

H. R. 6304. An act to transfer Lavaca County from the Houston division to the Victoria division of the southern district of Texas;

H. R. 7247. An act authorizing the Rhode Island State Board of Public Roads and the State Highway Department of the State of Connecticut to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pawcatuck River near the location of the present Broad Street Bridge between Westerly, R. I., and Stonington, Conn.; and

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H. J. Res. 271. Joint resolution amending section 1 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved July 3, 1930, relating to the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Illinois River and Minneapolis.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 268. An act to excuse certain persons from residence upon homestead lands during 1929, 1930, and 1931 in the drought-stricken areas; and

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution providing wreath to be placed on the grave of the mother of Washington on February 22, 1932.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 487. An act for the relief of Herbert G. Black, owner of the schooner *Oakwoods*, and Clark Coal Co., owner of the cargo of coal on board said schooner;

S. 499. An act authorizing the erection by the National Masonic Memorial Association of a memorial building at Fort Benning, Ga.;

S. 567. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. certain tracts of land situate in the county of Harford and State of Maryland;

S. 1021. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Baylin;

S. 1567. An act establishing a revolving fund to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture for agricultural credit purposes;

S. 1690. An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and citizens' military training camps who are injured or contract disease while engaged in military training, and for other purposes;

S. 1692. An act to amend section 90 of the national defense act, as amended, relative to the employment of caretakers for National Guard organizations;

S. 1768. An act to provide for the opening and closing of roads within the boundaries of the District of Columbia workhouse property at Occoquan, Fairfax County, Va.;

S. 2265. An act to extend the time for repayment of certain loans to farmers for the crop of 1931;

S. 2307. An act to provide for the settlement of damage claims arising from the construction of the Petrolia-Fort Worth gas-pipe line;

S. 2623. An act for the relief of Howard Donovan; and

S. 3282. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Bay of San Francisco from the Rincon Hill district in San Francisco by way of Goat Island to Oakland.

BICENTENNIAL OF BIRTH OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point by printing the proclamation issued by the President, inviting the people to organize and join in fittingly commemorating the bicentennial of the birth of George Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The proclamation is as follows:

BICENTENNIAL OF BIRTH OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A proclamation

The happy opportunity has come to our generation to demonstrate our gratitude and our obligation to George Washington by fitting celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of his birth.

To contemplate his unselfish devotion to duty, his courage, his patience, his genius, his statesmanship, and his accomplishments for his country and the world refreshes the spirit, the wisdom, and the patriotism of our people.

Therefore, I, Herbert Hoover, President of the United States of America, acting in accord with the purposes of the Congress, do invite all our people to organize themselves through every community and every association to do honor to the memory of Washington during the period from February 22 to Thanksgiving Day.

And I hereby direct that on the anniversary of his birth the flag of the United States be appropriately displayed upon all Government buildings in the United States and all embassies, legations, and offices of the United States abroad.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the seal of the United States.

Done at the city of Washington this first day of February, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and thirty-two, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and fifty-sixth.

HERBERT HOOVER.

By the President:
HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of State.

LOAN OF PICTURES OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 14.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That consent is hereby given to the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of George Washington, or a duly authorized committee thereof, to remove temporarily to the Corcoran Art Gallery, for exhibition in the bicentennial portrait exhibit to be held as a part of such celebration, any portraits in the Capitol Building (not in the public corridors), including the following:

George Washington, by Rembrandt Peale, in the Vice President's room;

George Washington, by Gilbert Stuart, in the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee room;

John Marshall, by Martin, in the Supreme Court robing room;

Frederick Muhlenberg, copied from a Wright portrait by Samuel B. Waugh, in the Speaker's lobby; and

Oliver Ellsworth, copied from an Earl portrait by Charles Loring Elliot, in the Supreme Court robing room.

The resolution was agreed to.

House Resolution 148 was laid on the table.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 14

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the "lame-duck" resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, an almost continuous session of my committee prevented my participation in the consideration of the recent so-called "lame-duck constitutional amendment." I voted against the submission of this amendment. About a year ago this matter was before Congress for consideration and, at that time, the House of Representatives added an amendment the purpose of which was to limit the second session of Congress. In that form I voted for a submission of the constitutional amendment. In consideration of the present constitutional amendment the House of Representatives refused to insert a provision limiting the second session, and the resolution as it passed the House placed no limit whatever on the sessions of Congress.

Undoubtedly there are reasons which would seem to justify such an amendment to the Constitution. Generally speaking, those reasons are grouped under two headings. First, that under the present system a Member of Congress does not actually take over his legislative duties for 13 months after his election; and, second, that under the present system there is a session of Congress after a general election and that defeated Members of Congress, or "lame ducks," participate in this legislative session.

There is, undoubtedly, some merit in both of these objections but, in my judgment, the objections are more theoretical than real. In the first place, while a Member of Congress elected in November, in the absence of a special session of Congress, does not actually take the oath of office until a year from the next December or 13 months from his election, yet what actually happens is that the Member takes office on March 4 following his election, is provided office space, a secretarial staff, immediately takes over the business of looking after the interests of his constituents, and utilizes the intervening time in the very necessary routine of contacting the various Government departments and serving what one might call his legislative apprenticeship. In the

event of a special session of Congress, of course, he immediately enters upon his legislative duties.

In my judgment, it is a wholesome thing to have a considerable intervening time from the election of Members of Congress or perhaps the change of a national administration before the time comes for the national legislative body to convene and begin to pass legislation. Political campaigns and especially national campaigns are oftentimes heated and bitter. To come out of such a campaign when, as I have said, there has perhaps been a change of administration, and immediately put new power in the new Congress to work, would indeed be dangerous and perhaps expensive experience. A few months cooling time is, in my judgment, most wholesome and necessary. If the country needs emergency legislation, the present Constitution provides a way in which Congress can be convened at any time the President so elects.

The second objection, that defeated Members of Congress who have been repudiated by their constituents are permitted to vote on legislation after such defeat, is the most serious objection to the present system. Yet when one stops to scrutinize the course of events, it is very hard to find specific instances where this element of Congress has really asserted a decided influence or where, because of their activities as a group or individually, bad legislation has been passed or meritorious legislation defeated. Again, I say that this objection is more theoretical than real.

By far the most serious objection and the deciding influence, so far as I am concerned, is the fact that under the proposed amendment to the Constitution, it will be possible and, in my judgment, altogether probable, that Congress, once it is convened with no limitation upon either of its sessions, will remain in practically continuous session. Nothing, to my mind, could be a greater menace to economic solidarity than the probability or possibility of having the national legislative body in continuous session. It is hard for me to understand how the business interests of the country and many of the leading newspapers can apparently so strongly favor the proposed constitutional amendment when they have almost universally protested against long and continuous sessions of the national legislative body.

I am still of the old-fashioned school who believe that it is a most dangerous experiment to be meddling and tinkering with our National Constitution. Indeed, I have made it a rule not to vote for any constitutional amendment unless, after the most careful deliberation and study, I am firmly convinced that unless such a proposal is embodied in the Constitution that free and representative government is in danger and the peace and prosperity of our citizens threatened. This is a rigid rule, but it seems to me that in the light of past experiences it is justified. I apply this rule to the present constitutional amendment and find myself with the small minority in voting against its submission.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present two unanimous requests. The first is that the Committee on Indian Affairs may have the privilege of sitting during the sessions of the House to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOWARD. Now, Mr. Speaker, the second request is that on Thursday morning next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I be permitted to address the House for 17 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. I object.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, may I have one moment to make an announcement? I desire to announce that I have dropped in the basket this morning a new piece of legislation differing from anything we have had here yet.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that my colleague, Mr. SWEENEY, is absent on account of illness.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. 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. 9349) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes. And pending that, may I say that I am informed it is the desire on both sides of the aisle that the bill be taken up for consideration under the 5-minute rule on Saturday, and that general debate be arranged accordingly. It is my purpose to make a general statement as to the bill as reported just before we take it under the 5-minute rule, and I will reserve time for that purpose.

Mr. SHREVE. What time does the gentleman suggest for general debate?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. General debate may continue until Saturday. There probably will be an agreement to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow and on Saturday, in order that we may give as much time as possible to those who desire time.

Mr. SHREVE. And general debate will run along until Saturday?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. PARSONS. Is it expected that we will have a vote on the bill on Saturday?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the time for general debate be equally divided, the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENTZ. I would like to ask the Speaker if it is the purpose to dispense with the Private Calendar to-morrow?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I understand the House will probably agree to a motion which will be made to have this bill kept before the House until it is disposed of. We expect to have general debate to-morrow on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama 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. 9349.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. McREYNOLDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I have only a limited time at my disposal. There are some few things I wish to say, and while I desire to be entirely courteous to everyone, I sincerely hope that I shall be permitted to proceed at least for awhile without interruption. If at the conclusion of my remarks I have any time, I shall be more than pleased to yield to any gentleman who wishes me to do so.

Yesterday the President sent to the Congress a message in which he recommended that he be given the power to make consolidations of various governmental agencies and bureaus, which he did not name in his message. Every Member of the House, I believe, is heartily in favor of any consolidation that can properly be made, and there is no Member who has served here for any length of time who does not know that there are duplications in every department of this Government. We are appropriating not thou-

sands, but millions of dollars which could be saved if a wise and proper consolidation of many of the governmental agencies was made and steps were taken to cut out the immense duplication that is now going on and has been going on for years in the past.

I was impressed with the message of the President. It occurred to me, however, that it was somewhat hastily, probably suddenly, prepared. I do not think anyone can read that message, which gave little or no information to Congress, without coming to that conclusion. Speaking for myself, I have wondered whether or not it was not hastily sent, because the House, under the splendid leadership of our distinguished and beloved Speaker and the majority leader, was contemplating upon its own account proceeding to consolidate some of these agencies in the interest of economy and efficiency. I am led to that conclusion by the fact that the President waited until the Committee on Appropriations, where all appropriations originate in the Congress, had actually prepared and either passed through the House or had ready for report to it, every appropriation bill save four, the Army, the Navy, the District of Columbia, and the legislative appropriation bills. Why is it that the House was not given last December the benefit of such suggestions as the President might have to make upon the subject of consolidation in the interest of economy and efficiency, so that they could have been put into effect at this Congress and for the next fiscal year? There was a reference made in the message, which was not necessary in discussing the subject at hand, which leads me to believe that perhaps the message was sent here also to stave off a favorable report upon a bill which I introduced after conference with a number of Members in this House, consolidating the Departments of the Army and the Navy into one great department to be known as the Department of National Defense.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I would rather not yield at this time.

Mr. BLANTON. The President's Cabinet officers are against that proposal, and both the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are fighting it, and every one of us who are for consolidation know that during the time since when Mr. Hoover became a Cabinet officer and since he has been in the White House as President there have been more bureaus and expensive commissions created than in any other like period of time in the history of the Government.

Mr. BYRNS. I was coming to that. The bill to which I refer has been pending before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments for a number of weeks, and during that time there has never been a more powerful lobby, in my judgment, at work here in this Capitol in opposition to it. If permitted to demonstrate it, I think I could show you and the country that if you will enact it into law it will save probably $100,000,000 annually when it gets into full operation and not interfere in the least with the efficiency of our fighting forces either in the Army or the Navy. [Applause.] Yet the President, who says that he is in favor of consolidation, announces in advance in this message that he is not in favor of consolidating these two departments. And the heads of these two departments, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] said, who hold no commission from the people, who do not represent the people, but who hold their commissions solely from the President, appeared before that committee, presumably with his sanction and in the interest of their own jobs, opposed the bill being reported out of that committee, so that an opportunity could not be given to the House to pass judgment upon it one way or the other. Not only that, but high officers in the Army, and particularly in the Navy, under the command of the President, have left their desks in the departments and have spent their time up here on Capitol Hill in the committee room and elsewhere opposing that bill. They are objecting to its being reported by the committee to the House so that the light of day can be shed upon it and you and I and others who may be for or against it may have an opportunity to express ourselves upon the subject.

If the President really favors consolidation, if he is really interested in economy, I wish to say to him and to the country that he can save infinitely more by the passage of that bill than he can by consolidating every other agency in this Government. [Applause.] Yet those under his command, those who hold commissions from him, are seeking to prevent a committee of this House from reporting that bill out for consideration. Those two suspicions of mine as to the real motive which prompted this message at this time are my justification for rising this morning to discuss for a while this message which has been sent to the Congress.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman be kind enough to give us his estimate of what will be saved by the consolidation referred to?

Mr. BYRNS. I have already done that, but if that bill be reported out—and I hope it will be, and expect it will be—then I expect to ask time of the House, when I shall discuss it at length. Of course, I can not do it in 15 minutes.

I want to make this suggestion while I think of it. There is something for which legislation is not needed when considerable savings can be made. The President was inaugurated three years ago next March 4. He was heralded over the country as the greatest administrator who had ever entered the White House. It is said—and I have never heard anybody contradict it—that he has created more commissions and more independent boards, some of them without legal authority—and I say that advisedly—than any other President in the history of the entire country. [Applause.] I think he could make a good start in the interest of economy, because all these commissions and boards are spending public money, by abolishing them and devolving their duties upon the legally constituted agencies of this Government which are in a position to render the service for which these boards and commissions were appointed.

I wonder if the President has just realized that there is such a thing as an overburdened taxpayer, to whom he refers in this message. I wonder if he has just become aware that it was owing to the reckless extravagance of the administrations of which he has been an important part that the Government has run into a deficit unequaled by many times in the history of this Government in peace times, a deficit of $903,000,000 last year under his administration, a deficit which will be at least $2,100,000,000, and probably more, under his administration on June 30, 1932. If something is not done the taxpayers and consumers of this country will have to dig down into their pockets to the amount of $1,400,000,000 in order to balance the Budget in June, 1933, after his administration has come to a close.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Final close?

Mr. BYRNS. Final close. That is what I meant. That is the record he is going to leave as to a wise administration of the fiscal affairs of our country. And yet all he does now is to make the feeble gesture of sending in a message when he learns that a Democratic House is about to take up the question of consolidation. The people are not going to be so easily fooled.

Now, the President came into the White House, as I have said, three years ago next March. He came in accredited, as I have said, with being a great public administrator, and with the announcement to the Congress and to the country that we must have a consolidation of agencies in this Government in the interest of economy, and particularly of efficiency. Three years have passed. During those first two years of his administration he had a great majority of his own party in both Houses of Congress, and yet nothing was done. No steps have been taken, except to consolidate the Veterans' Bureau and the Pension Bureau, and, in addition to that, not to consolidate but to actually divide the prohibition personnel, placing part of it in the Department of Justice and leaving part of it in the Department of the Treasury, which Mr. Doran says is costing more money than

it did when they were together, and securing no better enforcement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee 10 additional minutes.

Mr. BYRNS. So I repeat. Why should we now, late in February, be confronted with this message?

Do you know what the President of the United States for the past three years has had at his command? He is in command of every executive department of this Government, and he has a right to tell those executive departments and the heads of independent bureaus, from the head down, to do this or to do that and to gather any information he needs for his own convenience. In addition to that, he has the Bureau of the Budget, placed exclusively under his control, which is costing the Government now $200,000 or more.

Let me read to you for a moment just what the law says that the Bureau of the Budget shall do:

SEC. 209. The Bureau of the Budget, when directed by the President, shall make a detailed study of the departments and establishments for the purpose of enabling the President to determine what changes, with a view of securing greater economy and efficiency in the conduct of the public service, should be made in (1) the existing organization activities and methods of business of such department or establishment; (2) the appropriations therefor; (3) the assignment of particular activities to particular services or the regrouping of services. The results of such study shall be embodied in a report or reports to the President, who may transmit to Congress such report or reports or any part thereof, with his recommendations on the matters covered thereby.

What was the object of Congress in enacting that particular section of the Budget law? It was to give the President of the United States, through this Bureau of the Budget, for which we have appropriated every dollar he has ever asked, an opportunity to do just what he says now, three years after he became President, he would like to have Congress authorized him to do. He has had authority all along to gather the most complete information, but what definite recommendation has he made to Congress with reference to the consolidation or regrouping of services in our Government?

But that is not all. There is a Bureau of Efficiency, and a very competent and efficient bureau, with a courageous and intelligent man at its head, appointed by the President, for which appropriations of $200,000 or more are made every year, and that bureau was established exclusively for the purpose of investigating various departments of our Government and ascertaining where economies and better efficiency could be put into effect So he has had the Bureau of Efficiency under his control in addition to the Bureau of the Budget.

But that is not all. He has the General Accounting Office, with an appropriation of $4,000,000 every year, which the President could call upon for information and work if he needed it. Then, too, he has had sitting by his side in the Cabinet Hon. Walter F. Brown, the Postmaster General, who was the head of the commission to which I will refer hereafter, and who could have offered him advice by reason of his work on that commission.

Now, think of all that great force under his exclusive control and supervision. Why has he waited three years to come here, not to propose something but to tell you that if you will just pass a law giving him the right to do this regrouping during the closing months of his administration he will be able to promote better efficiency? But I tell you if you read that message as closely as I have you will not see where he has stressed very much the question of economy. The only real recommendation he makes in his message is the creation of eight great high-salaried offices [applause], three or four of them new offices, and the others promotions of a director or commissioner to the position of Assistant Secretary. He says that will cost only $40,000. How does he know? I tell you, Mr. Chairman, and I am talking to men and women who know, that there never was an Assistant Secretary created in this Government that did not require a personnel far beyond anything that might be paid to him or his secretary. Create those eight positions if you will.

But I want to tell you that instead of reducing expenses it would be but a few years before you would be appropriating millions of dollars to take care of the personnel in each of these separate offices. [Applause.]

It is significant that while the President tells us he proposes to create these high places—and you note he wants Congress to approve that at the outset—he does not tell us where he is going to reduce in any way. He does not tell you any particular office he is going to abolish. He does not give you the slightest information along that line.

Why, gentlemen, we have been talking about consolidations for the last 12 years. You will remember that just at the beginning of the war Senator Overman introduced a bill in the Senate, which became known as the Overman Act, which gave President Wilson, for the the duration of the war and no longer, the right to consolidate and to regroup services. But the war was on, and naturally you could not expect any real regrouping of services during that time. Then, nothing having been done, for the reasons I have stated, on December 17, 1920, there was created a Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Executive Departments. Under the provisions of the law creating it, it was required to report on the second Monday in December, 1922. President Wilson went out of office on March 4, and Mr. Harding became President. After he became President, on May 5, with a majority of his party in each House, a representative of the Executive was authorized to be appointed as a member of the joint committee at $7,500 per annum. The most anomalous situation that ever occurred, so far as I know, in the history of legislative proceedings was a joint commission of the Senate and House with its chairman named by the Executive from the outside and who really became the commission. Members of that commission told me after that was done that they abandoned all hope and all interest in it. The chairman of the commission at that time was the present Postmaster General, Mr. Walter F. Brown, from Ohio, who was appointed by President Harding.

However, they did something. They filed a rather voluminous report. But they secured an extension of time for filing the report to July 1, 1924.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BYRNS. Then, on June 3, 1924, the joint committee filed a report signed by Senators SMOOT and Wadsworth and Representatives MAPES and TEMPLE, and a supplemental report was signed by Senator HARRISON and Representaitve R. Walton Moore. That report has been lying here without action. The party of the President has been in power during all these years. No attempt has been made to act upon it or even to consider, so far as I know, the suggestions made therein for a regrouping of services.

The President was Secretary of Commerce at that time and afterwards appointed Mr. Brown one of his assistants, and yet we heard nothing from him or anyone else with reference to consolidation. Then, as I said, when he came in three years ago he proposed consolidations, but the matter was dropped and nothing done.

I do not want to take up the time of the committee, and I am going to cut short some of the things I wanted to say. There was one thing which struck me as peculiar about this message, and that was that the President wants Congress to pass this bill and leave the matter entirely up to him. Of course, he says that he will make his report and send it to Congress, and that if nothing is done within 60 days, then it shall become the law. Well, Congress is not going to change it if it is required that it shall be done within 60 days, especially when there is opposition to it. I can fancy that if we passed a bill such as the President proposes it would be a very foolish gesture to provide in it that it shall not go into effect until 60 days after its report to Congress, because if there is some opposition to it, particularly at the other end of the Capitol, you and I know

it would never be given final consideration within that time.

I am not personal in this matter. I am speaking from the standpoint of the record which has been made by these public servants in the interest of economy.

I have told you something about the great deficit that has occurred under the administrations of which the present President was an important part. He was Secretary of Commerce, becoming so on March 4, 1921, and he remained as Secretary of Commerce until he became President, on March 4, 1929.

Let us see just how much he has contributed to these reckless expenditures which have been going on during the past year and just what his part has been toward promoting a situation where we find it necessary to take practically everything the taxpayer has in order to balance the Budget. When he became Secretary of Commerce the appropriations for that great department amounted to $24,369,069.15. When he left the department, in 1929, the appropriations for the Department of Commerce, under Mr. Hoover as its Secretary, had increased to $40,049,168.02, an increase of practically 66⅔ per cent.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BYRNS. Under Mr. Hoover as President that great Department of Commerce is now drawing from the Government and expending out of the Treasury the sum of $54,422,230, more than twice the sum that was being appropriated for it only 11 years ago, when Mr. Hoover assumed charge.

Under the law as it exists to-day, the President of the United States has the power to consolidate offices in the Department of Commerce and in the Department of Labor and to regroup those services, and I suggest, in the interest of economy and, I think, better efficiency, our distinguished President—and I speak of him with the greatest respect—might exercise the administrative power he has in cutting down the expenses of that great department over which he once presided.

In 1926, under the influence, it was generally understood, of the then Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hoover, the President of the United States without asking Congress and without any legislation, because he did not need it, transferred from the Interior Department to the Department of Commerce two great bureaus of this Government. One of them was the Patent Office and the other was the Bureau of Mines. Let us see what happened to the appropriations after those bureaus left the Department of the Interior and went over to this great executive, the Secretary of Commerce. At the time they were transferred the appropriations for the Patent Office, in 1926, amounted to $2,808,800. In 1929, when the President left the Department of Commerce to assume the office of President, they had increased from $2,808,800 to $3,394,415.

Let us take the Bureau of Mines. In 1926 the Bureau of Mines, when in the Interior Department, was expending the sum of $2,101,560. It was transferred to the Department of Commerce and in 1929, the last year when the President was Secretary of Commerce, there was appropriated for it the sum of $2,681,618.

So, my friends, I am justified, I think, in saying that the President has played his part in helping to increase these great appropriations which we are now seeking so hard to reduce, and which the Ways and Means Committee is finding it so difficult to meet in the way of taxes.

Now, I want to say this and then I am going to close. I want to compliment the Members on both sides of the House for the unanimity with which every Member has stood in behalf of economy. There are very few, if any, exceptions I would make if I were called upon to take the roll and go down from top to bottom. I want to compliment you gentlemen upon this side, and those upon my own side, upon the fact we have come here with a determination to hold down appropriations and help, as far as we can, to balance the Budget. I am sure this is going to be the history of this House when it is written at the end of the session.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee two more minutes.

Mr. BYRNS. I have just been handed a statement here which I am going to read you. It is along the lines of the statement I have just been making, showing that even since the President entered the White House the appropriations have increased.

Under Mr. Wilson, in 1921, the expenses of the White House were $293,680, while for the present year of 1932, including the police force, they amount to $652,179, a rather substantial increase in itself.

Now, gentlemen, the point of my criticism, let me conclude, is this: The President of the United States, as it was his duty to do under the Constitution, should have used these great agencies of the Government, not this year or last year, but three years ago, when he became President, to ascertain the facts and to recommend to this House and to the Congress a consolidation of these great agencies which he now says can be made with such great economy and efficiency. [Applause.] Having inexcusably waited two years, he could have sent them up last December in the form of an alternative Budget, and let Congress put them into effect at once without having to wait until after the next election to consider them. I am satisfied in my own mind that if he had sent up an alternative Budget based upon the facts, and convinced this Congress that it meant not only economy but better efficiency, there is not a man in this House who would have opposed it, and we would have put it into effect and saved additional money.

In view of his own delay for three years without taking any steps when his own party was in power, it is not singular that at the first opportunity a Democratic House organization should take steps to do that which he has neglected doing for the past three years. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I read in the newspapers a short time ago a statement emanating from the Democratic leaders to the effect that the era of cooperation with the administration was over and that the country might now look for an era of politics. Judging from the goings-on here on Capitol Hill during the last few days and the speech of the gentleman from Tennessee, who has just left the floor, I conclude that that statement is correct.

The gentleman from Tennessee said that he spoke as the representative of a party that not only believed in economy but had a record for economy. That statement reminded me of a speech which I distinctly recall having heard made on the floor of this House by a former distinguished Democratic chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in the Sixty-third Congress—the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald—in his endeavor to hold down the appropriations then being made by the Democratic Party and to keep them somewhat in line with his party platform.

Just as an indication of what the record of the Democratic Party is on economy, I would like to quote from this distinguished representative of the party in regard to it. Mr. Fitzgerald, the Democratic chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in the Sixty-third Congress, said, and I am quoting from the RECORD of April 10, 1914:

> Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it may seem somewhat strange, but I hope it is not out of place, to remind Members on this side of the House that the Democratic platform pledged us in favor of economy and to the abolishment of useless offices; but it did not declare, Mr. Chairman, that the party favored economy at the expense of Republicans and the abolition of useless offices in territory represented in this House by Republicans while favoring a different doctrine wherever a Democratic Representative would be affected. In a few months I shall be called upon in the discharge of my official duties to review the record that this Democratic House shall have made in its authorization of the expenditure of the public moneys. Whenever I think of the horrible mess that I shall be called upon to present to the country on behalf of the Democratic Party [laughter on the Republican side] I am tempted

to quit my place. I am looking now at Democrats who seem to take amusement in soliciting votes on the floor of this House to overturn the Committee on Appropriations in its efforts to carry out the pledges of the Democratic platform. They seem to take it to be a huge joke not to obey their platform [laughter and applause on the Republican side] and to make ridiculous the efforts of the members of our party who do try to live up to the promises they made to the people. I know that some Members on this side are voting continually for appropriations because they fear the wrath of the public if they do not vote out of the Public Treasury assistance for everything anyone suggests. I have in my hand a letter which is somewhat characteristic of the correspondence which I receive daily.

If I placed my political fortunes above my sworn duty under the law, I would not attempt to carry out the promises of the Democratic platform, but I should place myself at the head of this band of Treasury looters upon every occasion.

This is the record for economy of the Democratic Party, the party which the gentleman from Tennessee now represents in this House.

It is always interesting to see the enthusiasm of new converts to a cause. They frequently deceive themselves into believing that they have originated something new and sometimes, as is the case here, try to take credit for it when others have, as a matter of fact, pioneered in the cause for years. So it is in this case. Not content with announcing the program of the Democratic Party, the gentleman from Tennessee has attempted to attack the record of President Hoover for economy and his stand for the reorganization of executive departments. The Democratic Party undertakes a big job when it undertakes to criticize or attack the record of the present President of the United States on this program of economy and of reorganization of departments. His record is unassailable in that respect.

He has a consistent record in that respect, to my personal knowledge, of more than 12 years. He has advocated, during those years, in season and out of season, a reorganization of the different bureaus and activities of the Government, recommending that some be abolished, others consolidated, and all of them put into a jurisdiction where they would have proper supervision, to the end that waste and duplication in the Government service might be eliminated.

No amount of talk can alter the record. The President's record in that respect, or upon that policy, is consistent from beginning to end. I repeat that he has urged such reorganization in season and out of season. He advocated it in public and in private all the time he was Secretary of Commerce, and he has urged it on Congress in every message that he has sent to this body since he became President of the United States. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Tennessee referred to the Joint Committee on Reorganization of the Executive Departments, appointed in pursuance of a resolution passed in December, 1920. Some of you will remember that that resolution was fathered by a former Member of Congress, Mr. Reavis, of Nebraska. He introduced it, spoke for it, fathered it. The agitation for such reorganization was first started by the American Society of Engineers, of which the President was a distinguished member, and at one time, I believe, its president, and Mr. Reavis voiced the sentiment of that society here in the House.

That committee consisted originally on the House side of the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Reavis, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Doctor TEMPLE, and the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Moore. From the Senate it consisted of Senator SMOOT, Senator Wadsworth, of New York, and Senator HARRISON, of Mississippi. Some of you know that the resolution provided that the President shall have a personal representative on the commission, to be appointed by him, who should act as chairman, and President Harding appointed Walter F. Brown, of Toledo, the present Postmaster General, to that position.

Mr. Brown made an intensive study of the departments. He endeavored to get the cooperation of the heads of the different departments and of the Cabinet officers. After a year or more of such intensive study and work, he recommended a tentative set-up or plan for consolidation.

I may say in passing that in that set-up he proposed a consolidation of the War and Navy Departments.

I may say here too that in the process of time, the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Reavis, retired from Congress, and Mr. Webster, of Washington, was appointed to take his place. Afterwards, when Judge Webster resigned from Congress to accept an appointment to the Federal court, I was appointed to take his place. That was before the hearings before the joint committee were started, so I was a member of the joint committee and present when the hearings were had.

The joint committee held hearings on the tentative set-up proposed by Mr. Brown, starting January 7, 1924. I have a copy of them here. The joint committee heard every member of the President's Cabinet except the Secretary of State. He was not heard because there was no radical change proposed in the set-up of the State Department. All other members of the Cabinet were heard.

After the hearings closed the committee went into the subject exhaustively, in executive session. It finally drafted a bill to carry out its recommendations and drafted its report. Senator SMOOT introduced the bill in the Senate, and I introduced it in the House of Representatives. It came up during the short session of Congress in 1924 and 1925, I believe. Identical bills were introduced and pending in both Houses of Congress. Mr. SMOOT made a motion at one time to make the Senate bill the order of business in the Senate, but the majority of the Senate voted against that motion. Those of you who are interested enough to look at the roll call in the Senate on that motion will see that the most of the men who voted against that motion were Democrats of the Senate, and not Republicans.

After the Senate refused to take it up there was nothing to be gained in taking it up in the House, so it was never considered here.

During the next recess of Congress, in collaboration with the Department of Commerce, with Secretary Hoover at the head—or, to be more accurate, in collaboration with Secretary Hoover and his Assistant Secretary, Mr. Drake—a joint resolution was drafted which provided for the set-up of the joint committee of Congress, consisting of two Members of the Senate and two Members of the House and one man to be appointed by the President, to make a study of the departments and independent bureaus of the Government and report to the President any consolidation or reorganization which it thought best; and if the President approved of the recommendations of that committee, he was by Executive order to put them into effect. What was the experience with that joint resolution? First, let me say that after that resolution was prepared Secretary Hoover, Senator SMOOT, and myself went to the White House to interview President Coolidge to get his approval of the resolution, and we introduced it with administration approval. All along, from first to last, the leading spirit, the leading proponent of this reorganization program, was the present President of the United States—President Hoover. [Applause on the Republican side.] He was then Secretary of Commerce. He went to the White House with us; it was in his department and under his direction that the resolution was drawn.

I introduced it in the House, went before the Rules Committee, asked that a rule be reported out of that committee to make it in order, but the alleged constitutional question was raised to it by some of the Members of the Rules Committee, among them the then Democratic leader, Mr. Garrett, against reporting it, because it was a delegation of too much legislative authority to the President. It was never reported by the Rules Committee, and that attempt at reorganization failed, as had every other attempt of the present President of the United States, to put through some reorganization program and thereby prevent duplication and waste in the Government service.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In other words, we gather from the gentleman's statement that he is undertaking to shift the responsibility from the President for failure to perfect these reorganizations to the Republican Party in Congress, which has been in control for some years?

Mr. MAPES. I am not trying to shift the responsibility from anybody; I am trying to keep the record straight; I am trying to put the responsibility where it belongs. It does not belong upon the shoulders of the present President of the United States, as your chairman of the Committee on Appropriations would lead the country to believe. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have never made a political speech on this floor.

I make very few of them anywhere. I am not making a political speech now, but I think the RECORD ought to be correct in respect to the people who want economy and who have advocated economy, and the blame should not be laid where it does not belong. Credit should be given to the man who, in season and out of season, has advocated this proposition for so many years. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from Tennessee referred to the expansion of the Department of Commerce during the administration of Secretary Hoover of that department. Yes; it did expand, and the gentleman from Tennessee might well have added that it increased in usefulness a hundredfold under Secretary Hoover's administration. In his eagerness to emphasize this new conversion of himself and the Democratic Party to a program of governmental economy, he forgot to give some of the well-known reasons for the expansion of the Department of Commerce under Secretary Hoover. He forgot to say that the Patent Office was transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Commerce during Secretary Hoover's administration, bringing with it 1,228 additional employees to the Department of Commerce. He forgot to say that the Bureau of Mines was also transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Commerce during Secretary Hoover's administration, bringing with it 971 new employees to the Department of Commerce. He forgot to say that during Secretary Hoover's administration of the Department of Commerce, Congress created the Civil Aeronautics Division of that department which now has 538 employees.

Who would attempt to say that this division is unnecessary and should be abolished? He forgot to say that during the administration of Secretary Hoover the department was required to make a census of agriculture and of manufactures, which increased the number of employees in the Bureau of the Census from 1,664 to 2,518, or an increase of 854. He forgot to say that by reason of the enactment of the laws regulating the Alaskan fisheries it was necessary to increase the employees in the Bureau of Fisheries from 462 to 700, or an increase of 238, during Secretary Hoover's administration. During that same time the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce increased from a personnel of 595 to 1,469, an increase of 874, due to the establishment by Congress of a much more effective organization in the interests of foreign trade. These transfers and additional activities of the department account for an increase of 4,703 employees, all of them due to acts of Congress or the transfer of other functions to the department, as against a total increase in employees of 4,608, or an actual decrease in the Government so far as administrative action could affect it of 95. During this period, of course, the business of the country increased by leaps and bounds, to say nothing of the constant increase in population.

During this same period the office of the Secretary shows a decrease from 183 employees to 144; the Steamboat Inspection Service, a decrease from 366 to 358; the Bureau of Navigation shows a decrease from 230 to 166 employees; the Bureau of Standards a decrease from 968 to 900 employees; the Bureau of Lighthouses, a bureau whose work is constantly expanding, a decrease from 5,909 employees to 5,905.

During the same period and from the time it was taken over by the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of Patents shows a decrease from 1,228 employees to 1,191, or a decrease of 37 employees, although the work was enormously expanded and although the revenue from these increases reverts to the bureau. It is interesting to know that that bureau, as a matter of fact, instead of being a cost to the Government has now become one where the Government makes a surplus.

That the expansion of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce as the result of various acts of Congress has more than justified itself is indicated by the fact that the number of inquiries from persons interested in the export business increased, during Secretary Hoover's administration of it, from 661,000 in the year 1923 to 2,770,000 in the year 1928. The cost of organizing and handling these inquiries from the American public was cut from $2.38 per inquiry at the beginning of this period to $1.34 at the end of the period.

The statement has been made that the consolidation of the World War Veterans' Bureau, the soldiers' homes, the civil-service pensions, and the Pension Bureau has resulted in the increase in the number of employees. That is true. They have increased from 31,576 to 36,408, or a net increase of 4,832. But in the meantime, Congress has enacted veterans' legislation which has increased the number of beneficiaries on account of whom payments are being made by the bureau, exclusive of insurance and adjusted-compensation benefits, from 1,079,044 to 1,557,790, or an increase in the number of persons having to be dealt with regularly each month by 478,746.

Furthermore, as the result of the increase in hospitalization by acts of Congress, the number of persons in hospitals has increased from 49,346 to 59,862, or an increase of patients of 10,516. Beyond this, the various acts of Congress passed since that time in connection with adjusted compensation have increased the number of persons with whom it has been necessary to open accounts from 1,378,862 to 3,647,855, or an increase in the number of accounts in this one branch alone of 2,268,993. In other words, while the number of employees in the bureau has increased by about 12½ per cent, yet the number of persons with whom the bureau has been called upon to deal has increased by 2,776,000, or more than 100 per cent.

Who is there here who thinks that there ought to be any material reduction in the office of the Veterans' Administration, which is charged with the responsibility of looking after the disabled veterans of all wars and of the widows and orphans of such veterans?

Nobody needs to take the word of anyone upon the question of the record of President Hoover for economy in the reorganization of Government departments. The record itself is conclusive. For example, on page 349 of the hearings before the Joint Committee on Reorganization of Executive Departments under date of January 22, 1924, Secretary Hoover said:

> No one who has had large experience in large industrial or other organizations will assert for one moment that the Federal Government is not badly in need of administrative reorganization. The fine results of the budgetary system in producing economies have now almost spent themselves unless there can be such a reorganization of Government administrative structure as makes it possible to secure better appropriation policies to eliminate overlaps and unnecessary division of functions. Moreover, whatever these reductions of expenditures may be, they are not, in my mind, as important as the economies to the public in its relations to the Government and in the large ability of Congress to handle certain types of expenditure with better comprehension and long-view policies.
>
> I do not believe that any Government reorganization will ever take place that will meet with agreement among the executive heads of the Government. Cabinet heads necessarily take color from their subordinates and subordinates are, from the nature of things, bound to be in opposition to serious change. If there is to be reorganization, it will have to be carried out by Congress and the President. The men who are at the head of various bureaus and secondary functions of the Government believe honestly and earnestly in the purpose of their service and they are bound to object to any change which seems to them would decrease their activities, reduce their personnel, or require them to take a less important position in some other grouping. They naturally and properly feel that the service which they direct is the most important function of the entire Government and that minimizing it in any direction would be wrong.
>
> Some of them feel so strongly that they feel it right to engage in propaganda in opposition to change. The cumulation of such

activities from many sources is likely to break down every attempt at reorganization as hitherto. No one deserves higher admiration than the permanent officials of the Government, but long years of experience in reorganization of private concerns and some years of experience in the Government have led me to believe that if the overlap and waste in the Federal Government are to be eliminated it must be handed down from on high and not attempted as the result of agreements, for they can never be brought about.

I call attention particularly to the difficulties of our reorganizing the Government departments through legislative action, and I want to show you how consistent the policy of the President has been during all these years ever since he came into the Government service in 1921. On page 352 of those hearings he said:

In view of the accumulation of resistance which will come from Government officials to any grouping, obvious from the hearings before this committee and the propaganda in the country by interested bureaus against such groupings and reorganization, it will be extremely difficult to secure a precise set-up by congressional action. Plausible arguments are made pro and con which can only confuse the Members of Congress who are not able to give the time and attention necessary to get to the bottom of these questions. Furthermore, a complete rearrangement of organization to-day would require amendment again to-morrow. New functions and new activities are constantly under creation by Congress to meet the tides of necessity.

Here is a suggestion he made back in 1924, exactly the same as he made in his message to Congress yesterday:

I would therefore like to make a suggestion as to the method by which this matter could be handled with more certainty of success and assurance of accuracy, not only at the present moment but for the future.

Still the gentleman from Tennessee gets up here and says that this message of the President delivered here yesterday must have been hastily written. It is the result of the convictions of 15 years of active work and observation in the Government service.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. BREEDY. The gentleman from Tennessee, I think unintentionally, because he is eminently fair, quoted a section of the Budget, and I think he referred to section 209, in which he said to the Committee of the Whole that the President had always had the power to effectuate the consolidations that he now suggests to Congress and asks for in the special message. Of course, that is not the fact. He has the power under section 209 to direct the Bureau of the Budget to make examinations and report to him, and he, in return, reports and recommends to Congress.

In his special message of yesterday he asks that we delegate to him special power to effect consolidations, himself.

Mr. MAPES. Of course, the gentleman from Maine is right. With a very few exceptions, all the activities of the Government are created and put into the different departments by statutory law, and the President can not remove an activity from one department that has been created and placed there by law, without some authorization by some other law that repeals the existing one. That is self-evident.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. Of course, the gentleman from Maine is entirely correct.

Now, continuing the President's statement before the Joint Committee on Reorganization of Executive Departments in 1924, page 353, he said:

This suggestion is that Congress should give authority to the President—

Identically the same as he suggested yesterday—

to make such changes within limits of certain defined principles as may be recommended to him by an independent commission to be created by Congress and clothed with these authorities. The broad principle of grouping by major purpose could be laid down by legislation and the major purposes of the departments could be likewise defined. The groups, according to major purpose, could be enumerated by the legislation and groups assigned to departments. Then the details of transfer of individual bureaus and functions to meet those principles could be left to the President upon the recommendation of such a commission.

Let me say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and to the other Members of the House that those who have had some experience in studying this reorganization problem are convinced that that is the only practical and feasible way, in fact, the only way, that a reorganization of the executive departments that is worth while will ever be accomplished. [Applause.]

With those principles defined and groupings decided—

Secretary Hoover continued—

then I believe that the reorganization should not only take place quickly and on sound lines, but also such a continuing body to make any changes that develop, as necessary, and take cognizance of new legislation in its relationship to administrative provision.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], I repeat, said that the President's message must have been hastily written. He made that suggestion in 1924. What did he say yesterday in this hastily prepared message? This is what he said. I quote from his message, on page 4182 of the RECORD:

There is little hope for success in this task unless it is placed in the hands of some one responsible for it, with authority and direction to act. Moreover, the consummation of a comprehensive reorganization at one moment is not in the best public interest. Such reorganization should be undertaken gradually and systematically, predicated on a sound and definite theory of government and effectuated as the result of study and experience gained in the actual process of reorganization.

If anybody thinks that any effective reorganization program or any program worth while can be worked out overnight here in the House of Representatives, he has another guess coming.

The President said again at another point in his message to Congress of yesterday:

Authority under proper safeguards to be lodged in the President to effect these transfers and consolidations and authority to redistribute executive groups in the 10 executive departments of the Government or in the independent establishments, as the President may determine by Executive order, such Executive order to lie before the Congress for 60 days during sessions thereof before becoming effective, but becoming effective at the end of such period unless the Congress shall request suspension of action.

And still the gentleman from Tennessee would lead the House to believe that this message was hastily written. The haste has been all on the other side. In the consideration of this question of haste it may not be out of place to suggest that this message of the President was written and advance copies of it distributed to members of the press several days before it was read in Congress, to be released for publication when read. Let me ask if this resolution introduced in the House by the gentleman from Tennessee, creating a so-called economy committee was not "hastily written" and introduced after some one learned what was in the President's message?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I happened to be looking over the RECORD this morning of the proceedings of yesterday in another body, and in their order of business was Senate Joint Resolution No. 76, entitled "Reorganization of Executive Departments." The consideration of it was objected to by the Senator from Colorado, Mr. COSTIGAN, a Democrat. It was introduced by Senator GEORGE, another Democrat. Is this position of the President reasonable or unreasonable? Listen to the answer to that question of this distinguished Democratic Senator. Let me read his answer from the RECORD of yesterday.

Senator GEORGE. I want to take this occasion to emphasize the fact, and I believe it to be the fact, that if any progress is ever made in the consideration of consolidation of boards, bureaus, agencies, and services, or in the elimination of unnecessary boards, bureaus, agencies, and services, it must be done by vesting authority in some one who can act. I know of no one who is better qualified to act than the President of the United States at any time.

[Applause.]

That is from one of the leading Democratic Senators. Here is what he said further, after some colloquy, and let me say that after some study of this question his position is, in my judgment, absolutely sound. Nobody who has ever

studied the problem of reorganization of executive departments can get away from it for a moment.

Here is what he said:

If we are going to do anything more than to pay lip service to economy—

Mark his language—

If we are going to do anything more than to pay lip service to economy, so far as it may be effected by consolidation and simplification of government, we must vest the power and authority to act in some one, and who better than the Chief Executive when we are dealing with the executive offices.

[Applause.]

Now, the gentleman from Tennessee says that the President has not submitted a program. It seems ridiculous to take the time of the House to answer that statement in view of his record. I have before me a speech which he made on the reduction of waste in Government by reorganization of executive departments, when he was Secretary of Commerce, before the thirteenth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, on May 21, 1927.

This is what he said in that speech:

Organization and coordination are essential in business. They are highly essential in government, for the Government is the greatest business undertaking yet submitted to the mind of man. Bad coordination among industries finally comes home to the people as a whole in the form of increased prices. And bad organization in government comes home in many more directions than even the taxes it wastes.

I want to interrupt the reading of that statement long enough to say this before I forget it: The only time the Congress has ever given any President authority to reorganize the executive departments was in time of war, when it gave it to your Democratic President, President Wilson, and he never exercised any power under it at all. [Applause.]

I do not criticize him for that, because it was during a time of great emergency; but when you talk about Presidents not acting, keep in mind that he was the only President who ever had authority to act and he took no action at all. If it was not unconstitutional to give a Democratic President such authority, why is it unconstitutional to give it to President Hoover?

Then the President went on to say, in this speech before the chamber of commerce in 1925:

And this is another of these laborious subjects in which stimulating oratory is about as serviceable as a sermon on high voltage, and it contains about the same proportion of humor and good cheer as a reminder that we have to work when the trout are rising.

Nobody ever made a more truthful statement than that. It is not oratory that is needed to conduct these reorganizations. It is some one with practical common sense who knows where the overlapping is and where the wastes are. Secretary Hoover continued:

Over many years our people have been striving to better the Federal administration. We have succeeded in two major steps.

Repeating the same thought he mentioned before the Committee on the Reorganization of Executive Departments:

We still have a third equally important and perhaps more difficult one to accomplish. The first step was the establishment of Government employment based upon merit; the second was the establishment of adequate control of appropriations through the Budget System. There still remains the third and even more important step to relieve the taxpayer of a greater but more obscure waste—that resulting from faulty organization of administrative functions. And the first two steps will never reach the full realization without the third.

In that speech he goes on to tell about the number of bureaus in the Government, the number of employees and the lack of any system in putting the different activities of the Government into different departments and how much could be saved by a thorough and businesslike reorganization:

Every single department, bureau, and board in the entire Government should be placed upon the operating table.

The gentleman from Tennessee says this message must have been hastily written, yet the present President of the United States said before the Chamber of Commerce in 1925:

Every single department, bureau, and board in the entire Government should be placed upon the operating table and a clean-cut separation established between semijudicial and semilegislative functions on the one hand and of administration on the other.

Then he says in another place:

To illustrate my point, I have made a partial collection of misfits and in so doing I have taken no account of either incidental functions or semilegislative or semijudicial agencies, except so far as they have administrative functions.

He then referred to the construction of public works and the number of bureaus or agencies, doing such work, 14 in all, and pointed out that they are located in 9 different departments. He pointed out at length what he thought ought to be done in that respect.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. YON. This recommendation was made in 1925, and since that time the number of boards and bureaus has increased and the appropriations have increased. Why at this late date has nothing been undertaken?

Mr. MAPES. Something has been undertaken, I will say to the gentleman from Florida. Some of us for years have been trying to have something done but we have not been making as much noise as the Democratic Party has been making in the last few days about it. However, we have a real appreciation of the difficulties involved in it, and the present President of the United States certainly has tried in season and out of season to have something done but, as I have said, he has not succeeded in getting Congress to act, but it is no fault of his that Congress has not acted.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Is not Congress responsible for the situation?

Mr. MAPES. Congress is absolutely responsible. I do not want to take the time to go into this at length, but many gentlemen here know that if you propose to change any activity of the Government the bureau or board affected will have some friend in Congress to oppose it. If we try to make a change some Member of Congress will say, "Well, it is going to affect my friend, I am not very much interested in it, so I guess I will protect him and vote against it." You get an accumulation of those situations in any general reorganization program to such an extent that it is absolutely impossible to put a bill through Congress which provides for a general reorganization of the executive departments. There is no question about that.

Mr. DYER. So the thing to do is to give the President the authority?

Mr. MAPES. Absolutely.

Mr. KETCHAM. If I recall correctly, my colleague who now has the floor served a number of years ago on a commission that went into this matter very exhaustively.

Mr. MAPES. I have called attention to that.

Mr. KETCHAM. I wanted to get the gentleman's judgment upon this proposition. Has the gentleman ever seen a more comprehensive or complete plan for the very thing desired than is comprehended in the series of recommendations now before us from the President of the United States?

Mr. MAPES. Not at all; and the Members of Congress who did the committee the honor to read its report all said it was a very fine report and one that ought to be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Michigan five more minutes.

Mr. MAPES. But that joint committee was confronted with the difficulties that everybody knows any committee will be confronted with, and that is the absolute impossibility of getting the average Member of Congress to take enough time or interest to study the situations until he realizes the merits of the proposals enough to resist these campaigns that are made by his friends who are going to be affected.

The President further said in this speech before the Chamber of Commerce in 1925:

Nor will we ever attain reorganization until Congress will give actual authority to the President or some board, if you will, or a

committee of its own Members to do it. It is of no purpose to investigate again and report. We have had years of investigation and every investigation has resulted in some recommended action. Congressional committees have for many sessions, and even so late as the last session, reported out important recommendations. What is needed is the actual delegation of authority to act.

I have said that the President in every message he has made to Congress has recommended this reorganization program.

He started off with his acceptance speech on August 11, 1928. On June 6, 1929, in his message to Congress, he said:

In order to secure the utmost expedition in the reorganization and concentration of responsibility in administration of the Federal bureaus connected with prohibition enforcement, so greatly needed to improve their effectiveness, I recommend that the Congress appoint a joint select committee to make an immediate study of these matters and to formulate recommendations for consideration at the next regular session.

I shall be glad to appoint a committee from the departments to cooperate with such a committee of the Congress.

And in his message to Congress of December 3, 1929, he said—and I am only quoting the conclusion:

With this background of all previous experience I can see no hope for the development of a sound reorganization of the Government unless Congress be willing to delegate its authority over the problem (subject to defined principles) to the Executive, who should act upon approval of a joint committee of Congress or with the reservation of power of revision by Congress within some limited period adequate for its consideration.

In a statement to the press of July 8, 1930, he reiterated the same thought. In an Executive order of July 21, 1930, he made certain consolidations of the activities of the Government with respect to the veterans.

In his message to Congress of December 8, 1931, he said:

I have referred in previous messages to the profound need of further reorganization and consolidation of Federal administrative functions to eliminate overlap and waste, and to enable coordination and definition of Government policies now wholly impossible in scattered and conflicting agencies which deal with parts of the same major function. I shall lay before the Congress further recommendations upon this subject, particularly in relation to the Department of the Interior.

In this message he again recommends that the public building and construction activities be placed under one head, and in a statement to the press of December 29, 1931, he renewed the same thought and then again in his message which was read from the desk here yesterday afternoon he expressed the same purpose.

Oh, how impossible it is to attack the record of President Hoover on his reorganization program. How hard up the Democratic Party must be for an issue if it has got to rely upon its attempt to belittle the record of the present President of the United States in this respect. It can not be done. He has the record and it is not ridiculous as is the record of the Democratic Party on economy. He has a consistent and unimpeachable record of constructive and active recommendation and advocacy of this program for a period of over 12 years. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] has made some rather sweeping charges here to-day, and by inference would have us believe even worse than he has charged directly. The purpose of his remarks seems to be to show that the Republican administration for the last 11 years has been wasteful and that the present President of the United States, both as President and as a Cabinet officer under the two preceding Presidents, has been wasteful as an official and inconsistent in connection with governmental consolidations so far as effecting economies is concerned. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] has effectively and thoroughly answered the gentleman's speech, so that I need refer to but a single point covered by the gentleman's charges.

On account of the President having been Secretary of Commerce for a period of over seven years preceding his election to the Presidency, the Department of Commerce is singled out by the gentleman from Tennessee as a special object of attack. He cites increased appropriations in this department and would have us infer that this means waste or extravagance. He barely mentions the transfer of two important bureaus from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Commerce; namely, the Patent Office and the Bureau of Mines; nor does he even mention the creating by Congress of two additional activities, the Radio Division and the Aeronautics Branch. No reference is made by the gentleman to these and other additional duties that have been imposed by Congress upon this department in response to the demands of business and the people generally for increased service.

The Bureau of Mines and the Patent Office were transferred to the Department of Commerce in 1925 by Executive order, while the Aeronautics Branch was created by law in 1926 and the Radio Division later.

In order to place the matter fairly before the committee, I wish to present a few facts in regard to the Department of Commerce during most of the period in which the present President of the United States was Secretary of Commerce. The figures given by the gentleman from Tennessee as to the total appropriations during these years would appear to confirm what the gentleman attempts to prove, that there had been a considerable increase.

Let us analyze the figures and then see what are the facts. At the beginning of the fiscal year July, 1922, there were 11,255 employees in the Department of Commerce. On July 1, 1929, a year after Mr. Hoover resigned from the Cabinet, there were 16,784 employees. On the face of it, this looks favorable to the gentleman's contention, but let us analyze it.

During this time there had been two large bureaus transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Commerce, and Congress had created two new ones and had added additional duties, so that the total number of employees, instead of being increased by 5,389, as it would appear if proper deductions are made for the additional bureaus, the total personnel was increased by only 1,715, an increase of 15 per cent, or a little over 2 per cent during each year.

Now, take the Secretary's office, which includes the chief clerk's office, and the service divisions under it. In 1922 there were 183 employees. In 1928, when Mr. Hoover went out of office, there were 144 employees, or a reduction of 39 employees in the office immediately under the direction of Mr. Hoover as Secretary. Does this indicate a desire to expand extravagantly?

I have had prepared a table showing the changes in personnel in the various bureaus of this department between 1922 and 1928, as follows:

Office and number of employees

Secretary of Commerce:	
1922	183
1928	144
A decrease of 39 employees.	
Bureau of Census:	
1922	1,664
1928	2,518

An increase of 854 employees due to the regular periodical taking of the census of agriculture and the census of manufactures—agriculture census every five years, manufactures census every two years.

Steamboat Inspection:	
1922	366
1928	358
A decrease of 8 employees.	
Bureau of Navigation:	
1922	230
1928	166
A decrease of 64 employees.	
Bureau of Standards:	
1922	968
1928	900
A decrease of 68 employees.	
Lighthouse Bureau:	
1922	5,909
1928	5,905
A decrease of 4 employees.	
Coast and Geodetic Survey:	
1922	978
1928	991
An increase of 13 employees.	
Bureau of Fisheries:	
1922	462
1928	700
An increase of 238 employees.	

This increase is mainly due to the administration of the White Act of June 6, 1924, providing for protection of the salmon fisheries of Alaska, which were nearing exhaustion; aiding the States in conservation and administration of their fisheries; direct aid to the commercial fisheries in the solution of their problems of handling, preservation, and distribution of fishery products and the saving of the waste products of the fisheries; and organization of the Upper Mississippi Wild Life and Fish Refuge under an act approved June 7, 1924.

Patent Office: The Patent Office was brought into the Department of Commerce in 1925 with a personnel of 1,228; in 1928 it was 1,191, a decrease of 37 employees.

Bureau of Mines: The Bureau of Mines was brought into the Department of Commerce in 1925 with 971 employees; in 1928 there were 983, an increase of 12 employees.

Aeronautics Branch: The Aeronautics Branch was organized in 1926 with 164 employees; in 1928 it had grown to 538, an increase of 374 employees, due to the rapid growth of the industry and the necessity for increased governmental personnel to keep up its greatly expanded regulatory duties.

Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce:

1922	595
1928	1,469

An increase of 874 employees.

The expansion in this bureau was primarily due to a very large increase in demands made upon the department for information regarding foreign economic conditions affecting American interests. Our stake abroad was greatly extended after the war through private investments which rose from eight billions in 1922 to nearly fourteen billions in 1928. Meantime our exports increased almost as heavily as did also such related lines as shipping, foreign branch factories, and so forth. As a consequence of this, the number of inquiries on such topics received by the department grew from 505,661 in the fiscal year 1921–22 to 2,770,773 in the year 1927–28. Incidentally, the work of meeting this tremendous new burden was so organized that the cost of handling each inquiry was cut from $2.38 in the beginning of the fiscal year 1922 to $1.34 in the fall of 1928. During this same period the number of inquiries handled by each employee of the bureau was increased more than 120 per cent. Perhaps the best evidence of the efficiency of this expansion is revealed in the actual results achieved in the field of trade promotion. Records on that point were begun in the fiscal year 1925–26 when voluntarily reported results of this type (orders secured and savings effected by reporting firms as the result of the department's services) totaled $7,319,323. In 1927–28 the total was $14,506,913. It should be carefully noted that these figures represent only those reported voluntarily by a small number of the firms actually assisted in this manner.

Briefly summarized, the foregoing figures show a total of 11,355 employees on July 1, 1922, and 15,963 on July 1, 1928, an increase of 4,608. Deducting from this figure the increase due to Patent Office, Bureau of Mines, and Aeronautics Branch, 2,712, there is an actual increase in the original bureaus in six years of 1,896 employees, or approximately 2½ per cent per year. The increase in all of the bureaus except Foreign and Domestic Commerce is at the rate of 1½ per cent a year.

There has been criticism that our Government is spending too much money on its foreign-trade-promotion activities, or in other words, on the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—an organization built up and made most effective by the President when he was serving as Secretary of Commerce. Do you realize that America's expenditures on her foreign-trade promotion are not as large as those of our principal trade rivals? On a per capita basis our Canadian neighbors spend nearly twice as much as we do on the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. On the basis of export figures American expenditures on trade promotion are only about 75 per cent of those of the British Department of Overseas Trade, an organization similar to our Foreign Commerce Bureau. Even Japan is spending more proportionately than the United States.

Although appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce increased from $1,211,010 in the fiscal year 1921–22 to $3,721,957 in the fiscal year 1927–28—the period when Mr. Hoover was Secretary of Commerce—there was an increase of services rendered by that bureau from 505,661 to 2,770,773 as measured by the number of trade inquiries, which is a fair criterion. Likewise, during this period the cost per inquiry dropped from $2.38 in 1921–22, to $1.34 in 1927–28, or a decrease of 43 per cent. I am now informed that the cost per inquiry service during the past fiscal year has been further reduced to $1.28. This is fair evidence of economical administration.

Each year the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce attempts an evaluation of the results of the services it renders. For many years past this total, which is based on written statements of American firms, has continued to increase. Last year the report showed slightly in excess of $50,000,000. For the fiscal year 1930–31 the foreign trade of the United States shrank approximately 35 per cent in value. In spite of this unfavorable situation, the report for that year shows that American firms, as a result of the bureau's services, have received new business and direct savings to the extent of $57,554,813, a fine tribute to the efficiency of this particular bureau.

The gentleman from Tennessee did not venture to criticize in detail the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, though he did so in the aggregate; but the suggestion has been made that in the interests of economy it would be advisable to close some of the foreign offices of the Department of Commerce in view of the decline in the foreign trade of the United States. This would be a shortsighted policy, and such a move would be especially unfortunate at this particular time. It would be analogous to doing away with our military forces in times of peace. The demands being made upon the foreign offices of the Department of Commerce are greater than ever before. There are many American firms which have abolished their foreign offices and who are looking to the Department of Commerce for advice and information which was formerly furnished them through their own branches. If the foreign offices are closed, no one will be available to carry on the trade-promotion work they are doing; no one will keep American firms informed of financial, tariff, and legal developments which take place; and there would be no one to whom American business might turn for advice and assistance in entering foreign markets. British, French, German, and Italian firms would be greatly encouraged by this retreat of American effort in maintaining its foreign commercial position and would lose no time in impressing upon local business men that Americans are only interested in finding markets for surplus stock. All the effectiveness of the Government's foreign-trade service would be nullified at a time when it is most needed.

The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce maintains the closet cooperation with industry, and all of its activities are the result of the insistent demands which have been made upon it. Many associations are cooperating in a financial way and during the past year industry has contributed over $1,500,000 to carry on some of the work which that bureau is doing. By far the larger part of this amount is in connection with the domestic-commerce activities of the department. We are in a period of readjustment of domestic business in which our business men are trying to find a profit by reducing costs instead of increasing volume. In this field business has found the Department of Commerce most helpful.

Upon a careful analysis of the facts, instead of indicating that there has been a wasteful increase in the Department of Commerce, it appears that the increase has been comparatively small, and that the results have fully justified the increase. [Applause.]

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Has there been any decrease in the number of employees of the House since the Democratic Party came into power?

Mr. TILSON. Not that anyone has noticed.

The gentleman from Tennessee complains of the commissions appointed by President Hoover. He, like every other President, has appointed commissions for the study of facts. Most of these are purely temporary in character. He overlooks the fact that during the present administration only 20 such commissions have been appointed by the President and that Congress has created 24; that of the committees appointed by the President 4 have been supported by Federal appropriations and that the others were purely voluntary and cost the Government nothing. During President Wilson's administration a total of 75 commissions of one kind or another were created by the President for similar purposes and as many more were appointed by Congress on its own motion. During the Coolidge administration 44 commissions were created for these purposes by the President and 74 were created by Congress on its own motion.

Under the leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I propose to set out here certain facts relating to the appointment of public commissions in the past, because they are pertinent now in view of much partisan criticism of the present administration.

In a business so vast and complex as that of the Federal Government a large part of the research work necessarily is carried out by special commissions and committees delegated to investigate a given subject and to report to the President or to the Congress. They also act for the coordination of governmental activities, recommend policies, represent the Government abroad or at national functions, and exercise semijudicial or semilegislative powers delegated by the Congress.

A great majority of these commissions are created not by the President but by the Congress upon its own motion. All of the commissions created by the President are for temporary nonadministrative purposes as are also a large number of those created by the Congress.

The number of commissions set up under recent administrations are:

President Roosevelt	107
President Taft	63
President Wilson	150
President Harding	44
President Coolidge	118
President Hoover	44

The commissions, committees, or conferences are of three varieties:

First. Temporary bodies created by the President's order for the purpose of coordination of Government activities, or for the determination of facts and advice as to policies on special subjects. These commissions cost the Government nothing.

Second. Commissions or committees created by Congress upon recommendation of the President. The expenses of such committees are paid by appropriation.

Third. Commissions created by Congress on its own motion. These expenses are always paid by appropriation.

During President Wilson's administration approximately one-half of the total of 150 commissions were created by Congress upon its own motion. Of those created by or upon recommendations of the President, 10 are still in existence.

During the Coolidge administration, 74 commissions out of a total of 118 were created by Congress. Of the 44 created by the President or upon his recommendation, 39 have completed their tasks and have been released.

During President Hoover's administration 24 out of the 44 commissions were created by Congress. Of the 20 created directly by the President, or upon his recommendation, 12 have completed their tasks and have been released, and only 2 are other than temporary. Of the purely presidential commissions, the expenses of 4 have been paid by the Federal Government, while 17 either cost nothing or rely upon public support.

The following are the commissions or committees created under the present administration, classified as those created by Executive order, those created by Congress upon recommendation of the President, and those created by Congress upon its own motion.

COMMISSIONS CREATED BY EXECUTIVE ORDER

First. Committee on Coordination of Veterans' Services: This was an interdepartmental committee and the result of its investigation and report was the consolidation of all veterans' services into the new Veterans' Administration, with the result of an annual saving in expenditures of fully $10,000,000. The committee has completed its work and has been dismissed.

Second. Advisory Shipping Committee: This committee was appointed to advise upon the sale of certain steamship lines by the Government and the reorganization of others. The policies recommended have been followed with success. The committee has completed its work and has been dismissed.

Third. California Water Commission: This commission was created in conjunction with the Governor of California for the coordination of State and Federal activities in water problems of the State of California. It has cost the Federal Government nothing. The commission has completed its work and has been dismissed.

Fourth. National Drought Committee: This committee was appointed to coordinate Federal, State, and other activities in the matter of drought relief and to recommend a national program. The result of its investigation was recommendations which led to the undertaking of relief by the Red Cross and appropriations by Congress for rehabilitation of agriculture from the drought. It represents no expenditure. The committee has completed its work and has been dismissed.

Fifth. San Francisco Bridge Commission: This commission was appointed in conjunction with the Governor of California to settle the conflict between Federal and State authorities in determination of the location of a bridge across San Francisco Bay. The commission settled this question, which had been a matter of public dispute for over 10 years, and preparations are being made for the construction of the bridge. The commission cost the Federal Government nothing. It has completed its work and has been dismissed.

Sixth. Advisory Committee on Veterans' Preference: This committee was set up to determine policies with respect to employment of disabled veterans and the method of preference to be given by Government departments. It made a report, and Executive order has been issued placing the recommendatitons in action. The committee has completed its work and has been dismissed.

Seventh. Advisory Commission on Unemployment Statistics: This commission was appointed to advise the method by which unemployment statistics should be recruited by the Department of Labor under authority of Congress requiring the establishment of such service. The committee has made its recommendations and they have been placed in action and the committee dissolved. The committee has cost the Government nothing.

Eighth. Emergency Unemployment Committee: This committee was created to coordinate Government activities in employment programs in the depression and secure organization of committees throughout the country through adequate organization of local agencies to take care of distress during the depression. It made an effective contribution to the situation.

Ninth. Interdepartmental Mail Contract Committee: This commission was appointed to coordinate the activities of the Department of Commerce, the Shipping Board, the Army, and Navy in respect to marine mail contracts. It has passed upon and negotiated postal and other contracts, which have resulted in agreements for the construction of nearly 500,000 tons of merchant ships. It is still functioning but costs the Government nothing.

Tenth. Research Committee on Social Trends: This committee is engaged in research into various social questions which bear on immigration, hours of labor, and many kindred subjects. Its expenditures are being met by the Rockefeller Foundation.

Eleventh. White House Conference on Child Health and Protection: This committee conducted investigations into child health and protection and directed the White House conference on that subject, and is engaged in follow-up activities throughout the country. Its expenditures have been met by the A. R. A. children's fund and there has been no expense to the Government. It has made a notable contribution to the welfare of children in coordination of National, State, and local activities. The conference has completed its task except publications.

Twelfth. White House Conference on Home Building and Ownership: This committee is engaged in exhaustive investigation of housing conditions, financial and other methods for extension of home building and home ownership. Its expenses are being paid by private subscription and it costs the Government nothing.

Thirteenth. Advisory committee on illiteracy: This committee was created to coordinate the activities of the Federal Government with State governments and private agencies throughout the country in the elimination of illiteracy. It has carried on active campaigns, organized schools for adults, and has greatly contributed to the elimination of illiteracy. It has been supported by private subscription.

Fourteenth. Council of Personnel Administration: This is purely an interdepartmental committee to establish standards in Federal Government employment.

Fifteenth. Advisory Committee on Education: This committee is engaged in exhaustive study of problems of coordinating the different Government activities together with those of the States and municipalities in questions of education. The committee's expenditures are being paid by the Rosenwald Foundation.

Sixteenth. Timber Conservation Board: This committee was created to study and advise on forestry policies with view to coordination of Federal, State, and private activities in conservation. It is supported by private subscription.

Seventeenth. Anti-Hoarding Committee: This committee was created by the President in volunteer cooperation with leading business and civic organizations of the country for the purpose of stopping the hoarding of money during the economic depression. It cost the Federal Government nothing.

Eighteenth. Committee on Abandoned Army Posts: This committee is made up of departmental officials; was appointed to devise means of utilizing Army posts abandoned in the War Department retrenchment program and cost the Federal Government nothing.

Nineteenth. Committee for the Study of Education in Haiti: This committee was appointed by the Secretary of State and consists of prominent educators in the United States. It is making a study with a view to improving the educational system in Haiti.

Twentieth. The President's Unemployment Relief Organization: This commission was set up under Walter S. Gifford as director to cooperate with the States and municipalities in devising ways and means for the relief of unemployment during the winter of 1931–32. It took over the work of the Emergency Unemployment Committee which was set up at the outset of the economic depression and has made a very distinctive contribution in the relief of the whole unemployment situation.

COMMITTEES CREATED BY CONGRESS UPON RECOMMENDATION OF THE PRESIDENT

Twenty-first. London Naval Conference: This commission negotiated and completed a naval treaty for the limitation of navies. It has saved hundreds of millions of dollars to the American taxpayer and secured parity to the American Navy and brought about better international relationship to both Japan and Great Britain.

Twenty-second. Federal Power Commission: This commission is a reorganization of the previous departmental commission in order to secure more expeditious and independent action than hitherto. It requires no additional expenditure except for salaries of commissioners.

Twenty-third. The Haitian Commission: This commission settled the terms of the withdrawal of the United States from Haiti and set up such arrangements within that island as prevented further revolution. This commission has completed its task and has been dismissed.

Twenty-fourth. National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement: This commission has made exhaustive reports on the whole problem of law enforcement and the reorganization of the law enforcement machinery and the judiciary of the country. The commission in a report said that "Federal participation in enforcement has shown continued improvement since and as a consequence of the act of Congress of 1927 placing prohibition officers under civil service, and the act of 1930 transferring prohibition enforcement from the Treasury to the Department of Justice."

Twenty-fifth. Commission on Conservation and Administration of Public Domain: This commission has made a report on the conservation of western lands and ranges and recommendations for management and disposal of public lands. Its report has been completed and has been submitted to Congress.

Twenty-sixth. The Federal Farm Board: This commission was proposed by both the Republican and Democratic Conventions and was recommended by the President for the relief of agriculture. It is permanent and is designed to aid cooperative organizations of farmers to market their crops.

Twenty-seventh. Reconstruction Finance Corporation: This organization was created by the Congress, upon recommendation of the President, with assets of $2,000,000,000 to assist in the reconstruction of the normal working of the credit fabric of the country with a view to aiding agriculture and industry in obtaining normal conditions. It is temporary in character.

Twenty-eighth. Geneva Arms Limitation Conference: This commission was created by the President, with expenses provided for by the Congress, for American participation in the General Arms Limitation Conference which began in Geneva in February, 1932.

Twenty-ninth. Tariff Commission: This commission is a reorganization of that provided for under the tariff act of 1922. Reorganization both in personnel and methods provided for by the Congress in the tariff act of 1930 was made in order to secure more expeditious action in investigating and increasing or lowering tariff duties to meet changing economic conditions.

PUBLIC COMMISSIONS CREATED BY CONGRESS UPON ITS OWN MOTION

Thirtieth. Interoceanic Canal Board: This board is engaged in a survey of the Nicaraguan Canal.

Thirty-first. Massachusetts Bay Colony Tercentenary Commission: This commission represented the Federal Government in the celebration in Massachusetts. This commission has completed its task and has been dismissed.

Thirty-second. National Memorial Commission: This commission was created by Congress for the erection of a building as tribute to the negro achievements in America.

Thirty-third. Iceland—one thousandth anniversary of the Althing: Commission created by Congress to attend the celebration representing the American Government. The commission has completed its task and has been dismissed.

Thirty-fourth. Yellowstone National Park Boundary Commission: This commission was created to settle the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park. It has completed its work and its report and recommendations sent to the Congress.

Thirty-fifth. Alaska Highway Commission: This commission was created by Congress to make a preliminary survey of the highway from Continental United States to Alaska.

Thirty-sixth. Chicago World's Fair Centennial Celebration: Commission created by Congress to investigate and report with reference to the Federal Government's representation and participation in the celebration. Its report is now before Congress.

Thirty-seventh. Joint Committee to Investigate Pay Readjustment of Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Geodetic Survey and Public Health Service.

Thirty-eighth. Universal draft commission: Public Resolution No. 98 (71st Cong.). Commission to study promotion of peace, equalization of burdens of war, and minimization of profits of war.

Thirty-ninth. District of Columbia fiscal relations: This committee to make full investigation of fiscal relations of the District of Columbia and the United States Government and to report its recommendations to the House.

Fortieth. Charleston, S. C., celebration of two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of founding.

Forty-first. Lewis and Clarke expedition celebration.

Forty-second. Joint committee to investigate Northern Pacific grants.

Forty-third. Joint committee to attend sesquicentennial celebration of Battle of Kings Mountain, S. C.

Forty-fourth. United States Battle of the Monongahela commission.

A careful study of this long list of commissions, boards, and committees heretofore appointed to find facts and help to formulate policies, will completely disprove the oft-repeated charge that the present administration has embarked upon a new or untried policy of dealing with great public problems.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON].

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Chairman, I am in no sense a militarist. However, no matter how much we may hope for peace we can not be blind or deaf to what is going on in the world in the way of preparing for war—hence, the importance of giving heed to the views of those who have in the past rendered services to this country in times of war and who now, although in civil life, give freely of their time from business, without compensation, to prepare for any national emergency that may arise.

I have here a statement prepared by Maj. Robert W. Reed, at the instance of the Kansas City Chapter of the Reserve Officers' Association, which I wish to place in the RECORD. I think it is a convincing statement.

The Kansas City Chapter of the Reserve Officers' Association is made up of the best of the community's citizenry.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *February 15, 1932.*

Hon. JOSEPH B. SHANNON,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHANNON: The Kansas City Chapter, Reserve Officers' Association, has authorized me, by unanimous vote, to lay before you its views on legislation pertaining to national defense. I do this with the knowledge that you have some understanding of our situation here—the work we are doing and the caliber of the personnel in our chapter. We feel that your visit with us—a most pleasurable one—has given you an insight into what patriotically interested citizens are doing chiefly by voluntary effort. In fact I might add that my own view of it is that the Government should not fail to support such activities if for no other reason than to encourage the joining together of high-minded citizens in unselfish support of the Government itself—men who would not have to but are ready to meet any emergency in which their services may be of some value.

Our organization is not advocating a big army nor any change in the already inaugurated military policy of the United States as arrived at by the Congress and set forth in the national defense act. Our interests—and I speak for more than 300 men here in Kansas City—primarily are those of taxpayers and citizens, not of professional soldiers.

The members of our chapter do believe, however, that in the present unsettled condition of world relations, it would be most unwise to reduce the already slender Military Establishment. Many members of the association have seen for themselves, in cantonment, camp, and field, the cost in human lives that is paid when a nation almost totally uninstructed in defense is suddenly hurled into war. It is our belief that leadership, instructed in time of peace, can save many thousands of lives in time of war. The Regular Army is not large enough to supply all of the required leadership; most of it will have to come from the civilian sources. Moreover, this is perhaps wiser in a democracy such as ours, because it prevents the growth of a powerful military caste.

Officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army are being used in a valuable manner to-day to give instruction to the civilian components. But this assistance, which has mutual advantages, will be wiped out if some of the proposals which have been submitted to the Congress are adopted.

In view of the present situation, therefore, I have been asked to lay before you the following points for your consideration:

1. The Regular Army, in both commissioned and enlisted strength, should be kept at its present figure. If it is reduced, it will mean that no personnel will be available for duty with the civilian components. It is our belief that the sending of men from the Regular Army to the civilian components does more than provide merely military training for the citizens interested; it also brings members of the Regular Army into closer contact with the community at large and the views of the everyday citizen.

2. The reserve officers should receive active duty as often as possible for short periods. This is much more valuable than the study of theories and lessons by the correspondence method. The appropriation set aside in the Budget for this purpose is not too large.

3. With the Regular Army greatly reduced and required to cover so many varying assignments, the National Guard has become virtually the "first line" of land defense. It, too, should continue to be supported with appropriations giving its personnel ample camp and armory drill training opportunities.

4. Those who have seen the citizens' military training camps in operation know that they are doing a valuable work. In this year, when so many young men are coming from the schools and colleges to find no immediate jobs available, the camps should not be abandoned, but perhaps even extended to meet the situation.

5. Likely material for junior officers must be found if the military policy already mentioned is to be successful. The best source for these is in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps units of schools and colleges. We believe that a reduction or suspension of this activity would be unwise.

In addition to the above, it is our feeling that the proposal to unite the Army and Navy in one department will not bring about the desired efficiency, and might lead to serious complications in the event of a great national emergency.

Most sincerely,

ROBERT W. REED,
Major A. G.-Res., President Kansas City
Chapter Reserve Officers' Association.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, next to agriculture, the oil industry is the principal one in my State of Oklahoma, and we are very much interested in any legislation that will favorably affect it. The oil industry has been in a very depressed condition for the past few years.

It is estimated that there are approximately 330,000 oil wells in the United States and that of these 300,000 produce on an average only 4.7 barrels of oil per day. The danger is that when the industry is demoralized by ruinously low prices the pumping of thousands of small wells may have to be discontinued and the oil that might have been produced from these wells is forever lost.

The price of oil has fluctuated from $1.45 per barrel to as low as 10 cents per barrel during the summer months of 1931. Of course, oil can not be produced at such ruinously low prices. Every effort has been made to assist the industry. Some three years ago we appealed to Congress for a tariff on oil. Members of the House are familiar with the hearings held at that time, both before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate.

The producers of oil, particularly in the areas where the largest amount of oil is produced, have held numerous conferences and entered into various agreements to pinch in their wells and to reduce the production. As a result production of oil has been greatly curtailed throughout the United States.

At the suggestion of the oil producers and with their approval the Governors of Oklahoma and Texas enforced agreements to prorate oil production through martial law. The price of oil has responded, until it is now around 77 cents per barrel, but that is below the cost of production.

Mr. MANLOVE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. MANLOVE. Is not part of that reduction due, in fact, to the action of the Governor of Oklahoma in closing down the oil wells?

Mr. HASTINGS. I have referred to that and just said that it was done with the approval of the oil people, and that he brought the price up around 77 cents a barrel.

Four of the larger companies are importing oil and refined products into this country. Appeals have been made to them to reduce their importations. The complaint of the oil producers is that these companies have not been reducing their importations in the same proportion as the domestic producers have curtailed the output of their wells.

In 1930 the oil and refined products imported into this country aggregated around 105,510,000 barrels, which was

more than one-eighth of 898,011,000 barrels, the amount of oil produced in the United States.

It was urged before the Ways and Means Committee that the amount of oil and refined products imported into this country approximated about 10 per cent of the total production in this country and that this percentage is not sufficient to unfavorably affect the price of oil and refined products in the domestic market.

The answer to such a contention is that the amount of wheat produced in the United States during the year 1930 was 898,011,000 bushels. The amount imported, upon which a duty was paid, was 21,000 bushels. The duty wheat imported for that year was one-forty-fifth of 1 per cent of the wheat produced.

Let us examine corn. We produced 2,060,185,000 bushels of corn in the United States in 1930. We imported 1,554,971 bushels. This was a very small fractional part of 1 per cent of the amount produced—about one-thirteenth of 1 per cent—a negligible amount.

This negligible percentage, to a measurable degree, applies to many manufactured products imported into this country. However, there was a duty of 42 cents per bushel placed upon wheat and 25 cents per bushel placed on corn imported into this country.

Let me emphasize that there is being imported approximately 10 per cent as much oil and refined products as is produced in this country.

When we were trying to get relief by having a tariff duty placed on oil and refined products during the last session of Congress a resolution was passed directing the Tariff Commission to study the difference between the cost of producing oil in Venezuela and in the United States. The report of the commission shows that it has been found that this difference amounts to $1.03 per barrel.

The Committee on Ways and Means is searching with a financial microscope for every additional source of revenue that can be found. Our expenditures during the last fiscal year exceeded our revenues by $903,000,000. It is estimated that our revenues will fall short of our expenditures by more than $2,000,000,000 during the coming fiscal year, and this committee is trying to raise an additional billion dollars in revenue.

There are certain admitted sources of revenue including a graduation of the income tax in the higher brackets, which everyone favors. The committee is undertaking a most difficult job. Protests are coming into the committee and Members of Congress against increasing our taxes on many subjects.

Here is an industry that is in dire distress. It has been suggested that an excise tax of 2 cents per gallon on imported oil and an excise tax of 4 cents per gallon on imported gasoline and a corresponding tax on other imported refined products would raise approximately $100,000,000. This would relieve the committee of great embarrassment, because it would not have to impose taxes on many other subjects.

On the basis of the amount imported into this country in 1930—crude oil 62,129,000 barrels and refined products 43,489,000—the estimated amount of $100,000,000 levied as an excise tax would have been collected.

It is urged, both before the Ways and Means Committee and through the press of the country, that if an excise tax of 2 cents per gallon on crude petroleum and 4 cents per gallon on gasoline and a corresponding tax on other refined products imported into this country would result in no importations and that no revenue would be collected.

We submit that there are two answers to this argument:

First. The Tariff Commission found that the difference between the cost of producing crude oil in Venezuela and in this country is $1.03 per barrel, and therefore a tax of 84 cents per barrel would not result in greatly reducing the importation of oil and refined products.

The oil area in Venezuela is being rapidly extended and proven, and oil will continue to be produced now that added facilities have been brought to that country at a lower rate than heretofore. It costs more to pipe crude oil from the mid-continent field to the Atlantic seaboard than it does to produce oil in the Venezuela field and ship it to the same points.

Refineries are being enlarged in Venezuela, where great quantities of oil will be refined, and we may expect that much greater quantities of refined products will be imported into the United States.

Second. Conceding that there would be decreased importations of crude oil and refined products which would result in the collection of a reduced amount in revenue, let me invite attention to the fact that the levying of this excise tax would stabilize the oil industry in our own country, and the Government would collect a far greater amount from income and inheritance and other taxes than it would lose because of reduced importations of oil and refined products.

There is no overproduction of oil in the United States if the domestic market is retained to domestic producers. The domestic producers, however, can not produce oil and compete with those companies importing oil from the Venezuelan field. This oil is imported by four of the larger companies—the Dutch Shell Co., the Gulf Oil Corporation, the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana.

Now everyone, in addition to the members of the oil fraternity in my State of Oklahoma, is deeply interested in the protection of the oil industry. It pays to our State a 3 per cent gross-production tax on all oil produced in the State. The proceeds from this tax in a large measure maintain our State government.

In 1926, taxes collected by the State of Oklahoma from this source amounted to $10,483,348.99, and the taxes for the following years, which have been collected by the State, are $11,476,851.40 for the year 1927, $10,063,957.57 for the year 1928, $10,426,263.50 for the year 1929, $8,816,372.76 for the year 1930, and $4,332,123.60 for the year 1931.

This reduction in the amount of taxes collected from this source has had a very serious effect upon the revenues of our State.

Fifty per cent of this tax, including penalties, goes to the general revenue fund of the State, 33⅓ per cent of the tax goes to the counties producing the oil, and 16⅔ per cent goes to the aid of the weak schools of the State.

It will readily be seen, therefore, how the reduction in the price of oil affects the revenues of our State.

During periods of depression in the oil industry there is no new development for oil. When the industry is prosperous, leases are taken in new territory far removed from producing fields. Thousands of additional acres are leased. The farmers are paid rentals for the leasing of their lands that enables them to pay their taxes and other expenses, but during times of depression this new development is discontinued. The farmers are therefore very deeply interested in the welfare of the oil industry.

The depression in the oil industry greatly affects the employment situation in my State of Oklahoma. It is estimated there are now 100,000 men out of employment in Oklahoma.

It is urged, as one of the arguments against legislation levying an import tax against oil and gas and other products, that it will increase the price of gasoline to the ultimate consumer, but I leave it to the experience of every purchaser of gasoline that there has been little difference in the cost of gasoline and other refined products during the past three years, when the price of oil has fluctuated from $1.45 per barrel to as low as 10 cents per barrel. The price of gasoline during all that time has remained practically the same. Its selling price varies in the several States because of the difference in State taxes. In Oklahoma this State tax on gasoline is now 4 cents per gallon. In some States it is 3 cents per gallon, and, I believe, goes as high as 7 cents per gallon in Florida.

During the past three years there has been no appreciable difference in the price of gasoline to the ultimate consumer, and this is also true as to the cost of lubricating oil. The consumer pays around 25 or 30 cents per quart for this kind of oil, whether the price of oil is high or low. The truth is the price of gasoline and other refined products of petroleum

is commercially controlled and has little relation to the price of crude petroleum itself.

The imposition of an excise tax on imported oil and refined products will not only add to the prosperity of the oil industry but to those engaged in mining coal and in other lines of business depending upon the prosperity of those engaged in the production, manufacture, sale, and distribution of oil and its refined products.

When we are searching for every method of taxation let me emphasize to the committee that the levying of an import tax on gasoline and the other refined products of petroleum will not only bring in about $100,000,000 in additional revenue and relieve the committee from taxing other lines of industry, but it will contribute much to the restoration of prosperity to one of the greatest industries in our country, which is in almost a death struggle for existence. The imposition of such an import tax will enable my State of Oklahoma to realize more on account of its gross production tax on oil produced in the State, will lower the local and State taxes to the people, assist the schools of the State, and will encourage leasing of additional territory, and in that way be of benefit to the farmers of the State, and will give employment to thousands of the unemployed in the oil industry and will be a great relief to the people of the country generally.

Mr. SHREVE. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to call attention to a most novel labor situation existing in the Middle West and the Far West. It is the first time in the history of labor that airplane pilots have been locked out. It would present a very interesting situation except for the fact of the tremendous dangers to the public involved. The profession of piloting an airplane, and particularly a passenger plane, requires the highest degree of skill and a great deal of experience. Congress passed a law placing in the Department of Commerce jurisdiction over equipment and personnel.

The Department of Commerce, in the light of experience which we have in this new method of transportation, has promulgated rules and requirements for commercial aviators, and it is working out, with a few exceptions, rather satisfactorily. Naturally, as we gain more experience, the rules and requirements will be changed from time to time. I hope it will not be necessary to change the present system of regulations. The Department of Commerce must realize and always bear in mind that their regulation and enforcement must be for the public interest and not for the convenience of operating companies.

A few days ago there appeared in the Capitol a gentleman—I believe he is the president of the Century Air Lines (Inc.). If I am not mistaken, he had a conference or a hearing with members of the Committee on Appropriations and stated that he would be willing to have his company carry air mails for 50 per cent less than is now being paid to operators having contracts with the Post Office Department. The members of the committee who spoke with him were naturally interested and gave him a courteous hearing, as they always do to any citizen having business with the committee. Then this gentleman—and I refer to a certain Mr. Cord, president of the Century Air Lines (Inc.)—went back to Chicago, called in his pilots, and slashed their wages 40 per cent; and in the course of the negotiations told the pilots he was going "to take the romance out of aviation" and bring down the salary of pilots to $125 a month. Imagine attempting to get licensed, experienced, and trustworthy pilots transporting passengers in the air for less than $30 a week, less than a union truck driver gets in the city of New York.

Then this man announced a lockout, discharged all the pilots, and advertised for new pilots. Many Members of the House have taken an interest in this situation and have communicated with the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Commerce has dispatched their inspectors to Chicago and other points to check on the men employed, as to their qualifications. I am in contact with the Department of Commerce and I think we will be able to prevent attempts of this company in getting Government inspectors to go to out-of-the-way places and secretly check unfit men. A record should be made, kept, and published of who these men are, because you can readily see the danger of putting inexperienced men in charge of passenger planes, not alone for the passengers but for the people on the ground below.

The gentleman who is going to take the "romance out of aviation," I am reliably informed, has placed an armed guard in every plane, right back of the flyer. Just what the purpose is no one knows. Imagine the state of mind of a pilot attempting to operate a plane under such condition. The guards employed are of the usual type and character generally used as strike breakers or scab guards. Now, some will say that such a statement is exaggerated. I will say that the management of this company presents a very low order of citizen, judging from past performances. Permit me to read a letter written last May by this company in the course of preparation for this strike and in the course of the company's competition with other companies. I have in my hand a photostatic copy of a letter, the original of which is in our possession, written by the general manager of Century Air Lines (Inc.), addressed to George H. Pfeuffer, their own terminal manager at Detroit, Mich. It reads:

DEAR SIR: Any number of people, including executives of the Cord Corporation, have advised me that Thompson—

This is a competing line—

is making a practice of telling our passengers who are on the bus with their passengers on the 1.30 schedule that they should ask for refund of their ticket and get out on the first ship, which is Thompson's, and that you have no hesitancy in refunding their money to them so that they can do this.

I can not understand why it should be necessary for anyone to tell you not to permit this, but rather arrange to offset it and, if possible, give Thompson a dose of their own medicine; but it seems that some one must tell everybody just what to do.

Why don't you get some good hard-boiled scrapper and ride him on that bus all day long. If he hears anyone making a suggestion to any passenger about Thompson, have this tough beat him up. It was necessary to do this in the early railroad days and also in the taxicab and bus developments and apparently it is necessary for us to adopt this sort of tactics.

Get after this situation right now and let me hear from you what has been done about it.

Then it is signed W. F. Bliss, their manager.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. MAAS. This is the same organization that was after the air mail contracts?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes, sir. They reduced their pilots, as I said, 40 per cent, and are attempting to bring down licensed experienced pilots, in charge of human life, to a wage of $125 a month. This is the same company the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] has investigated and has filed complaints against with the Secretary of Commerce.

Now, gentleman, Mr. Cord may have taken the romance out of aviation, but he has put the undertaker in aviation; and now I am sure the gentlemen of the House who have and are taking an active interest in the development of aviation will all agree that such conditions must not exist in commercial aviation and that it is quite proper we should advise the traveling public to stay off Century planes until such time as experienced competent pilots are replaced on their ships. Mr. Cord might as well know that if he is conducting this strike on gangster-thug methods, as indicated in the letter I have just quoted, and if he expects that citizens paying fares are going to be in danger of being beaten up, according to the written instructions in their own letter, and pay pilots less than the prevailing rate of the profession, he may never hope to have a contract as long as this low type of individuals are in charge of the Century Air Lines or any other operating airplane company. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER].

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, the measure under consideration is the appropriation bill of the Department of Commerce. The development of trade and commerce is dependent upon two vital factors—money and credit. The business prosperity of the Nation rests upon the

confidence of the people in our banking system, since the banks are the chief sources of supply of both credit and money.

For this reason the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia], one of the recognized leaders of this House, has introduced a bill to provide for the insurance of bank deposits. I also have introduced a bill along similar lines and for the same general purpose. I trust that the Committee on Banking and Currency is giving this matter very serious consideration. I know of no question in which the people of the country are more concerned than that of the safety and security of their money and the availability of credit.

Something more substantial than a proclamation against hoarding is required to bring the money now in hiding back into the banks and turn it again into the channels of trade.

Congress a short time ago passed a bill creating a $2,000,000,000 financial reconstruction corporation, in an effort to improve the credit of our financial institutions, railroads, industry, and agriculture. The reason given for the legislation was that continued financial and commercial disaster has shattered the confidence of the people. The feeling of fear for the future in the public mind is at the bottom of our business troubles. Until general confidence in our financial institutions is restored, little business improvement can be hoped for and prosperity will continue to be "just around the corner."

The prosperity of the Nation is based upon the full use and movement of the people's money, and that depends upon the confidence of the people in our banking system.

The present debacle in business and banking is not a new thing in the economic history of our country. During the years 1837, 1857, 1873, 1893, and 1907 American banks, business, and commercial institutions went through a similar collapse.

Must we always live in dread of the return of panics? Shall American business and finance continue to face the future with fear, or with the courage born of confidence in the safety of our financial institutions?

Banks are now undergoing a severe test as to their ability to serve as safe reservoirs of money and credit and to meet successfully the business crisis that confronts the country. In the past 10 years more than 7,800 banks in the United States have failed, with deposits of over $2,500,000,000. This is an appalling fact. In the year just ended, 2,290 banks closed their doors, with deposits of over $1,750,000,000. These figures are enough to show the staggering blow that the Nation's business has suffered.

BANKING IN BRITAIN

We borrowed our language and our form of government from Great Britain. We still speak the language of Britain, but our laws are not so well enforced, nor have our banks been as safe for depositors as those of our English-speaking brethren.

A short comparison of our banking history with theirs discloses a decided difference in results. Canada, our neighbor on the north, has had but one bank failure in the past 10 years. During this century England has not had a bank suspend, and Scotland has not known a bank failure in a hundred years.

The tremendous fall in commodity prices since the war is one of the chief causes of our many bank failures. Government taxation also takes too large a toll from our national income, and these two causes breed bank failures and bankruptcy. But Britain and Canada have suffered a deflation and shrinkage in commodity prices even more drastic than our own. The burden of taxation which banking and business must bear is much more severe in Britain than in America. Where a citizen of this Republic must contribute $1,000 in taxes upon his income for the support of his Government, the Englishman pays many times as much into his Nation's treasury.

A study of results from liquidation of failed banks in past years shows the comparative looseness of our banking methods and consequent losses to depositors in banks. A statement to me from the Comptroller of the Currency shows that from 1865 to 1929, 70 per cent of proven claims have been paid to creditors of our failed national banks. The average per cent paid to creditors of national banks fully liquidated, for the years 1930 and 1931, was but 50½ per cent of claims of depositors.

Prior to 1915, eight Canadian banks failed. Six of these banks paid note holders and depositors in full and one is still in liquidation. Only one Canadian bank, which closed in 1908, resulted in loss to its creditors.

Since there have been no bank failures in England or Scotland, there have been no losses to depositors in those countries, no hoarding of money, nor runs on their financial institutions.

DEPOSITORS' INSURANCE NECESSARY

Unless we provide for better protection of bank depositors against loss, we will be forced to go to the British system of a limited number of powerful central banks with a multitude of branches supplying the need for local banking facilities throughout the country.

A Federal insurance law would protect depositors in the banks of the reserve system only. To enjoy the protection and benefits of such a law a State bank would have to become a member of the Federal system. This is a requirement easily fulfilled. A provision for insurance of depositors in member banks was included in the Federal reserve act when it passed the Senate in December, 1913. This provision was included in the Senate bill through the efforts of Senators Hitchcock, of Nebraska; Williams, of Mississippi; Thomas, of Colorado; and others. The insurance section was eliminated while the bill was in conference.

I will read some short extracts from the Congressional Record while the reserve bill was under consideration.

Senator Hitchcock, of Nebraska, said:

[From the Congressional Record, December 17, 1913]

Mr. President, the provision in either of these bills is similar, although the bill which I have reported is, I think, better, that after the payment of the expense of the member and the reserve banks, after the payment of dividends, after the accumulation each year of a surplus, the remaining profits instead of being given to the stockholders, who are not entitled to them, instead of being paid to the Government of the United States, which is already sufficiently recompensed, shall be paid into an insurance fund for the protection of those depositors of failed banks who would otherwise lose their money.

That is not a tax on the judicious banker; it is not a burden upon the people of the United States. It is simply using some of the profits to pay depositors who, unfortunately, have had their money in banks which for some reason have failed in spite of the legislation of Congress.

Senator Thomas, of Colorado, said:

[From the Congressional Record, December 23, 1913, the day the Federal reserve act was adopted]

Mr. President, I have been greatly disappointed that the conference committee struck from the bill that part of section 7 which was designed to create an insurance fund for the benefit of depositors in failed member banks. My disappointment is modified in some degree by the assurances which are given by members of the Senate conference committee that it is the intention of the Banking and Currency Committee of both Houses to present a more mature and better-designed system of depositors' insurance.

Senator Owen said:

[From the Congressional Record, December 23, 1913]

The House committee is preparing a special bill on the plan of insuring bank deposits. They have a subcommittee especially charged with that duty.

Former Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo, who advocated the insurance provision in the original Federal reserve act, in his book Crowded Years states:

The bill as reported to the Senate by Senator Owen contained a provision for insuring deposits of member banks. The insurance fund was to be administered under the supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury. Into this fund there was to be paid a certain percentage of net earnings for the benefit of depositors in failed member banks.

It was a mistake, I thought, to eliminate the depositors' insurance feature. One of the greatest reforms, as well as one of the greatest blessings, that could be achieved would be an organization that would save depositors from loss no matter what happens to the bank. It may be argued that the unusual number of bank failures in the past few years condemns insurance of deposits as unsound. I do not agree with this view. If the banks had been members of the reserve system, they would have been more effectively supervised and the number of failures much less.

On this point it is interesting to note that of the 2,290 banks that closed in 1931, 1,772 were nonmember banks.

The depositors' insurance section that was stricken from the Senate bill in conference provided that after 6 per cent interest was paid upon the stock of the reserve banks, one-half of the remaining profit should go into a surplus fund—one-fourth be paid to the United States as a franchise tax and one-fourth be used for the establishment of a depositors' insurance fund.

RECORDS OF PAST LIQUIDATIONS

It is interesting to note what would have resulted had the insurance fund provision remained in the law. Up to and including the year 1930 the total net earnings of the reserve banks was $523,204,165. Of that amount, 6 per cent, or $100,941,058, as required by law, was paid in dividends upon stock, $147,126,000 was paid as a franchise tax to the Government, and $275,136,000 was put into a surplus fund.

It has been impossible for me to learn the total losses to creditors in failed national banks for the years 1930 and 1931, but the Comptroller of the Currency has made a report showing the loss to depositors—from the enactment of national banking law in 1862 down to and including the year 1929. During these years the Nation suffered from the panics of 1873, 1893, 1907, and the deflation of 1921. During these 67 years 1,241 national banks were placed in receivership. They held deposits of $261,205,000 when closed. The sum of $193,279,863 has been paid to creditors on proven claims against these banks, leaving a total loss to depositors in failed national banks in 67 years of $67,925,702.

All proven losses to depositors in failed national banks since 1862 could have been paid from the surplus fund of the Federal reserve system and still leave multiplied millions for any possible emergency. Had the insurance provision been retained in the law our national banking system would stand to-day like a financial Gibraltar against the storm that now shakes our business structure to its very center.

But the Federal reserve bank surplus earnings is not our only lawful source of supply for a depositors' insurance fund. The Nebraska guaranty law, which was twice sustained by our State and Federal supreme courts, required a semi-annual payment of one-twentieth of 1 per cent of their total deposits into a fund to insure depositors against loss. This provision is carried in both Mr. LaGuardia's bill and my own. A similar tax levied on the thirty-three billions on deposit in member banks on June 30 last would produce the sum of $33,000,000 annually for the support of a depositors' insurance fund. In 10 years this levy would provide an insurance fund of more than $330,000,000—an amount greater than the determined loss to depositors in national banks up to date.

There is still another source that could be fairly and justly drawn upon to help build a sufficient depositors' insurance fund. On September 29 last there was $10,000,000,000 of time and savings deposits in member banks. The general rate of interest paid on such deposits is 3 per cent per annum. Time depositors might well contribute to the insurance of their funds against loss by bank failures, and I believe they would be glad to do so under fair and reasonable conditions.

FUNDAMENTALS OF BANKING

Insured banks should be allowed to pay only 2¾ per cent on savings and time deposits. The banks holding such deposits should be required to pay one-fourth of 1 per cent upon time and savings deposits into the depositors' insurance fund. This plan would leave the total cost of time and savings accounts to depository banks the same as at present. One-fourth of 1 per cent of the ten billions of time and savings deposits in member banks June 30 last would equal $25,000,000. In 10 years, if that amount were collected upon insured time deposits, it would add two hundred and fifty millions more to the depositors' insurance fund.

Time deposits draw interest and add to the earnings of depositors and insurance will be mutually beneficial to both banks and depositors and would more than compensate for the small cost of contributions to the insurance fund by the insured.

A depositors' insurance fund can be established from these various sources which I have enumerated which will fully insure depositors in member banks against loss even under existing banking laws.

Many State bank insurance laws were faulty in that they did not empower the State to refuse bank charters where charters should not be granted. During the war boom the number of State banks nearly doubled. When deflation set in and bankruptcy became rampant and many banks that should not have been allowed to organize were forced to close the special assessments to take care of these failures became too big a burden for the solvent banks to bear. Competition for loans and deposits led to violations of vital banking laws and sound business rules. In Nebraska we had too many banks and not enough bankers. A sound banking system can only exist when the number of banks is limited to public needs. Banking is a quasi-public business. The public interest should always be the first consideration.

The people have two prime interests in banks. The first is to provide a safe place in which to put their money. The second is to establish a financial reservoir where money and credit may be obtained upon reasonable terms when needed.

Overbanking breeds bad banking, speculation, and bankruptcy. There must be a sufficient profit in any safe business to absorb the losses that occur. No bank fails that is prosperous and really making money. With these principles included, a depositors' insurance law will fully protect both public and private interests.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF INSURANCE

The constitutionality of a bank deposit insurance law can not be disputed. In the case of Shallenberger against First State Bank of Nebraska and Noble State Bank against Haskell, reported in Two hundred and nineteenth United States Reports, 114, the United States Supreme Court sustained the State's right to require all corporations engaged in banking business to contribute a certain percentage to a fund for the protection of depositors who sustained losses because of the failure of insolvent banks. In the more recent case from Nebraska, Abie State Bank *v.* Weaver (282 U. S. 265), the United States Supreme Court again sustained the Nebraska statute.

Therefore the constitutionality of such a law is no longer open to dispute. The desirability of such protection can not be denied. In fact, the practice of requiring insurance of certain bank deposits is now in force. The United States Government will not deposit funds in a bank unless the Federal Government is insured against loss by the deposit of bonds or other accepted security should the bank fail. States and counties make like requirements. Neither a county, a State, or the Federal Government will trust their funds to a bank unless fully insured against loss.

But the citizen whose money makes possible the profits in the banking business is left to suffer his loss, no matter how severe the blow may be to him.

Prudent management and Government supervision has not proven sufficient security in the past. This fact gives warrant for additional legislation for the safety of the depositor who is entitled to every protection possible under the law. When a citizen deposits his money in a bank chartered and commissioned by his Government he should not suffer the loss of his money because of the bankruptcy of a corporation authorized, supervised, and controlled by the Government which created it.

The Federal reserve act was the product of the leadership and genius of Woodrow Wilson and demonstrated the ability of Congress to give to the Nation a currency system that has proven safe and sound under every condition. Its notes are not guaranteed by the Federal Government but are secured by the mobilized credit of the Nation and the united strength of the 12 great central banks. Ninety per cent of the Nation's commerce is not transacted with money but with bank checks and drafts drawn against the peoples' money deposited in the banks. A depositors' insurance law would

give these instruments of commerce a standing second only to that of the Federal bank note itself and give to the people the same confidence in the safety of their bank deposits that they now have in the security of the bank note. They want assurance that when they put their money in a bank it is in a safe place.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentleman will pass his bill in this session of Congress; and if he and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] succeed in doing that, in my judgment they will have rendered the greatest service to the people of the Nation they have had rendered in a long time.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I thank the gentleman.

Last year the people drew more than two billions of money out of the banks and hid it away because they were afraid their money was not in a safe place. The fact that over 2,000 banks closed in 1931, with deposits of nearly $2,000,000,000, was the reason and warrant for that fear.

The President, by proclamation and organization of committees all over the country, is doing everything in his power to induce the people to put the money now in hiding back into the banks.

Congress is passing financial reconstruction laws and other banking bills to try to save the bankrupt or near bankrupt. Are we going to do nothing for the solvent citizen who can pay his debts and is the real support of every sound business institution we have left? I insist that if by proclamation or legislation the people are induced to put their hard-earned savings back into the banks, banks chartered and controlled by the Federal Government, they are entitled to every assurance possible under the Constitution that they shall always find they have put their money in a safe place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, on the 20th of January I announced to the House that in view of the very abnormal economic conditions which now confront us at home and abroad, and in the hope that some substantial results may be achieved at Geneva, the committee, in agreement with the chairman, voted, for the time being, not to report H. R. 8230.

Since that time conditions abroad have materially changed. The spokesman of the French delegation at Geneva has indicated that France demands a security pact in exchange for armament reduction. The American people have definitely repudiated this idea and are unwilling to commit this country to such a course of action. The British delegation has announced its desire for the reduction in the size of battleships and the abolition of the submarine. Our own delegation has indicated a desire to extend the Washington and London naval treaties beyond 1936, a general reduction, provided France and Italy can be brought into agreement, and the abolition of submarines. Japan has indicated her stand as favoring the reduction of the size of battleships and reduction in the size of their guns, reduction of the size of aircraft carriers and the allotted tonnage, the retention of submarines but with limited war uses. Italy has favored the abolition of battleships, of submarines, and of aircraft carriers.

These proposals differ widely, but nothing contained in them affects either cruisers or destroyers, except in so far as a total tonnage reduction is concerned. Some nations favor the total abolition of submarines, others insist upon their retention, and in view of these divergent views it is safe to assume that the abolition of the submarine is far off. Some nations favor a curtailment in the aircraft-carrier category and on cruisers with flying-on decks. No possible agreement can be foreseen which would in any way limit cruisers, destroyers, submarines, or aircraft carriers in such a way as to conflict with the provisions of the naval construction bill, H. R. 8230.

Some agreement may be reached with regard to the size of replacement battleships, but, as the London treaty provides that no such ships shall be laid down prior to 1936, no mention of them is made in the construction bill, and that bill will in no wise conflict with any agreement reached at Geneva.

In the Far East the situation has become more and more alarming.

No Member of this House more devoutly wishes for the preservation of peace than do I, but I believe that a definite pronouncement should be made to all the world of the intention of the United States to build up to the limits permitted under the London treaty. Such action on our part would, I believe, strengthen the hands of our delegates at Geneva and permit agreements which might not otherwise be possible. The efforts which we have made toward securing a reduction of naval armament have been outstanding. The Washington treaty provided for a limitation of the total tonnage that each country might have in battleships and in aircraft carriers and limited the size of guns that might be carried by battleships, aircraft carriers, and cruisers. The tonnages provided for in that treaty were in the ratio of 5 for Great Britain, 5 for the United States, and 3 for Japan, and the ratios so established are generally referred to as the 5–5–3 ratio of naval strength.

At the time of the Washington conference we had under construction a large number of battleships and battle cruisers, which upon completion would have made us the most powerful naval country in the world. But we had no such program for the cruiser types, and while other countries were willing to agree to tonnage limitations and treaty stipulations, which would cause us to scrap these new ships under construction, as well as many of those which we had already built, it was not possible to obtain an agreement that they should make corresponding sacrifices in the cruiser types and thus extend the 5–5–3 ratio. We had a destroyer superiority at the time and naturally were unwilling to sacrifice that unless other nations would sacrifice their superiority in cruisers.

The final result of the Washington conference was that the limitations as to total tonnage applied only to the battleship and aircraft-carrier types. No limitation was applied to the cruiser types other than a limit on the size of the gun which they might carry, and the nations were left free to build cruisers, destroyers, and submarines as they saw fit.

In order to obtain this agreement we not only had to destroy our ships that were building but many of the ships that we had already completed, and, in addition, we were forced to agree not to increase the fortifications at Guam or in the Philippine Islands.

It is particularly significant to note that the treaty was so deftly worded that Great Britain was permitted to construct and develop a great naval base at Singapore, while we were denied the right to construct defenses at either Guam or in the Philippines.

Our statesmen fondly hoped that the altruistic example that we had set to the rest of the world in destroying millions of dollars' worth of completed ships and other millions of dollars' worth of ships that were building would be followed by the other powers and that they would refrain from augmenting their naval strength in the types which were not limited by the treaty. That hope was shortly proved to be vain, for both Great Britain and Japan proceeded to lay down ship after ship of those types which were not limited by the treaty. From the date on which the treaty was signed, February, 1922, to the present time we have laid down, built, or appropriated for but 36 ships, as compared with 96 for Great Britain and 126 for Japan. During the same period France has laid down 152 and Italy 109 ships.

As a result of the Washington conference we destroyed 20 battleships that were completed, of a tonnage of 325,850 tons, which had cost us $117,753,000. In addition we scrapped 11 new battleships or battle cruisers, which were building and which, when completed, would have had a tonnage of 465,800, and which had cost us $94,757,000. In all

31 ships were destroyed, of a total tonnage of 795,650 tons, which had cost $212,510,000. Certainly that was an indication to the world of our desire for armament reduction. But as I previously pointed out, the example that we set of not building ships was not followed by other nations, who proceeded to build up their own navies.

A conference for the further limitation of naval armament met at Geneva in 1927. That conference failed to reach any agreement, chiefly because the demands of the other naval powers were so great that the United States could not subscribe to the high limitations which they desired to fix. With the failure of that conference and when it was seen that the other countries proposed to continue to build up their navies until they had an overwhelming strength in the cruiser type, Congress authorized the 15 cruiser program, in February of 1929. As soon as the powers saw that this country intended to provide cruisers for our Navy, Mr. McDonald hastened across the ocean and soon thereafter a naval conference was called to meet at London. That naval conference agreed to subdivide the cruiser category into two types of cruisers: Those which carry guns of more than 6.1-inch in caliber, and those which carry guns not exceeding 6.1-inch in caliber. The result of that conference was to restrict our country in the construction of the 15 cruisers which Congress had authorized in the year 1929. Only 7 of those could be completed under the terms of the London treaty prior to the year 1936, and but 3 others could be completed at all. One of those 3 could not be laid down prior to the year 1933, one not before the year 1934, and the third not before the year 1935. Total tonnage limitations were established for both categories of cruisers, for destroyers, and for submarines, as indicated in the table below, and agreement was made for the disposal of 3 of the 18 battleships we had been permitted to retain under the terms of the Washington treaty.

Categories	United States	British Commonwealth of Nations	Japan
Cruisers:			
(a) With guns of more than 6.1-inch (155 mm.) caliber	*Tons* 180,000	*Tons* 146,800	*Tons* 108,400
(b) With guns of 6.1-inch (155 mm.) caliber or less	143,500	192,200	100,450
Destroyers	150,000	150,000	105,500
Submarines	52,700	52,700	52,700

Under the terms of the London treaty we disposed of or demilitarized three battleships, of a total of 75,300 tons, which has cost some $29,554,000. Before the expiration of that treaty in 1936 we must further dispose of 1 old 8-inch cruiser of 7,350 tons, which cost $4,312,000; of 128 destroyers of a total tonnage of 122,120 tons, which cost us $207,604,000; of 31 submarines of a tonnage of 17,540 tons, which cost us $26,460,000. In all, as a result of the London treaty, we must dispose of, before the end of the year 1936, 163 ships, of 222,310 tons, which cost $267,930,000.

As a result of the two limitation of armament treaties, the Washington treaty and the London treaty together have necessitated the destruction of 194 ships, totaling 1,013,960 tons, which cost $480,440,000. Certainly if ever a country set an example in limiting armament, the United States has done so. The example that has been set has not been followed by others. Japan, as I have previously indicated, since the signing of the Washington treaty has laid down 126 ships; Great Britain, 96; and the United States but 36.

The Navy of the United States is to-day confronted with a most serious situation. By the year 1934 every destroyer which we have afloat will become over age. We have 11 destroyers that have been appropriated for, but to date the President has seen fit to lay down but 5 of them. Great Britain by 1936, if she lays down not a single new destroyer, will have 47 under-age vessels of that type, and Japan will have 70 vessels of that type. In submarines we will have but 20 that are under age, as compared to 33 for Great Britain and 47 for Japan. In cruisers of the 6-inch category we will have but 10, as compared to 14 for Great Britain and 18 for Japan. In the 8-inch cruiser type we will have 16, as compared to 15 for Great Britain and 12 for Japan; and in the aircraft category we will have 3 carriers, as compared with 6 for Great Britain and 4 for Japan.

The 5–5–3 ratio, which was the basis of the Washington treaty, has become to-day a 5-6-4 ratio, and by the year 1936 will be almost a 5–5–5 ratio unless something is done by this country to maintain the ratios prescribed at Washington and at London. At Geneva the other day Japan was demanding equality for herself. In other words, she was demanding a 5–5–5 ratio. If in the year 1936 we enter another conference, Japan will actually have achieved a 5–5–5 ratio and will be actually stronger than the United States in almost every type except battleships and 8-inch cruisers.

In this connection, it must always be remembered that in order to reach an agreement at Washington we surrendered the right to fortify Guam and the Philippine Islands, and those islands lie at the doorstep of Japan. With a 5–5 ratio, as between the navies of the United States and Japan, we would have little chance of protecting them.

The question simmers down practically to this, Does the United States desire to maintain a navy?

It has been the consistent policy of our Government for over 125 years to maintain a Navy. That Navy has again and again proved its value to our country, a value far exceeding its cost; but the maintenance of a navy that is inadequate for the demands that may be made upon it is one of the worst forms of national extravagance. Real economy is achieved only if an adequate navy is maintained.

The Members of this House have been repeatedly told that 70 per cent of the Federal appropriations go for preparedness and wars, past and future. The annual appropriations for the Navy are about 9 per cent of the Federal appropriations, those for the Army are about 11 per cent, so that a total of about 20 per cent is the actual part of the Federal appropriations that goes for the maintenance of the Army and Navy, or goes for preparedness. The remaining 50 per cent of the sum, which you have been told is for wars, past and future, goes for the reduction of and interest on the public debt, for pensions, for the hospitalization of veterans, and for the relief of those who answered the call of their country in its hour of need. That 50 per cent is in reality the cost that we are to-day paying for our lack of preparedness.

Our Navy is maintained to support the national policies and commerce and to guard the continental and overseas possessions of the United States. There is no word of offense in that policy; there is no thought of offense in that policy. It is all defense—defense of our territory against invasion, defense of our commerce, defense of our national policies, which carries with it defense of our rights and the rights of our citizens.

Great and populous as is our country, we must realize that size and population are in themselves no protection. China, with an area greater than our country and with a population three times as numerous, has been unable to keep Japan from extending her control over Manchuria and over Shanghai; but, unlike China, we have, in addition to our great continental territory, island possessions which lie thousands of miles from the North American Continent, and the Panama Canal, connecting the Atlantic and the Pacific. The foreign commerce of our country is valued at about $8,000,000,000, and the sea-borne coastwise trade at about $6,000,000,000. Much of out intercoastal trade flows through the Panama Canal, but all of it, coastwise and foreign, is of vital importance to our country. President Hoover himself, in October, 1928, said:

> We might survive as a Nation, though on a lower living standard and wages, if we have to suppress the 9 or 10 per cent of our total production now sold abroad. But our whole standard of life would be paralyzed and much of the joy of living destroyed if we were denied sufficient imports. If this happens, we must stagnate and degenerate in civilization. We could not run an automobile, we could not operate a dynamo, or use a telephone were we without imported raw materials from the tropics. To-day we are the largest importers and the second largest exporters of goods in the world. Our total volume of exports translates itself

into employment for 2,400,000 families; and, in addition to this, millions more families find employment in the manufacture of imported raw materials.

An interruption of our sea-borne trade would bring about, in a comparatively short time, an economic situation many times worse than that which now confronts us. We could not export our cotton, wheat, meat products, or manufactured articles of any description, and hence the price of these articles would be greatly depressed, and we would be without storage facilities for those which we could not consume ourselves. Millions of people would be thrown out of work and our planters and farmers would face economic ruin. We would be deprived of such essential raw materials as manganese, tin, shellac, mica, and rubber, without which we could not make steel or manufacture automobiles or machinery, either steam or electric.

We would lack coffee, tea, quinine, and other articles which are so generally and widely used as to be necessary for the comfort and welfare of our people. No nation has a greater interest in keeping the seas free for trade than has the United States.

Some have held that there is a moral obligation upon us to build up to the limits prescribed in the London and Washington treaties so as not to disturb the ratios provided for in those treaties. Whether or not this be so, the material interests of our country require that we should do so. Without such a navy we can not protect our sea borne trade, the Panama Canal, or even assure our country against invasion. This country has ever been prone to protect its national rights and to preserve the rights and properties of those citizens, and for this purpose a navy is absolutely indispensable.

I believe that the welfare and safety of the United States require that our Navy should be built up to the limits and ratios permitted under the London and Washington treaties. Whether we like it or not, the United States is to-day the leader of the world, the leader of civilization, and the nation that is looked to by the rest of the world.

This country does not require a navy of one strength when conditions are prosperous and of another strength when there is an economic depression, for we have the same country, the same people, and the same interests to protect at all times, and we all know that depressions are temporary.

It is in times of depression, however, that more can be purchased for a dollar than at any other time. To-day more and better warships can be purchased for a given sum than at any recent period. The construction of vessels which have been provided for in the naval construction bill would afford employment to many men who otherwise must soon be forced into the ranks of the unemployed, and will furnish work that will prevent some of our great shipbuilding plants from being forced to close their doors and to discharge their employees. Eighty-five per cent of the money spent on the construction of ships flows directly back into the pockets of labor—40 per cent goes directly to labor in the shipyard and something over 45 per cent goes to labor used in preparing the material before it reaches the shipyard. I would not stand here upon this floor and advocate that we build ships which are not needed by our Navy merely to relieve unemployment, but when those ships are needed, when the welfare and interests of our country require their construction, when we can purchase them at a minimum of cost, and when their construction will provide labor for thousands of American citizens who would otherwise be forced into the ranks of the unemployed, I believe that this is the proper time to provide such work for our people.

The bill provides for a definite naval program, laid down in an orderly, conservative fashion, in such manner that excessive expenditures need not be made in any one year. This orderly and systematic construction should materially reduce the cost of construction of the individual vessels. Where two similar ships are built, one following immediately after the other, a very great saving may be expected. In the case of our new airship *Akron* the cost of the initial ship was about $5,000,000, but the cost of the second ship, *Macon*, will be only about $3,000,000. By providing that the second ship should be laid down immediately following the completion of the first, a saving of about $2,000,000 was effected, or a saving of 20 per cent of what the ships would otherwise have cost had they been contracted for separately. The 5-year naval aircraft program approved by Congress in 1926 was estimated to cost $85,078,750. When finished last June the actual cost was $58,771,000. This great saving of nearly $27,000,000 represented 31 per cent of the estimated cost, and was due primarily to the fact that there was an orderly, steady, progressive, continuing program. A spasmodic, irregular program for the construction of the vessels provided for in this bill would very probably result in increasing the cost of those ships, while a steady, orderly, continuing program will very probably result in saving 15 to 20 per cent.

The construction provided for in the naval construction bill in no way conflicts with the so-called 1-year naval holiday. The Secretary of State was requested to furnish the Naval Committee with definite information as to whether any tentative agreement which had been entered into by the State Department or by the President would in any way act to prevent the immediate construction of naval vessels, and whether or not the President was in any way restricted from proceeding with the construction of destroyers which the Congress had appropriated for and which had not as yet been laid down. The Secretary of State, in reply, quoted a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Navy, under date of October 28, 1931, in which he stated his opinion of the effect of the year's armament truce in the following language:

> It permits the completion of ships building or contracted for; it permits replacement building, and it would seem by omission of any provision to the contrary that it permits authorization and appropriation for other vessels provided they are not begun before November 1, 1932.

Not only does the construction provided for in this bill not conflict with the provisions of the so-called 1-year naval holiday, but it in nowise conflicts with the provisions of the Washington treaty of 1922 or the London treaty of 1930. Moreover, the provisions contained therein are such as will in nowise conflict with any agreements that can be reached at Geneva.

We have listened to the siren song of delay for 10 years, while our naval strength has sunk relatively lower and lower. The pacifists, those who believe that complete and total disarmament is the way to eternal peace, would have us continue this delay, but to continue delay means the slow but ultimate destruction of the American Navy. Delay has already reduced us to the point where, unless we lay down new ships, we shall find that by the year 1936 we will have but 11 destroyers that are under age, as compared with 47 for Great Britain and 70 for Japan. We shall have but 20 under-age submarines, as compared with 33 for Great Britain and 47 for Japan. We shall have but 10 of the 6-inch cruisers, as compared to 14 for Great Britain and 18 for Japan. It is high time that the world appreciated that the people of the United States intend to provide and maintain a Navy adequate for the protection of our country, our commerce, and our citizens. This naval construction bill is the first step in that direction. It does not in itself appropriate a single dollar from the Treasury of the United States. It is merely an authorization which is necessary in order that the Congress may make appropriations when in its judgment this would be desirable.

Not only do I feel that this bill should be immediately enacted, but I feel that appropriations for the ships that are provided for in it should be immediately forthcoming. Did the people of this country fully appreciate the naval situation, did they realize how rapidly their Navy is sinking to the position of that of a second-class naval power, I am sure that there would be a most insistent demand for the immediate enactment of this bill and for the construction of the ships provided for under it, and this in spite of the present economic situation.

I believe that the safety and welfare of this country insistently demand the enactment of this naval construction bill at this time.

I believe that no people in the world have a more generous and noble character than the people of the United States.

So long as we remain strong our actions in world affairs will be directed by our own people. If we become weak, our actions will be controlled by a less generous and less noble people.

No Government which fails to provide for its own preservation against the assaults of every probable foe is entitled to the support of its people. The primary duty of government is self-preservation, and no logic can justify it in stripping itself of its means of defense and relying for its preservation upon the mercy, the pity, or the love of other nations. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the committee does not follow out the announced policy of the leaders of the House to reduce expenditures on behalf of the taxpayers. They have declined to reduce in any amount the expenditures heretofore had for the enforcement of the prohibition laws. That is the only branch of the Government where the Committee on Appropriations, so far as I have been able to learn, has not endeavored to reduce expenditures. They have reduced expenditures in connection with other Federal statutes. They have reduced expenditures for running down and capturing counterfeiters, and those who violate the white slave act, and the automobile theft act, and every other penal statute.

A few days ago in the Committee on the Judiciary a vote was had upon reporting out a resolution providing for submitting to the people through conventions the question of whether or not they desired to retain the prohibition law as it is or to amend it. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], gave out a statement in which he gave the names of those who voted in favor of submitting the resolution to the people and those who were against it. He included his own name among those who voted against giving the House an opportunity to vote on this resolution, and a statement which said, in effect, that this was no time, in his judgment, for the Congress to discuss or to consider prohibition, since we had before us many matters touching the economic recovery of the country. It is my opinion, though, that prohibition is a very vital matter connected with the economic welfare and success of the country and that it has a place in the whole scheme of the rehabilitation of the country and the giving of employment to the people. I was one of those whose name was given out as having voted to give the House an opportunity to vote on the question of whether or not the States might, through conventions called by the people in the various States for that purpose only, consider whether they might, if they desire, do away with prohibition or change it as best suited and desired by the citizens of certain States, but not to interfere with those States that did not desire to make any change in prohibition.

Since all the professional prohibition organizations profess to believe that the overwhelming majority of the American people believe in prohibition, I can not understand why anyone should vigorously object to granting them permission to vote directly on this issue. An overwhelming vote in support of prohibition would prove that the sentiment of the American people was in favor of it and would do more than any other thing to silence the opposition to it.

One of the corner stones of our Republic is that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. As we know, the American people by referendum vote have never given their consent to the national prohibition law. It is my judgment, after 12 years of observation, as a citizen and as a Member of Congress, that this problem will never be solved until the people have had an opportunity to vote on it directly.

I can not conceive that any person would wish to deprive the American people of the sacred right to determine for themselves whether they wish prohibition or not. They ought to have the right to express their opinion through the ballot box. Voting for delegates to a convention that is to pass upon national prohibition is the best and most direct way this can be done. To deny the people the right to vote thus upon prohibition is to deny them the right to exercise the most sacred principle of our Government.

State legislatures sometimes fail to register the will of the people in the matter of legislation. In November, 1918, the question of the adoption of a prohibition amendment to the Missouri constitution was submitted to the people of that State. With thousands of young men deprived of suffrage by their military service, the people of Missouri rejected the principle of prohibition by a majority of almost 75,000. When the members of the legislature, elected on the day this referendum was taken, met in January they wholly ignored the sentiment of the people as expressed at the polls and ratified the eighteenth amendment.

There is much evidence to support the popular impression that the people of the United States were the victims of a high-powered propaganda campaign conducted by a highly organized minority, which finally resulted in the adoption of the eighteenth amendment. The records of the several States show that in advance of the ratification of the eighteenth amendment the people of 23 States had adopted prohibition by direct vote. In these 23 States only 2,666,408 votes were cast for prohibition and 2,104,906 against it. The population of these States was 33,077,701 in the 1920 census.

The people of 25 States, having a population of 72,272,348, had never adopted prohibition by popular vote. It is therefore apparent that only 2½ per cent of the people of the United States had voted for prohibition prior to its adoption as a national policy.

The records of the Anti-Saloon League, the principal prohibition organization, show that only 20,000 out of more than 150,000 churches in the United States cooperated in the movement to fasten prohibition upon the people. One of the most widely known women prohibition agitators had publicly stated that in the campaign to force prohibition upon 120,000,000 people less than 500,000 people were actively interested. As shown by the records of the Anti-Saloon League, not more than 300,000 people contributed the campaign funds of more than $50,000,000 that was used to finance the propaganda organizations which lobbied prohibition through Congress and the State legislatures.

These facts present compelling reasons why the people should be given an opportunity, even now, to express their will on prohibition in referendum elections. Surely, if we believe in the principles upon which our country was founded, we would not wish by some arbitrary constitutional provision to bind the people forever in the chains of a policy to which they have never assented.

The policy of the country as expressed in the seventeenth and nineteenth amendments is to give the people greater voice in the affairs of the Government. The seventeenth amendment took away from the State legislatures the power to elect United States Senators and vested that power in the people. The nineteenth amendment enfranchised the women and gave them direct voice in government.

If, as it has been so frequently stated by some, the nineteenth amendment came to the rescue of the eighteenth amendment, everyone should welcome an opportunity to demonstrate that fact and permanently settle the prohibition question.

The policy of protesting against a referendum on the prohibition issue seems to indicate a fear to submit the cause to the test of a popular vote. Either that or those opposed to that are not in sympathy with the traditions and policy of our Government.

If any law ever written into the Federal and State Constitutions has had a fair trial, it is the eighteenth amendment and its supporting legislation.

The combined power of the Federal Government and most of the State governments has been invoked to enforce this legislation. This is true of no other Federal amendment or law.

The Federal Government alone, in direct and indirect appropriations, has expended more than $600,000,000 in an attempt to enforce the law. The State governments have spent enormous sums in the same effort. The Federal Government has put the stigma of criminality upon nearly

1,000,000 persons and the State governments upon a million more. The jails, penitentiaries, and prison camps have been filled with the victims of the law. The courts have construed every moot question against the citizens and in favor of the Government in order to make more effective its enforcement.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for a speech.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman does not want a quorum present, I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. DYER. I do not yield to the gentleman and, of course, his remarks will not appear.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, a point of order is always in order.

Mr. DYER. I do not object to the point of order, but I object to the gentleman's speech. I will yield to the gentleman in a few minutes if the gentleman cares to ask a question.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question now?

Mr. DYER. Not now.

I was speaking, when I was interrupted, about the expense of prohibition.

Congress has voted every dollar recommended for the enforcement of the act. It has adopted numerous amendments to make its enforcement more effective. It has appropriated millions of dollars to build penitentiaries to house its victims, and it has enlarged the Federal judiciary and the Federal prosecuting machinery in order that the violators of the law might be more speedily and surely punished. We have created the greatest spy system in the world to harass our people.

If the prohibition law has not had a fair trial, wherein lies the fault? Surely the Congress of the United States, of which I am a Member, has done its duty.

In the quest to determine why the law has failed, may I ask you to examine with me some of the records?

Perhaps you have the biography of Wayne B. Wheeler, the great lobbyist of the Anti-Saloon League, written by his publicity secretary, Justin Steuart. The opening paragraph reads:

> Wayne B. Wheeler controlled six Congresses, dictated to two Presidents of the United States, directed legislation in most of the States of the Union, picked the candidates of the important elective State and Federal offices, held the balance of power in both the Republican and Democratic Parties, distributed more patronage than any dozen other men, supervised a Federal bureau from outside without official authority, and was recognized by friend and foe alike as the most masterful and powerful single individual in the United States.

It is generally believed that Mr. Wheeler, before his death, wrote this description of his extraordinary unofficial usurpation of power over the Government of the people of the United States. It does not appear to be an exaggeration.

The reports which Mr. Wheeler made to the executive committee of the Anti-Saloon League show that, without authority of law, he ran the Prohibition Enforcement Bureau of the United States. He appointed its officers and controlled its patronage. He dictated the appointment of numerous Federal judges, district attorneys, and other officials charged with the enforcement of the law. He was powerful enough to retain a prohibition commissioner in office when a President, on four different occasions, sought to remove him.

The records of the Anti-Saloon League prove beyond dispute that it controlled every function of government charged with the duty of enforcing the prohibition law.

If the prohibition law has not had a fair trial, the blame must be laid upon the shoulders of the professional prohibition organizations which unlawfully and unconstitutionally usurped the legal powers of government and used those powers in an attempt to enforce the law. If, under those circumstances, the law can not be enforced, I do not see how it will ever be possible to enforce it.

Do you think the people of the United States will ever again submit to the unconstitutional usurpation of official authority by propaganda organizations and permit their representatives in Congress to appropriate another $600,000,000 to experiment with the law? Do you think the people will continue to elect Presidents who will permit the Anti-Saloon League to boss them, or Congresses that will bow to the dictation of this professional reform organization? How long do you think the people will continue to suppress their revolutionary impulses while the Anti-Saloon League sets itself up to serve as judge, prosecutor, and jury to tyrannize them and deprive them of their liberties and their property?

The rising tide of indignation against the eighteenth amendment and the tyrannical enforcement act presages a progressive and accumulative resistance to these laws. The people will not much longer submit to being tyrannized by a little handful of professional propagandists whose principal interest in the law is the money they cajole out of the public to sustain them in their easy jobs. Certainly the sentiment at the present time is much more aggressive against the prohibition law than it was in the early part of the 12-year period. It is not likely again to have such a favorable opportunity of enforcement as in the past.

In this senseless and fruitless effort to enforce an unenforceable law the professional dry organizations have cost the people of the United States not only the $600,000,000 appropriated for prohibition but have caused them a loss of more than $6,000,000,000 in Federal revenues. A large part of the revenues lost to the State and Federal Governments has been diverted into the hands of gangsters to finance crime virulent in character and unparalleled in magnitude.

The cost of crime arising out of or associated with prohibition has been estimated from $10,000,000,000 to $15,000,000,000 a year. The damage to our country, as evidenced by disrespect for law and constituted authority, is unmeasurable and irreparable.

In the face of this humiliating record I do not believe that I should use the authority delegated to me by my constituents to deprive the people of the right to vote on whether they wish to continue this destructive, hypocritical, crime-breeding, corrupting, and demoralizing policy or get rid of it. It seems to me that it would be the highest expression of my duty as a citizen and as a Member of Congress to afford the peaople of the United States an opportunity to voice their opinion of prohibition through the secret ballot.

No government is a free government which denies its citizens the right to express themselves freely at the ballot box on any great issue. No government is a just government unless it derives its powers from the consent of the governed as expressed by direct vote. No law can long remain upon the statute books unless it represents the sober, deliberate, and intellectual judgment of the people. Laws enacted during periods of great emotional upheaval, or as the result of high-powered propaganda, ought always, after a cooling-off period, be submitted to the electorate for a test of their sentiment toward them.

More than three-quarters of a century ago the immortal Lincoln voiced a great truth when he said that "no law is stronger than is the sentiment in the community where it is to be enforced." That truth was vigorously and emphatically repeated by the report of the President's Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement.

That body of impartial and eminent investigators, after studying every phase of prohibition for more than 18 months, reported to the President and the Congress that public sentiment did not sustain the prohibition law and that there was no prospect that public sentiment ever would support the law.

Why should we wish to impose this law upon the American people when every sign of the times indicates that the people wish to throw off this yoke of prohibition oppression? Are the professional prohibition organizations greater and wiser than the people?

It was suggested by a distinguished Member of the Senate a few days ago that if Bishop Cannon, master mind of the Anti-Saloon League, and some of his associate professional

prohibition propagandists could be shipped to the North Pole, Congress would, within 24 hours, grant the people of the United States relief from the oppressive and expensive burdens of prohibition. Perhaps Congress might solve the problem by putting them on a life pension, and thus save the people several billions of dollars a year.

The propaganda with which Members of Congress are being flooded, protesting against a vote of the people on prohibition, seems to be ample proof that the dry leaders feel that the people would reject prohibition and that the only way it can be retained is by denying the people the right to vote upon it. I can not believe that at this day it would be a wise thing to discard the principle enunciated in the Declaration of Independence that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

In the Wickersham committee's report on the prohibition laws, House Document 722, on page 4, the committee says:

From 1862 until the World War every brewery and distillery in the United States was operated under a Federal license, subject to policing by the Federal Government and required to maintain and file elaborate records. Subject to these provisions the liquor traffic was conducted with the sanction of the Federal Government, which profited from the business to the extent of depending upon it for over one-fourth of the national revenue over a long series of years.

In the same document Judge Anderson, on page 90, says:

The people are being poisoned with bad and unregulated liquor to the permanent detriment of the public health and the ultimate increase of dependency and crime. The illicit producer, the bootlegger, and the speak-easy are reaping a rich harvest of profits and are becoming daily more securely intrenched. The enormous revenues (estimated at from two to three billion dollars per annum) placed in the hands of the lawless and criminal elements of society through this illegal traffic are not only enabling them to carry on this business in defiance of the Government but to organize and develop other lines of criminal activities to an extent which threatens social and economic security. The country is growing restive under these conditions. The situation demands some definite and constructive relief.

The loss to agriculture by reason of prohibition is enormous.

In the hearing on the food control bill before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in June, 1918, Gov. Carl E. Milliken, of Maine, read the resolutions on prohibition adopted by the Federal Council of Churches. The following is an extract:

The Federal Council of Churches, officially representing 30 denominations with a communicant membership of more than 80,000,000, in special session assembled, desires to record its conviction that the immediate prohibition of the liquor traffic as a war measure is essential to the conservation of the economic resources and latent powers of the Nation.

Five eminent economists estimate on the basis of the latest positive official figures that 7,000,000,000 pounds of food materials are used in the production of fermented and distilled liquors. Two university professors of physics estimate, after eliminating the amount necessary for denatured alcohol, the food value of the remainder would supply the energy requirements of 7,000,000 men for a year. The Brewers Year Book declares that the toil of 75,000 farmers for six months is required to furnish these foodstuffs.

The following statement was made by Miss Anna Adams Gordon, then president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union:

In our first command, to conserve food, Mr. Hoover, in a letter to Senator SHEPPARD, dated June 4, 1918, which is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 8034, said:

"The cessation of brewing would affect a saving of approximately 3,150,000 bushels a month from a nutritive point of view. It needs no comment from me, from a food point of view, that I should favor the saving of this amount of grain."

To conserve fuel is the next command, and the Fuel Administrator announces a possible shortage of 75,000,000 tons of coal. We understand the breweries use about 5,000,000 tons annually.

To conserve labor is another command. Three hundred thousand men engaged in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of alcoholic liquor should be released for "win the war work."

Wayne B. Wheeler, then general counsel for the Anti-Saloon League, in the course of a statement on the legal points involved in the proposed legislation said:

This legislation has not only a reasonable relation but a direct bearing on these subjects clearly within the power of Congress—1,000,000 men will be taken from the ranks of the producers, and the food supply short and help lacking, to plant crops. Liquor wastes enough food to maintain 7,000,000 men.

Herbert Hoover, then Food Administrator:

Entirely aside from the ethical questions, my impression is that we could conserve from 50,000,000 to 60,000,000 bushels of grain from the brewing side.

[NOTE.—At the time this statement was made the amount of grain rationed to the brewing industry had been greatly reduced. In the letter referred to by Miss Gordon, Mr. Hoover made his celebrated statement that "it is mighty difficult to get drunk on 2¾ per cent beer, but easy enough if we force a substitution of whisky."]

Dr. E. A. Taylor, professor of physiological chemistry of the University of Pennsylvania:

By these operations of prohibition of manufacture there would be a cessation of the manufacture of beer and complete withdrawal of all beer from the market in a short time. * * * This would save 80,000,000 bushels of grain, 60,000,000 of which is barley.

Dr. Wilbur Crafts, superintendent and treasurer of the International Reform Bureau, said:

I think it is about 110,000,000 bushels, very conservatively speaking, that is wasted in drink—6,000,000,000 pounds is the statement of the Council of National Defense.

Clinton N. Howard, of Rochester, N. Y., lecturer for the International Reform Bureau, said:

What would be the effect on the food conservation of the Nation if the 110,000,000 bushels of grain made into 2,000,000,000 gallons of beer and 140,000,000 gallons of whisky consumed in this country last year had been ground into flour and baked into bread? It would give a loaf of bread every day in the year to 15,000,000 families.

25,000 FARMERS TO GROW 25,000,000 BUSHELS OF GRAIN

In connection with the exchange of 25,000,000 bushels of Federal Farm Board wheat for Brazilian coffee, Mr. George S. Milnor, the $50,000 a year grain expert of the Federal Farm Board and the Farmers' National Grain Corporation, testified before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on November 26, 1931; he stated that it would give full-time employment to 25,000 farmers to grow the 25,000,000 bushels of wheat exchanged for Brazilian coffee. That makes it very clear that it would take the full time of 80,000 farmers to produce the 80,000,000 bushels of grain that would be used by the breweries on the preprohibition basis. In 12 prohibition years the farmers, on account of the prohibition of beer, have lost a market for 960,000,000 bushels of grain and 960,000 farmers have lost a year's work and income.

The following appears in a statement submitted to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, June 19, 1918, by War Time Prohibition Association, as having been written by Prof. Irving Fisher, of Yale University.

Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, in a communication to the Baltimore Sun of August 25, 1931, quotes the same statement, saying that it was written by Professor Fisher, and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator Cummins, of Iowa.

The statement follows:

Transportation required by the breweries

	Tons
Raw material, 3,000,000 pounds of foodstuffs	1,500,000
Required coal	3,000,000
Product 60,000,000 barrels	9,000,000
Total on teams and cars	13,500,000

All of which require hauling and over half of which require railroad transportation.

This requires over 200,000 freight cars during the year and uses several hundred locomotives constantly and increases freight congestion.

SUGAR

The breweries use 64,000,000 pounds of sugar, and you are short of sugar.

LABOR SHORTAGE

The breweries of the United States employ 65,000 men, but the total engaged in making, handling, and selling it is over 300,000.

The amount of freight which Professor Fisher says was originated by the breweries would be sufficient to load 675,000 cars with 20 tons of freight. I understand that the average freight-car load in the United States is 18 tons, but I have preferred to be liberal and used 20 tons instead.

On April 23, 1917, Hon. David F. Houston submitted to the Senate Committee on Agriculture a statement of the value of the farm products used in the brewing industry from 1903 to 1916.

The values from 1910 to 1916 follow:

1910	$90,800,000
1911	97,700,000
1912	127,600,000
1913	92,700,000
1914	103,600,000
1915	105,700,000
1916	101,000,000

[From a statement to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, June 19, 1918, by Miss Anna Adams Gordon, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union]

To conserve fuel is the next command, and the Fuel Administration announces a possible shortage of 75,000,000 tons of coal. We understand the breweries use about 5,000,000 tons yearly.

[From a statement to the same committee on the same day by Deets Pickett, research secretary of the Methods Board of Temperance, Prohibition, and Public Morals]

I want to submit to the committee some testimony which leads us to believe the coal problem could be solved by prohibition. In the United States Census Reports for 1910, volume 8, page 363, the consumption of coal by the brewing industry for the year ending June 30, 1909, was 2,990,357 tons, or three and one-half times as much as the bakers, six times as much as the printers and publishers, nine times as much as the manufacturers of boots and shoes, and twenty-five times as much as the manufacturers of men's clothing.

Mr. Pickett also submitted a statement from L. P. Ross, general manager of the Northern Iron Ore Co., to W. S. Blauvelt, of the United States Fuel Administration at Washington, in which he said:

We estimate that the breweries and saloons consume coal at the rate of approximately 273,328 three-ton carloads per annum. This amount of fuel would produce approximately 8,197,140 tons of pig iron.

We estimate that approximately 700,000 railroad cars are required to transport raw material for the breweries, and the beer produced in the United States per annum, based on all the beer being shipped, but not including the return shipment of empty barrels.

We are reliably informed that approximately 350,000 men are engaged in the liquor traffic.

The only objection to permitting the people to have such a beer, nonintoxicating, is that it will restore saloons. I, too, am opposed to any encouragement of saloons; and if the prohibition law is modified as I propose, this beer will not be distributed through saloons. In fact it will materially aid in getting rid of a lot of saloons, otherwise known as speak-easies, that now exist. These speak-easies sell beer now, which consists of home-brew, alley made or illegally imported from Canada or some other country. When the people can get good brewery-made beer through their grocers or other distributing agencies, they will not patronize speak-easies that sell this mostly unfit beer, highly alcoholic, as well as other intoxicating and poisonous liquors.

Careful investigations indicate that there are now in the United States 220,000 speak-easies, distributed as follows:

Arizona	750
California	15,000
Colorado	1,500
Connecticut	5,000
Delaware	250
District of Columbia	500
Idaho	500
Illinois	40,000
Indiana	2,500
Iowa	3,500
Kansas	1,000
Louisiana	5,000
Maine	1,000
Maryland	5,000
Massachusetts	10,000
Michigan	10,000
Minnesota	2,000
Missouri	3,000
Montana	5,000
Nebraska	1,500
New Hampshire	1,000
New Jersey	10,000
New Mexico	750
New York	42,000
Nevada	500
Two Dakotas	1,000
Ohio	5,000
Oklahoma	2,000
Oregon	3,000
Pennsylvania	20,000
Rhode Island	2,000
Texas	3,500
Utah	750
Vermont	750
Virginia	1,000
Washington	4,000
West Virginia	1,500
Wisconsin	7,500
Wyoming	500
Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Kentucky	2,500
Total	222,500

In some of the other States, particularly in the South, corn liquor is the popular beverage and is distributed openly by bootleggers, the number of which is estimated at 50,000.

There has also been gathered data to show that illegitimate beer—that of more than one-half of 1 per cent of alcoholic content—is being consumed in the United States to the extent of approximately 4,000,000,000 gallons annually. This is all manufactured illegally and the most of it outside of this country. As a result our farmers do not benefit in the sale of grain and other agricultural products that are used nor do our citizens secure employment in the making of it, and our Government, now sorely pressed for revenue, gets nothing in taxes.

Will the American people long tolerate this condition?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to call my friend's attention to the fact, because the gentleman is the ranking Republican on the Committee on the Judiciary, that in the last election, in 1928, when there was a sharply drawn issue of wet and dry, with Governor Smith posing as the exemplar of the wets and President Hoover as the exemplar of the drys, President Hoover received 6,000,000 more votes as a dry than did the popular wet. How does the gentleman explain that when he speaks of the people expressing their sentiments on this issue?

Mr. DYER. I will say to the gentleman that the votes for Mr. Hoover and Mr. Smith were not altogether upon the wet-and-dry issue. They were for Mr. Hoover largely because the people of the country felt that he could best control and manage the affairs of this Government in the interest of all the people.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, they had all become disgusted with the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover administrations long before the election, and they accepted a supposed dry, preferring the lesser evil.

Mr. DYER. I will say to the gentleman that Mr. Hoover, of course, is able to take care of himself. He will be the candidate of the Republican Party again in the coming election; and notwithstanding the campaign of slander and tyrannical efforts of the Democratic National Committee to injure and to undermine him with the people, he will again triumph and be elected, because the people of the country want him. A wet-and-dry issue will not defeat him. This Congress controlled by the Democrats is dry and it will do nothing against prohibition, but just the contrary.

Mr. BLANTON. Even my partisan friend from Missouri does not expect him to carry a single pivotal State.

Mr. DYER. Oh, yes, I do; and I predict his reelection. If it was not for the wet Democrats the Democratic Party would not now be in control of the House. The vacancies caused by the death of Republican dry Members have been filled by wet Democrats from Michigan, New Jersey, New Hampshire, and other places, including the fourteenth Texas district.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, but it was the economic issues that controlled and not the wet-and-dry issue.

Mr. DYER. Oh, they made their fight purely upon the wet-and-dry issue in all of those places where they elected men to fill vacancies, and the result of it is that the House has been organized by Democrats. I am very glad of it.

We have a very able and distinguished Speaker, and the Democrats being in power places them in a position where they must cooperate with our great President and do their part to relieve conditions that now face us from an economic and unemployment standpoint. The Democratic leaders in the House will do this, too, if outside Democratic influences will keep their hands off and let us, Democrats and Republicans, work unitedly for the welfare of our great country. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. But these candidates had the background of a party that has always stood for the people as against a party that has always stood for special interests.

Mr. DYER. The Democrats did not have any party in New Hampshire and New Jersey.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will find out in the coming election this next November that they have a party in those States.

Mr. DYER. It was purely a wet-and-dry issue and nothing else. The gentleman's party is in the majority in this House because wet Democrats were elected in these off elections. [Applause.] Yet it is not possible to do anything against prohibition with the organization of this House as it is; with the Speaker a dry; with the chairman of the great Judiciary Committee, elegant, able, and fine gentleman that he is, a dry; with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, bringing in $11,000,000 for prohibition, without crossing off a dollar, a dry. The House is dry. It is controlled by the dry Democrats of the South, and you fellows from the North and the East might as well go home and tell your people about it, that you can not do anything about it.

Mr. BLANTON. In New Hampshire and New Jersey the controlling issues were economic ones and not the wet-and-dry issue. We won on economic issues.

Mr. DYER. They tell me they only talked about liquor in all those districts in order to get elected. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KARCH].

Mr. KARCH. Mr. Chairman, in due course this House will be asked to consider measures originating in the Senate calculated to provide for a more efficient supervision of foreign loan transactions. There may be similar bills pending in the House. So far none have come to my notice.

It may not become my lot at the time these measures are being considered in this House to be accorded any of the available time for debate, and I therefore seize this opportunity to express my views on legislation of that character and to go on record as favoring the enactment of these measures to which I have just referred, and to be unalterably opposed to the cancellation, in whole or in part, of what are popularly known as "war debts."

Mr. Chairman, as the parade of international bankers, who have sent into the reaches of the world that flood of gold, has crossed the witness stand before the Finance Committee of the Senate, and as those international bankers have blandly hidden behind the sheerest technicalities in denying the essential information as to how and why they were willing to betray their own people for the Judas price of profits, the countries of Europe, of Central and South America, prepare calmly and grimly to tell us that they will not pay; that they will not repay the flood of gold we so generously sent to aid them in their hour of prostration after the great madness had ended.

They have already told us they would not repay the flood of gold we sent them while the great madness was raging, nor yet the further golden torrent we poured out to them for their political and industrial development.

Every Member of this House knows that we canceled practically the whole of the debt due us from the Allies for money we loaned them during the period of actual hostilities, and also some of the money we loaned them after the armistice.

My time will not permit me to go into the details of the interallied debt-funding agreements under the act of 1926, but it is a well-known and accepted fact that the debts now due our Government from 20 foreign nations, amounting to more than eleven and a half billions, do not represent by any means the sum of the gold we poured into Europe during the war and after the hostilities had ceased.

Those figures do not represent at all the billions in supplies of every character—from railroad locomotives to clothing and from trucks and tractors to medicines—which we sold at the merest fraction of their value to our Allies in whose countries they then were. The sum now due us, of course, does not include the millions piled upon millions of our money given as doles to foreign peoples to feed and clothe them by that greatest of all givers of other people's money—Herbert Hoover.

All these years our people have patiently and painfully borne that burden of debt.

In our own hour of need what do we hear from those countries which called so plaintively to us in their suffering? Why, sir, this is what we hear—and I quote from the Washington Star of the 21st of this month:

> The time for making a clean slate of all reparations and war debts is rapidly approaching its final phase.
>
> Views as to how to approach this question to the best advantage of everybody—

That is, everybody but the people of the United States—

> are being exchanged between the principal European nations. Meanwhile the Department of State, while pleading ignorance of what is going on across the ocean—

Just as it pleaded ignorance of any knowledge of or participation in loans to South American countries until the Peruvian loan with its corruption, the Barco oil concession involved in the Colombian loan, the Cuban loan involving the son-in-law of President Machado, and the Panama loan involving charges of deleted and altered reports were revealed before the Senate Finance Committee recently—and now I continue to quote—

> is informally being told of the progress of the negotiations between Great Britain, France, and Italy either by our representatives abroad or by the representatives of those countries in Washington.
>
> The decision reached to postpone the Lausanne conference, it is said in reliable quarters, was not due exclusively to any precarious situation of the Laval Cabinet or to the desire of postponing the reparations question until after the elections in France and in Germany but mainly to the fact that the principal creditor nations of Germany had become convinced their principal debtor will not or can not pay reparations any longer.

Now, Mr. Chairman, listen to this:

> The conversations between London, Paris, and Rome are reliably reported as not dealing with the fact of whether America's debtors will or will not pay their debts but only with the best methods to stop any further payments to this country.
>
> There are two schools of thought in Europe to-day. One is that each nation should approach the United States individually, and after putting before the administration the financial situation of each country, to ask for a cancellation of the debts. * * *
>
> It is reported that most of the European nations with the exception of France are in favor of such a solution. France finds this humiliating, however. Her leaders do not think it would be dignified for important European nations to present to the American Congress their balance sheets and ask, hat in hand, this country for a reduction or cancellation of debts.
>
> The second theory being discussed between the European chancelleries is that the European nations reach a common agreement and a final decision not to pay a cent of their debts to the United States as long as Germany is not paying reparations. When the unity of action has been agreed upon the United States should be informed and told that from a certain date after July 1 the European powers will no longer be able to pay us any further installments on the war debts. * * *
>
> * * * Much as European governments, such as those of Great Britain or Italy, dislike to be defaulting, there seems to be a popular tendency to tell the Americans where they get off, and to force their respective (European) governments to act in a way they were heretofore disinclined to do.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us refer to another article, appearing in the Washington Herald of January 21, dealing with the intended default of the international debts. It says:

> The United States is largely responsible for the abandonment of the Lausanne reparations conference, it was admitted in official circles yesterday.
>
> Administration officials were pleased because it removes the major issue of acting on a direct request for extension of the moratorium or the reduction of the war debt from the forthcoming presidential campaign. Officials point out that the next war-debt payment is not due until December 15, and the election will be over.

Mr. Chairman, if that statement is true, those administration officials offered a gross insult to every man, woman, and child in this country. While the President insists that he is against any further debt cancellation—for reductions are merely cancellation on the installment plan, cutting off the dog's tail by inches—his officials chortle in glee that the issue will not come until "the presidential election is over." We are told that we are to be deceived, anesthetized by false promises, until we have voted. We are to be soothed until after we have cast our votes without one chance to register our emphatic disapproval of this course—and then the final act in this scrapping of international honor is to be staged.

We have heard much, Mr. Chairman, in the last few weeks of the private loans to foreign governments by our international bankers, who were draining the gold from every nook and cranny of our own country and giving us in exchange foreign bonds which testimony before the Senate Finance Committee has proved those international bankers must have known and did know were to prove practically worthless, while the State Department stood silently by watching the plundering of our own people.

We have heard of sums amounting to six billions, then eight billions, mentioned as having been secured for Central and South American nations, for the European nations, for nearly every nation on the globe, by means of exchanging worthless bonds for our good dollars. That is not the whole of the story. The sum of private loans and investments fostered by our international bankers and foisted upon our country banks and investors for profit is more than seventeen and one-half billions of dollars, according to outstanding authorities.

That sum added to the amount loaned by this Government to European countries after the war and not including the amounts loaned those countries during hostilities amounts to more than $29,000,000,000. Add to that the one and a half billions of gold loans of last summer forced by the Hoover moratorium, and the total is up to more than thirty and a half billions.

Add to that the debts already canceled, the vast amounts of supplies given foreign countries, and the tremendous sums given for Mr. Hoover's world-feeding projects—one of which is still in operation according to last accounts (Food Relief Administration, with headquarters in New York City, which received $100,000,000 appropriation from Congress, collected another $150,000,000 from private sources, and recently gave a large sum to a Quaker society for relief of miners)—and you have a total exceeding $40,000,000,000 of American gold sent into the nations of the world since 1914 by our Government and our international bankers, or about 10 per cent of our total national wealth in 1929 before the crash.

In 1914, Mr. Chairman, American private foreign loans and investments totaled a little more than two and one-half billions of dollars. In 1929 those private foreign loans and investments totaled more than fifteen and one-half billions. In 1930 they totaled more than sixteen and a half billions, and in 1931 they totaled more than seventeen and a half billions, while at this date they total, including the loans to the Bank of England and the Reichsbank of Germany, made last summer, more than $19,000,000,000.

The figures of the noted economist, Dr. Max Winkler, show that while foreign governments were demanding and securing cancellations of a large part of their debts to our Government, the international bankers were vying with each other to pour into the eager hands of these same governments and private foreign corporations billions of American money, while this country was approaching starvation in credits.

American business men, Mr. Chairman, were being starved for credit, American railroads were being starved for credit, American industry and American agriculture were being starved for credit, while these international bankers for profits were proceeding to drain from this country its supply of credit and pouring it out abroad and then persuading American banks and American investors to accept in place of their gold worthless foreign bonds and stocks.

In the most shameful, the most brazen, the most wanton, and the most dangerous campaign of stock-and-bond flotations ever perpetrated upon any nation in the history of the world, Mr. Chairman, American international bankers were robbing their own country of credits to export those credits abroad, the while aiding and abetting foreign nations to demand cancellation of the remains of the debt they owed the American people who had been urged to "buy Liberty bonds till it hurts"—and it is still hurting, worse than ever.

Conniving with foreign officials, in some cases paying tremendous commissions to sons of foreign Presidents, these bankers had their agents abroad seeking for opportunities to send American gold into foreign countries for profit, while they knowingly foisted upon their own people worthless foreign bonds and stocks, and at the same time agitated, propagandized, and aided foreign nations to refuse payment of the billions owed to the whole people of this Nation who bought Liberty bonds in a spirit of patriotism and charity.

Think of it, Mr. Chairman, in 1929, the year of the great stock-market crash, international bankers sent into other countries American gold credits in the sum of $1,465,958,000, and in 1930, when America was prostrate under the blow caused by the collapse of the speculative orgy, those same bankers sent American gold credits into foreign countries in the sum of $1,550,056,000, or 5.74 per cent more than in 1929. Our banks were failing in this country by the hundreds; factories were closing down; a great cry was going up from our people, "Give us work, give us bread"; and bankers and politicians were answering, "Billions for credits abroad, but not a dollar for doles at home!"

How could the international bankers close their eyes in 1929 and 1930, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that since 1928 the total number of governments in default on their private or public debts increased from 67 to 283?

How could the international bankers peddling those worthless foreign stocks and bonds close their eyes to the fact that the countries of Europe by their aid and encouragement were preparing to do what those countries now say they will do next December "after our presidential election is over"—"tell Americans where to get off," and default the debts without "humiliation" of having to tell us the reason why?

Do these international bankers admit, now that they have been exposed, that they were "unwise" in thus sending into other countries the gold credits they denied their own people? Ah, yes, Mr. Chairman; they have admitted it in the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee—and have sought to apologize and to explain away their guilt in this infamous rape on American prosperity.

Here is what B. C. Forbes says about that in an article published in Washington on the 19th of this month:

> American money will not be sent out of the country as thoughtlessly, shortsightedly, recklessly as before.
>
> I learn that leading bankers handling foreign loans decided some time ago that their methods must be reformed, and that an informal agreement to accomplish this end was reached.

Ah, yes, Mr. Chairman, now that the ruin is wrought, now that Judas is exposed, he begins publicly to reform.

Let us continue to read:

> Crossing the Atlantic with a business getter for a New York financial concern, I got from him three years ago a rather astounding picture of what was then going on. New York had men drumming up loans in foreign countries, each competing with all the others in offering alluring terms to prospective borrowers.
>
> Whenever intimation spread that a country or municipality or a large corporation was receptive to the idea of borrowing money here (in the United States), a swarm of scouts from American underwriters flocked to the spot like bees around honey.

One wonders, Mr. Chairman, why the American country banks and American investors could not have been told this in 1928.

Now listen to further observations of this noted economist and financial writer in the same article:

> This country has had no association or organization charged with any responsibility for seeing to it that American investors

received a square deal when buying foreign securities sponsored by our own bankers.

Why should we need any association or organization to assure American investors a square deal other than the bankers themselves—if they were the right kind of bankers?

Too many institutions and firms, it is now discernible, were governed mainly by an itch to bag commissions. There was not enough thought or study given to the probable outcome of the unrestricted lending to all and sundry in any and every part of the globe. * * * Unfortunately, the move to correct the foreign-financing evil was not made until unconscionable damage had been done. Whether Congress will consider that the wholly unofficial understanding or agreement among the bankers can be counted upon to prevent future abuses remains to be seen.

If restrictive legislation be passed, the bankers will have nobody to blame but themselves.

I for one, Mr. Chairman, say that any group of international bankers who would do to the banks and to the investors and to the people of this country what these international bankers have done are not to be trusted to reform. They are not to be trusted to refrain from again indulging in a reckless, unconscionable, fatal orgy of foreign loans and investments if the rewards of fat profits beckon them. Let us, by all means, have restrictive legislation that will adequately protect the banks and the people of this country from these raids upon our credit.

And now, Mr. Chairman, what of the moratorium? What of the billion and a half of loans made last summer to the Bank of England, to the Reichsbank of Germany?

Why, sir, at the very moment we were going to the rescue of the Allies when they faced defeat at the hands of the central powers they were whispering, "We must never pay these debts."

At the very moment, sir, when we were ministering financially to all the bruised and bleeding countries of Europe after the madness had passed they were whispering among themselves, ally and enemy alike, "We must never pay these debts."

At the palace of Versailles, gathered about the peace table, those nations we succored in their hour of need were scheming and plotting to get as much territory as possible, to get as much damages as possible, and smilling at good old Uncle Sam, whose altruistic principles would not allow him to take 1 cent or 1 foot of territory for his work of rescuing a prostrate Europe, and whispering among themselves, "We must never pay those debts."

In the years following the war, while those same nations were garnering billions of American gold, they were beginning to proclaim in loud chorus, a chorus in which our international bankers joined, "We must never pay those debts!"

And to-day, Mr. Chairman, that cry has reached its crescendo, and all Europe is howling, "Shylock, we will never pay those debts!"

Last summer, according to an article by Garet Garrett in the Saturday Evening Post, at the very moment those same nations were again screaming to us for help to save them from their own insane folly, their ruinous expenditures for armies and armaments with which to wage another war, and at the very moment Mr. Hoover and the international bankers were going to their rescue, the gold honor of the American dollar was being impugned, as it is to-day being impugned in Europe by the very nations we were succoring. Our credit was being impugned by our debtors, and for what reason? Why, says Garrett, because we had been too free with it, precisely for the reason our debtors knew they had borrowed too much on poor security.

We were, he tells us, in the rationally impossible position of debtor nations raiding the gold reserves of a creditor nation while the creditor nation was self-bound under an agreement not to collect its debts from them. That, Mr. Chairman, was the effect of the Hoover moratorium.

We had the strange experience, says this writer further, of being a creditor nation and finding ourselves beholden to one of our principal debtors, that debtor, France, undertaking on grounds of generosity and helpfulness, if you please, to stop raiding the creditor's gold reserves short of the point at which the creditor's gold solvency might seem in jeopardy.

We witnessed the sight, says Garrett, of public ovations in this the creditor country to the premier of one of its principal debtors when he came to tell us that more of Europe's after-war debts must be charged to the American taxpayer in a spirit of international friendship; more public ovations as he departed, saying he had our official promise to consider it.

And while we were laying a burden of $252,566,803 in interest and principal due in 1931 from the debtor countries on the backs of our own overburdened taxpayers, the nationals of England and of Germany were withdrawing that gold as fast as we could send it over. And the moment we stopped sending gold to the Bank of England—England went off the gold standard.

While the Bank of England was passing out to France, to Belgium, to Holland, to Englishmen our gold, did Mr. Edward Charles Grenfell, London partner of Morgan, Grenfell & Co., member of the British Parliament, and a director in the Bank of England, sound any warning to President Hoover and American banks through his firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. of what was being done with the American gold being poured into the Bank of England while we were staggering under hardship and unemployment in this country? He did not.

And did Thomas W. Lamont, when he appeared before the Senate Finance Committee and was asked if any partner of the house of Morgan was connected with any of the foreign banks to whom these loans were made, tell the committee about Mr. Grenfell, member of Parliament and director in the Bank of England? He did not!

And what is happening to-day, Mr. Chairman?

These same European countries are undermining in every possible way the credit of the American dollar.

The Journal of Commerce of January 21 carries the headlines that a new gold outflow to Europe looms, as more than nineteen millions of the yellow metal is shipped to France, Belgium, and England. The article goes on to state that the Bank of France has announced its intention of withdrawing $125,000,000 in earmarked gold it has been carrying for several months in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Why? To discredit the American dollar!

That article further makes the startling statement that the short-term European balances remaining in the United States are about $700,000,000 and that they may be withdrawn, while the maximum amount of free gold (not earmarked) left in the Federal reserve banks at present is only $800,000,000.

What is causing this withdrawal? Why, Mr. Chairman, these foreign debtor nations do not like our $2,000,000,000 bank-railroad-insurance company balm bill. They do not like the idea of our Federal reserve system broadening its credit expansion policy, if you please. Owing us more than $30,000,000,000, these debtors of ours are withdrawing their balances because they do not like our loose credit methods. We are too generous, in their eyes, in our loans. We are attempting now to rescue ourselves, therefore it is unsafe for them to keep their gold in our vaults. That is what they say.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, they do not want any of this gold we have loaned them in our vaults if next December 15 they default. That is why they are withdrawing their gold, these European nations! They are getting ready to default, therefore this gold must not be where we can reach it.

If and when the European nations tell us flatly and bluntly they are not going to pay any more of their honest debts to our Government, just what do you suppose is going to happen to the private debts of foreign governments and corporations, the securities of which are held in our banks throughout our country and by our American investors in the sum of more than $17,500,000,000?

Why, Mr. Chairman, is there a Member of this august body who believes for an instant that if these governments so far forget their national honor and integrity as to default obligations based upon the most solemn and sacred covenants between nations, that they will hesitate for a moment to default on the greater sum owed by them to American banks and investors who have no one, not even the power of

their own Government, to try to prevent it? Of course not. If and when those foreign nations default their debts to this Government, they will with impunity default the private debts.

I might continue at greater length upon the preparations for this default, but I desire to address myself for a moment to another phase.

Europe is serving notice on us that she does not intend to pay.

Europe is serving notice on us that she will drive us from the gold standard if she can.

Europe is serving notice on us that she, too, can erect tariff bars to keep us out of the markets of the world.

Europe is serving notice on us that she will not disarm, but that she will continue to make stupendous expenditures for armies and armaments in preparation for the next great war—and with whom?

Therefore we are faced with these problems: Either we must grant indefinite moratoriums, which means eventual cancellation, or we must agree to extreme reductions, which is cancellation in part; we must cancel the whole debt or we must force those European countries to stand before the world stripped of false raiment of virtue and integrity and naked in their disregard for their national honor or their international obligations. What are we going to do?

If I believed those nations, when they had forced us to cancel these honest debts due the American people, would then pay their private loans to American banks and investors, that might possibly be another question, although I would still oppose cancellation. But I do not believe that. I do believe that if we canceled those governmental debts to-morrow and threw upon the backs of our already crushed people the burden of that debt those foreign governments would, before six months, default on every private debt they owe our banks and our investors.

Therefore I, for one, am in favor of refusing to cut or to cancel those debts, and if those European nations default—then that will put a stop to our international bankers sending more of our gold into the rest of the world at the expense of our own industries, our own agriculture, our own people.

We may as well meet this issue courageously and with honor, for within ourselves lies the power of our recovery. Our salvation is in self-containment.

Within our own borders lies 93 per cent of our market for our own products.

In the 6-hour day lies our hope of affording employment to our now despairing workless millions.

Redistribution of wealth is another step toward recovery.

Rectification of our credit structure and restoration of credit control to the Congress and its removal from the hands of the international bankers is another necessary step.

We face the future sad but unafraid. This great Nation, this Government of, for, and by the people can not perish from the earth. We can withstand this shock of default by Europe. We can weather the storm. Our people are courageous, they are patient, they are intelligent, and they are worthy of a better fate than the rest of the world would award them. So we will not go down in despair if we will take care of our own, if we will turn our eyes and our efforts to our own welfare, instead of helping all the world and neglecting our own needy ones.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, the bill I propose to discuss is an exact copy of a bill introduced by Hon. William H. Murray in the Sixty-third Congress, and discussed by him in this House on October 19, 1914, as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 51, Appendix, page 1189.

During and after every big financial crisis in this country and England there has been an endeavor on the part of the lawmakers, at the behest of the bankers to pass legislation to relieve them of the consequences of the depression, which they had themselves oftentimes brought about. A notable example of this was after the great financial crisis in England in 1825. Sir Robert Peel, in a zealous endeavor to straighten out the errors of the banking situation in England was undertaking to foster upon the banks of Scotland the ideas of the English bankers and economists by preventing the issuing of notes less than 5 pounds. This action on his part first brought the Scottish banking system to the attention of the world and showed the amazing fact that although Scotland was the poorest and most barren country in soil, without resources of any character and without gold, had since the establishment of the Scottish bank by Mr. Patterson, founder of the Bank of England, developed tremendously, not only in agriculture, but in fisheries, livestock, and manufacturing, and all this due to the plan and policy pursued by the Scottish bank which issued its notes and extended its credit to the farmers, merchants, manufacturers, and all the various industries. These bank notes were accepted and used throughout Scotland, although not legal tender. They were for use only within the boundaries of Scotland and were preferred by the people of Scotland rather than specie for money.

The English bankers, having discovered this unusual prosperity in Scotland under this banking system, undertook to hamper and get a hold on the Scottish banking system and through the great Robert Peel undertook to abolish all small notes under 5 pounds. This act on the part of the British Parliament was resisted by all the force of the Scottish people, and in the defeat of this plan Sir Walter Scott was a leading figure.

When the next financial crisis arose, brought about by the Jacobine insurrection, the value of gold rose rapidly; and the Scottish banks in order to protect themselves, suspended the payment in specie on the presentment of their notes and issued six-month notes bearing 5 per cent interest, and by this means rode through the crisis, maintaining its currency at par.

The Scottish banking idea is based on the idea of mutual benefits from the community to the bank, and the bank to the community, and consists of a large central bank, but with branches centrally located in communities to afford banking facilities to every 4,000 inhabitants. There was no limitation of liabilities to stockholders in Scottish banks. Not a single penny was exempt against the depositors and note holders in case of failure. The cash-credit system adopted by the Scottish banks was the one that produced prosperity in the country and established public confidence in the integrity of the bank. After all, public confidence in truth is the fundamental principle on which any banking system must rest; and unless you are able to secure this public confidence, no banking system, however wisely designed, would be expected to enjoy permanent success; and although the champions of the Federal reserve banking system of this country declared on all occasions that there could be no monetary panics in these United States, their prophecies were false and at the present moment we are undergoing the greatest financial panic that we have ever had in the history of our country. The Federal reserve banking system was wisely designed and ably constructed and weathered the storms of the Great World War, carrying us safely through those perilous days. But shortly after the return of our victorious Army and America resumed its daily task of rehabilitation, the Federal reserve banking system fell into evil days; and instead of functioning as was the intention of its makers—the Congress of the United States—it became the tool of the gigantic speculative interests of the country, who disregarded all the laws of economics and, forgetful of the true purposes of a great banking system, turned the Federal reserve system into the hands of those who, actuated by avarice and greed, immediately commenced the policy of staying credits to those who produce and to furnish credit to those who speculate. When the flow of credit to the manufacturer is stopped he is forced to discharge his workers, who must find employment and subsistence elsewhere.

When credit is denied the farmer, he undertakes to increase his crop in order to make enough of his products to pay off his obligations, and it is an indisputable fact that in the

history of world banking whenever you curtail the credit and medium of exchange to the manufacturers and farmers of a country that it has been immediately followed by a glut of agricultural products. So it is in the present financial crisis. As a result of the unjustifiable curtailment of credits by the present banking system of the United States, there followed immediately a glut of agricultural products; and you can establish all the boards, cooperative organizations, and curtail the productions of agricultural products that you please, but you will not have touched the cause nor corrected the evil until you bring about a renewal and reexpansion of credits and money. Mr. Patterson, who established the Bank of England, established a great central bank system in the British Empire, suitable to the requirements and needs of that great country. On account of its great commercial trade, its import and export trade, a banking system suitable to the commercial needs of that great country, he was careful that no lenders of money for short terms on commercial paper were allowed to serve on the board of directors. Eight of the directors retire every year. It is customary to choose young men to fill vacancies on the board so that they will still possess good health when advanced on the board of governors. It is a rare thing that a director is made a governor out of his turn, or that he ever served more than two years on the board.

When he came to the establishment of the Scottish bank he found a wholly different situation existing there from that existing in England. Scotland was a rough and rugged country of poor soil and poor people, scattered over rough mountain country with very restricted means of transportation. She had no foreign trade or commerce and no well-established industry. The English system contemplated the expansion of its notes and currency throughout the world, and its great magnet of attraction would be the mother bank of England, where the specie and money of the world would center. The Scottish banking system contemplated that the notes of the Bank of Scotland would circulate only within Scotland and in its various communities, the circulation of which would expand and contract through the various seasons of the year as the commerce would expand through the seasons. Based upon the idea that it would inflate when inflation was needed and deflate when deflation was required.

Since our banking system has resulted in draining the far reaches of the South and West of its coin and circulating medium into the great money centers of the North and East, it naturally follows that now is the time for the Congress of these United States to repeal the 10 per cent tax placed on bank issues in 1875, a scheme that was promulgated by avaricious bankers of the East to get control of the whole banking system of the United States. Now is the time to strike from the board of control of the Federal reserve system every man who is engaged in international banking and lending money to the speculators and gamblers of this country. Such men have no place on such a board, where they are able to control the lifeblood and life commerce of this country. The record discloses the fact that the international bankers of this country have sold the confidence of the great American public for paltry dollars, and for profit they have been willing to sell the depreciated bonds of foreign governments for good American dollars, sending the money abroad, while manufacturing, forestry, livestock raising, and farming industries have been left drained dry and to grovel in the dust of humility and financial distress. Conduct of that kind and character in times like these convert men to the "no-bank" idea, so courageously and vigorously advocated by that great man and Democrat, Andrew Jackson. We had State bank issues prior to 1875. Some of it was wildcat; and although the worshipers of gold throw up their hands in holy terror at the mention of State-bank issue, yet these systems grew and the States in which they existed were able to prosper in spite of the cornering of gold in Wall Street. The gold-standard worshipers are but the competitors of the old goldsmiths of the past.

The two outstanding features of the Scottish bank system are the principle of cash credits and note issue.

The principle of cash credits is somewhat akin to letters of credit or guaranty of credit in vogue years ago in banks of this country. Cash credit simply means that where a person is not possessed of sufficient cash to do business but has the confidence and acquaintance of other persons of good repute, he could have an open account in his name on which he could borrow up to a fixed amount, say, $2,000 or $2,500 over and above the amount which he might be able to pay into his credit. In other words, if a tradesman or farmer should get $2,500 to operate his business upon the indorsement of two or more good sureties the bank would extend him credit. The liabilities of the sureties were limited to the $2,500. In other words, the farmer or tradesman would attain a letter of credit and make his deposits from time to time, and he was not required to pay interest on the total amount of credit at the bank, but only paid interest on the amount due the bank each day, and the bank allowed him interest on his daily balance, so that this arrangement would enable many worthy and honest people to enter trade or business and engage in commerce who otherwise would not have been able to do so on account of lack of finances and under such an arrangement that he would not be overburdened with interest charges. Under the present banking system in this country you are compelled to pay interest on the full amount of the loan of $2,500 and receive no interest on your deposit. Under proper safeguards such as I have put in my resolution State banks would be enabled to issue their notes which would circulate in their communities.

In the early history of the country, under the State laws, there were various forms of notes issued by the banks with all kinds and degrees of success and failure. This was during the earliest development of the country between the Revolutionary and the Civil Wars. America was an undeveloped wilderness, a new country, poor in specie and loanable capital, and therefore was forced by the necessity of her situation to adopt some monetary devices which would not be tolerated under more favorable conditions.

There was the banking system of New England, including the noted case of the Bank of Suffolk, of Massachusetts, which issued its notes against general assets and organized a clearing house for note redemption for banks in New England.

Bankers have always sought special favoritism from the lawmaking bodies. Take the example of the banks of Rhode Island. They were granted by the legislature special facilities for collecting their debts. It was provided that, upon a note or other instrument made payable at the bank, in case of default in payment the president or directors might cause demand to be made, and in case of his failure to make payment, that without suit or judgment against the borrower, these officers could go to the proper officers of the court and have an execution issued or an attachment of real estate levied. Of course, this "bank process" immediately brought great resentment on the part of the public and was finally set aside. Under this special favor the banks of Rhode Island made great progress and gain.

Then we had the New York bank system known as the "free banking system," under Governor Van Buren, and under him the "safety-fund plan" was inaugurated. It was suggested no doubt by the regulation of Chinese merchants who, by grant of the Chinese Government, had the exclusive right of trading with foreigners, but all were made liable in case of failure of any one of them. In other words, this was the first bank guaranty law.

You will note that all banks in New England and New York were banks of issue, the amount of their note issue being safeguarded from time to time by the laws of their several States. Under the "free bank act" of New York all persons were given the right to engage in the issuing of notes, which were obtained from the State comptroller upon depositing with him the bonds of the United States, of the State of New York, or of any other State approved by the comptroller. Notes could also be issued on bonds and mortgages on improved real estate worth double the amount se-

cured by the mortgage, and the notes had to show that they were secured by bonds or mortgages, and by which secured.

In Ohio they had branch banks, each branch bank being required to deposit with the mother bank 10 per cent of the amount of its circulating notes. Each branch was liable for the circulation but not for the other liabilities of the other branches. The State bank of Ohio was eminently successful, as was the State bank of Indiana.

In the State of Michigan the safety fund law was ignored. Wildcat banking followed, and as a result there were a great many bank failures, and by 1844 nearly all of the free banks were in the hands of receivers. In 1851 Illinois passed a banking law permitting the issuing of notes on securities, and this was followed by other States. The restrictions imposed by New York were disregarded in the West, and as a result wildcat notes were issued. A great many banks were created, owned, and managed by the State. Under the Federal Constitution no State was permitted to "emit bills of credit" and it was decided in the case of Craig against the State of Missouri that certificates issued by the State and made receivable for salaries and taxes, even though not full legal tender, were unconstitutional, but in the case of Brisco against the bank of the Commonwealth of Kentucky it was decided by a majority of the court that there was a distinction in a case where the bills were issued by a bank under the control of a president and board of directors and that the notes were not bills of credit within the inhibition of the Constitution, which included only paper issued by the authority of a State on the faith of the State and designed to circulate as money.

A unique political question opened in Kentucky in 1820 by the enactment of the replevin law, which gave debtors two years within which to redeem their goods, unless payment was accepted by creditors in notes of the Bank of the Commonwealth. This led to a fierce political campaign and one of the judges of the district court declared the law unconstitutional, which was upheld upon appeal. An extra session of the legislature was called in an effort to remove the judge, and this was followed by the election in 1824 of a legislature that repealed all the laws concerning the appellate court and created a new court of appeals, and for awhile the State of Kentucky had two systems of courts at the same time. At the next general election they changed their mood and enacted a law repealing the new court.

The Bank of Indiana stands out as a notable example of sound State banking and was able to ride safely through the storm of bank failures which occurred during the time of its existence. The Bank of Indiana had a large note circulation, but it was based on liquid assets. The bank weathered the crisis of 1857 without suspending specie payments and retired its circulation when gold went to a premium in 1862, and went out of business only upon the imposition of the 10 per cent tax. And when it wound up its affairs it had ample assets and unimpaired credit.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I take great pleasure in yielding 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma. [Applause.]

Mr. McKEOWN. I thank the gentleman.

The suspension of specie payments at the outbreak of the Civil War drove gold and silver from circulation and required an expansion of bank-note issues to maintain the volume of the currency. The Suffolk bank system of New England continued in operation at Boston, but the notes failed to flow in as rapidly as before for redemption.

While much prejudice had been engendered in the minds of the people of this country on account of the unhappy memories of some State bank issues, the only really practical defect, taking the country as a whole, was its lack of uniformity.

Those State banks that issued currency against general assets, such as those of New England, Indiana, and Louisiana, compared with banks issuing notes against securities like the banks of Illinois, New York, Wisconsin, and banks established under the charge of States, demonstrate the success of banks issuing notes against general assets as against the failure of banks issuing the circulation based on securities.

The history of State banking systems is the history of the success based on the issue of notes upon general assets as against the failure of the systems based on the depositing of securities, like the national banking system.

Banks in Canada, using a somewhat similar system to that engaged in by the successful State banking systems, have had but few failures, while the bank failures in the United States in the same length of time have amounted into the thousands.

Prior to the Civil War the banks of New Orleans were perhaps the greatest banking institutions of the country, with the possible exception of the banks of New York. The banks of New Orleans were able to hold their notes at par through the panic of 1857 and on through the Civil War, although the Confederate Government fell.

The New Orleans banks were required to divide their loans in two classes—those made from capital and those made from deposits. Loans from capital were permitted to be made on mortgages and other investments beyond 90 days. Deposit loans were restricted to 90-day nonrenewable paper, and the banks were prohibited from speculating or dealing in any products. In addition to this they were required to have 33⅓ per cent reserved against their circulating notes.

For at least 20 years in the State of Iowa there was a great fight against the establishment of State banks.

In the State of Illinois, after the collapse of the banks following the panic of 1837, paper-issue banks ceased to exist between 1843 and 1851.

As early as 1848 agitation was commenced by the recommendation of Millard Fillmore, then Comptroller of the Currency of New York, who recommended that Congress issue notes to be secured by stocks of the United States, to be received for public dues to the National Treasury.

This was followed in 1861 with a revival of the Fillmore suggestion by one Laurent Bonnefoux, with the exception that the security was limited to New York stocks.

In 1861 Silas M. Stilwell took an active part in presenting this proposition to Mr. Salmon P. Chase, Secretary of the Treasury.

When the national-banking system was proposed it was called a monopoly by the economist Henry C. Carey, for placing a limit on bank-note circulation, and the term "Money Trust" was heard long after the limitation was removed.

The fundamental principle of the national-banking system was a note issue secured by a deposit of bonds with the Comptroller of the Currency. This principle was derived from the New York system, and was often imitated by other States. The banker had merely to deposit bonds or other securities which provided a productive investment and at the time protected his notes.

The problem of agricultural credit was never taken into consideration in the establishment of the national banking system and, in my judgment, has never been taken into consideration until the establishment of the Federal land banks and agricultural credit banks. Agricultural credit was amply cared for under the New Orleans banking system, where capital loans were made to make long-time loans, whereas the deposit loans were limited to 90-day nonrenewable paper.

One of the most objectionable features to the bond-secured note issue is its inherent inelasticity. This was disclosed in the experience of the New York system in the fifties when, in a period of rising business cycle, capital was attracted to more productive investment than the purchase of bonds upon which to issue paper money.

My proposal is to repeal the 10 per cent tax on State bank issues with a proviso that would require State banks issue to be properly safeguarded and protected. This tax

was passed for the sole and only purpose of making all the banks in the United States come in under the national banking system, enacted in 1865, and has long since accomplished that purpose; and under the Federal reserve banking system in vogue now it is provided that all national banks shall be members of the Federal reserve system, and there is no further necessity for this obsolete prohibitory statute, which, to my mind, has worked to the great detriment of the financial welfare of the people of the South and West.

The New England States have, since the creation of the Government, been the center of great wealth and the congregation of the money of the country, and will continue to be so, and when the money of the far reaches of the West and South are drained into this portion of America hard times and panics, with financial distress, are inevitable. It is felt first in the places from which the money comes, the West and South, and is reflected in the falling off of the purchase of goods, wares, and merchandise from the manufacturers in the industrial part of the country, and then the closing down of factories follows in the industrial section of the country.

A careful study of the history of financial panics will bring one to the conclusion that a deflation of the circulating medium of exchange in a country is invariably followed by a glutted market for agricultural products. That is true to-day. We have one of the greatest gluts in agricultural products to-day. Instead of wasting our money in ineffective methods of relieving the glut, it is my sober judgment that we should immediately expand the medium of currency by permitting the establishing of safe and sound State banks of issue in the sovereign States.

The act was first passed on the 13th day of July, 1866, at a time when the South had no representation in the Congress, and was not made effective until 1875. The constitutionality of the act was tested in the case of the Veasie Bank, of Maine, *v.* Fenno (8 Wall. 533), and remarkable as it may seem, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court at that time was Judge Salmon P. Chase, who while Secretary of the Treasury recommended the passage of the bill to Congress. By a majority opinion the court sustained the constitutionality of the act.

In the light of the recent child labor case (257 U. S. 520), in which Chief Justice Taft held that Congress had no power to prohibit child labor through a tax, it would lead the average citizen to the conclusion that either the Supreme Court was right when it decided the Veasie Bank case and wrong in the child labor case, or right in the child labor case and wrong in the Veasie Bank case.

The purpose of a tax in the Veasie case was to destroy State banks of issue, and Chief Justice Taft draws a distinction between the two cases on the ground that Congress has the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof, which involved the incidental power to destroy State banks of issue.

There is no authority vested in Congress by the Constitution to issue notes. There remains no good reason why this act should not be repealed. The repeal of this act was one of the outstanding planks in the Democratic platform of 1892, on which Grover Cleveland was elected, and no doubt would have been in the platform of 1896 but for the silver issue; and if this Congress fails to repeal it, it will no doubt be an issue in 1932.

With the repeal of this act let us see what good occurs: First, the sovereign States wouldhave restored their ancient and undisputed right to have State banks of issue within their borders.

The control of the medium of circulation, which is the lifeblood of commerce throughout the Union, would be taken away from the hands of the few. The passage of the resolution which I have introduced would not bring about a lot of wildcat note issues or shinplasters, because my resolution, in the repeal of the 10 per cent tax, limits the repeal to such State banks or bank associations where their notes do not exceed the capital stock of the bank, and all the assets of the bank are liable for the redemption of such notes, provided that an amount shall be held in reserve for the redemption of such notes equal to $1 to every $3 of such notes so issued, and any State by legislative enactment may authorize such notes for circulation by any person, firm, association, corporation, State bank, or State banking association, upon State, county, township, or municipal bonds or bonds lawfully issued by legally organized drainage or irrigation districts, or associations, not to exceed 75 per cent of the par value of such bonds; provided that 15 per cent in gold of the face value of such notes for circulation shall be held and maintained in reserve at all times for the redemption of such notes; and provided further, that any State may, by legislative enactment, authorize such notes for circulation by any person, firm, association, corporation, State bank, or State banking association upon any staple product of the farm, field, or mine when the same shall have been fully insured against fire or deterioration in value or loss; provided further, that there is held and maintained in reserve at all times 15 per cent in gold of the face value of such notes for redemption of the same, and that such notes as herein authorized shall be exempt from all taxes and penalties otherwise prescribed by the act of February 8, 1875.

It can be readily seen by this action on the part of Congress that States that now suffer from a lack of circulation, such as Oklahoma and Texas and other Southern and Western States, could relieve themselves of their present calamity in business with a currency that would circulate only within the State and business would proceed and the country would soon be rehabilitated. Although I am unwilling to assume the rôle of a prophet and proclaim, as has been said by champions of other banking systems, that we would never have another panic, I am certain that the poor and undeveloped regions of this country under this system would be given a fair and equal opportunity to grow and develop and their people enjoy the share of the prosperity of the Nation to which they are entitled. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. [Applause.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly our present economic plight and difficulty is traceable, mainly, to the World War, which destroyed the European balance of trade and credit, and transformed us, an erstwhile debtor nation, into a creditor nation. As a debtor nation we enjoyed a very active, lucrative export trade with countries the world over. This trade, resulting as it did in an inflation of real-estate values and commodity prices, caused also an expansion in agriculture and finance. We exported vast quantities of cotton, wheat, lumber, as well as many other commodities, and with these exports we paid the debts we owed abroad.

That is now all passed; we have become a creditor nation, owing no one any money, and with practically all the nations owing us money. These debtor nations do not, however, come to our ports for our surplus cotton, wheat, lumber, and manufactured products, since they have not the wherewithal to pay for same. This state of affairs can be remedied in one of two ways—either by our loaning these nations the money with which to purchase our products or by our taking their goods and articles in exchange for our own.

We have loaned these nations approximately two billions of dollars, and we can not loan them any more. In fact, our people have no more money to invest in foreign securities. On the other hand, Europe is unable to pay us in world goods, since we have put up so high a tariff rate and barrier that it is well-nigh impossible for them to send us their goods.

It is fundamental that to sell abroad you must buy abroad. The Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Lamont, in his annual report shows this most readily by the figures of the American foreign trade, taken for the years 1910-1914; then for

the postwar period, 1922–1926; and then for the period of the depression up to June 30, 1931.

These records indicate that during the pre-war period, when our exports were twice the amount of our exports of the postwar years, our imports during the former period were similarly twice the amount of those during the latter period. Furthermore during the depression period, when our exports fell off about one-third, our imports fell off about one-third. In other words, during these several periods of time our imports practically balanced our exports and our exports practically balanced our imports, all of which gives further proof of the inescapable truth that selling and buying compensate each other. And so I repeat, to export we must import, and to import we must export. Even Mr. Hoover realized this, for in 1921, when he was Secretary of Commerce and when the economic and industrial conditions in this country and abroad were still chaotic as a result of the lack of economic recovery from the war, he made a notable address at the National Shoe and Leather Exposition, and there stated these vital truths about foreign trade:

I may say in passing that our whole standard of living greatly depends upon our imports, and our exports are the great balance wheel for our productions. Exports are vital to the stabilization of our industries, of price levels, of wages, and of employment. While many of the causes of the present depression lie within our own borders, yet there may be no recovery from these hard times for many years to come if we neglect our economic relations abroad.

Those words, my good friends, were uttered in 1921. Mr. Hoover was not then President, and the views of high protectionism had not then had time to have their deadly effect on him. He sang an entirely different tune when he signed the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, which not only imposed enormous burdens on our consumers but also reduced our trade within 17 months after its passage $5,326,000,000. This was an inevitable result, since with high rates Europe could not ship goods to us and, correspondingly, could not buy from us. Thus in a recent report submitted by the Committee on Ways and Means we find the following:

That this widespread depression has been aggravated by the high and, in many instances, prohibitive rates of the tariff act of 1930 can not be successfully denied. The foreign and domestic trade data furnished by the statistical division of the Department of Commerce on January 7, 1932, recites that for 17 months prior to July 1, 1930, our exports were $6,829,000,000; for the same period our imports were $5,766,000,000; our total exports and imports were $12,595,000,000.

The tariff act of 1930 was approved June 17, 1930.

For 17 months since July 1, 1930, our exports have decreased from $6,829,000,000 to $4,007,000,000. During the same period our imports have decreased from $5,766,000,000 to $3,262,000,000 and our total exports and imports have decreased from $12,595,000,000 to $7,269,000,000, making a total decrease of exports and imports for 17 months after the passage of the tariff act of June 17, 1930, of $5,326,000,000.

This has resulted in the accumulation of huge surpluses of both manufactured articles and agricultural commodities for which there is no market.

It is, indeed, pertinent to ask what Mr. Hoover has done to improve our economic relations abroad; what has he done to increase the amount of goods imported from abroad, to enable the foreign nations to buy more from us? It is pertinent to say, in answer, that he has done his level best to destroy our economic relations abroad and to hamper and hinder the freedom of trade and intercourse with other nations, by his espousal of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, and of anything else that calls for the highest kind of protection.

We may further inquire as to what plan, if any, has the administration devised to get rid of our excess products—60 per cent in cotton, 255 per cent in wheat, 535 per cent in rye, 405 per cent in tobacco, 305 per cent in lard, 30 to 35 per cent in petroleum. These surpluses must be sold abroad if business is to revive; yet they simply can not be marketed, because most of the nations are incensed by our extortionist tariff, and have therefore set up their own high tariff barriers.

Thus, our automobile companies, making a half million cars per year for export purposes, our petroleum, leather goods, textile and cotton industries, our electrical-appliances manufacturers, paint, hosiery, and many other industries, looking for wide markets to sell their wares, now find themselves confronted with retaliatory tariffs everywhere. Our tariff walls beget other tariff walls; the channels of trade become blocked; business assets become frozen. Surely some statesman, some national figure—it ought to be Mr. Hoover—should come forward with a plan to open up these channels of trade and thaw out the frozen conditions of world commerce.

About a week ago a very significant article appeared in the metropolitan press. Quoting from that article, we find:

The British Government's imposition of a general tariff, coming within a fortnight, will be followed by a bold and far-reaching attempt to bring down the tariff walls against British goods all over the world.

The Government contemplates not only a tariff of give and take with the Dominions, but will try to win preferential entry for British products into all the so-called "sterling" countries which followed Britain in going off the gold standard.

It will begin with Denmark and Argentina, which are more closely bound to Britain economically than some of the Dominions themselves. Ultimately it is hoped Holland, Sweden, Norway, Egypt, and others will come into the scheme.

A significant hint came to-day from J. H. Thomas, Secretary of State for the Dominions, that the Government would open discussions with foreign countries even before the opening of the Dominions conference at Ottawa in July. Mr. Thomas promised there would be "no negotiations that would prejudice free and unfettered negotiations at Ottawa," but left the door open for immediate talks with the countries outside of the British Empire which come wihin Britain's economic orbit.

In effect, these discussions will mark the beginning of a powerful drive against most-favored-nation treaties everywhere. Under existing commercial treaties the products of the high tariff of the United States are admitted into Argentina and Scandinavia on exactly the same terms as the goods of the low tariff of Britain.

After the new British tariff is imposed, and its imposition by the end of next week is regarded as likely, invitations will be issued to foreign countries to come in under the British tariff wall if they grant corresponding favors to British goods in their own markets. * * * In the case of Argentina it will be an invitation, backed by a weapon of tariff, to transfer her purchases of manufactured goods from the United States to Britain.

Overtures have thus been made—and they have undoubtedly been made through diplomatic channels—for our country to negotiate some sort of tariff reciprocity with England. But up to this hour we have heard nothing from the White House or from the administration in this regard. And in the meanwhile the new British tariff bears heavier and heavier on our exports. Forty-six per cent of our annual exports will have to pay new duties under the general levy of a 10 per cent increase on practically all American-made goods and commodities, effective March 1, 1932. This 10 per cent increase will be paid by 46 per cent of America's annual sales to England, which in 1930 was equal to $672,181,000. (Legislative reference service, Library of Congress.)

By a specific provision of Parliament the Dominions of Great Britain are exempt from the application of the new 10 per cent law. At the imperial conference, to be held next July at Ottawa, the question of the preferential treatment of empire-made products, to and from the dominions, will be discussed. Under ordinary conditions, a 10 per cent increase in England on American-made goods might invoke no difficulty; but since England is off the gold standard, the purchasers of American exports in England are required to pay substantially more for American products, in terms of depreciated sterling than they would have been required to pay if England were on the gold standard. Add to this the increase of 10 per cent, the inflated commodity prices caused by debased English currency, and you strike confusion in the hearts of the American exporters to England. Furthermore, a thoroughly chauvinistic policy, going, as it does, hand in hand with our high protective tariff, has intensified the campaign, now rampant in England, of buying only British-made goods.

There is, moreover, another disastrous effect of our high-tariff policy that must not be lost sight of, and that is the veritable flight of American industries to Canada and Europe. In their endeavor to escape the devastating effects of the retaliatory tariffs of England and Canada, American industries have been erecting plants in foreign lands. Nor

can we censor them for this; for they must do business and must have an outlet for their capital, and since we discourage the operation of their plants here, they go abroad.

According to Dr. James Harvey Rogers, of Yale, the expatriation of American industry has been rapid and devastating as the result of our tariffs. By the end of 1929 American investments in factories abroad reached $1,813,000,000. Approximately 45 per cent of this sum was invested in Canada, 35 per cent in Europe, and the rest in Latin America and Asia.

Some 1,500 plants, American except for American pay rolls and American raw materials, now operate in Canada. In Europe there are 453 American branch factories employing European workers, while millions of American workers roam the streets. As pointed out by Doctor Rogers, to escape retaliatory foreign tariffs provoked by the Hawley-Smoot law, our industrialists moved their plants in under the foreign walls.

In this migratory movement, to the stimulus of foreign tariff barriers is apparently added that of our own—

Writes Doctor Rogers in his book, America Weighs Her Gold—

Thus, because of our own tariff walls and because of others largely provoked by our own, the resulting handicaps to our export trade are leading to the export of our industries themselves; and, in general, it is our most progressive industries which are first to find this avenue of escape.

Furthermore, in migrating they are carrying with them not only American machinery, American technique, American executive ability, but what to many appears vastly more important, no uncertain part of American buying of raw materials and supplies and of American wage-paying ability. These are losses that never can be recovered.

As yet, as far as I can discover, no responsible person in the administration has seized upon the handle offered by Great Britain. Her invitation to discuss reciprocal tariff pacts should undoubtedly be accepted; the opportunity to increase our trade, at least with Great Britain, should unquestionably be embraced.

In this connection I wish now to read House Concurrent Resolution 11, which I offered under date of January 18, 1932:

That for the purpose of further readjusting the duties on importations into the United States of article or articles the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, and of the exportation into the Dominion of Canada of article or articles the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States, the President of the United States is authorized and requested to negotiate trade agreements with the Dominion of Canada wherein mutual concessions are made looking toward freer trade relations and the further reciprocal expansion of trade and commerce: *Provided, however*, That said trade agreements, before becoming operative, shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States for ratification or rejection.

The words of this resolution are identical with the words of a resolution adopted by this very House and sponsored by the late Oscar W. Underwood, a very distinguished Member of this body, who then presided as majority leader. In the passage of this measure he had the whole-hearted support of the people of the United States and of the then President of the United States, Mr. Taft, a firm believer in reciprocity, who exemplified rare statesmanship in crystallizing public opinion in this country in favor of Canadian reciprocity.

At this point I wish to offer a copy of a letter dealing with Canadian-American reciprocity, which I sent to the President under date of October 21, 1931:

OCTOBER 21, 1931.

Hon. HERBERT HOOVER,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I herewith submit to you certain figures of which you are undoubtedly aware. They indicate the total values of imports and domestic exports of merchandise into and from the United States in its trade with Canada, by monthly periods, from January, 1929, to August, 1931, inclusive.

Imports

	1929	1930	1931
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
January	42,053,279	37,396,672	23,467,872
February	36,981,102	33,289,278	21,304,561
March	39,938,029	38,436,610	24,151,945

Imports—Continued

	1929	1930	1931
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
April	40,394,782	36,364,727	23,781,668
May	44,330,153	37,396,573	24,045,080
June	44,315,288	36,522,094	22,992,434
July	44,101,233	30,341,009	22,348,189
August	43,760,209	29,279,842	20,529,330
September	42,256,553	32,522,475	
October	46,073,000	34,336,077	
November	42,455,621	30,309,575	
December	36,836,997	26,155,348	
Total	503,496,245	402,350,290	

Domestic exports

	1929	1930	1931
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
January	66,531,417	50,721,870	31,966,882
February	66,951,912	54,254,052	33,511,759
March	85,680,408	62,579,353	39,634,381
April	87,446,018	61,060,793	42,980,821
May	93,491,232	66,316,837	39,862,104
June	76,434,730	57,060,631	33,383,502
July	75,863,775	52,898,871	31,449,980
August	73,400,978	52,066,019	29,119,561
September	77,456,825	50,264,773	
October	80,603,078	47,081,498	
November	64,187,050	40,222,599	
December	54,006,621	33,283,891	
Total	902,144,044	627,811,187	

From these figures it is readily discernible that our trade with Canada has suffered a decided and impressive decline, both as to exports and imports. Whatever can be done to improve this situation should not be left undone. Surely increased trade between ourselves and our neighbors to the north, while it would not wholly solve the economic difficulties under which we now labor, nevertheless would appreciably improve conditions. We have unquestionably come to a parting of the ways. We must determine whether high tariff walls shall isolate us permanently from Canadian markets or whether we shall lower these walls and again become good commercial friends.

Your distinguished predecessor, the late William Howard Taft, in his annual message to Congress of December 6, 1910, and also in his special message of January 26, 1911, voiced sentiments and observations relative to reciprocity with Canada which are just as potent to-day as when they were first uttered. In these messages he called the attention of Congress to the important fact that reciprocal trade agreements had been reached between our Secretary of State and the representatives of the Dominion Government, and that congressional action was now necessary. He also stated that the controversies resulting from the uncertainties which attended the partition of British territory on the American continent at the close of the Revolution had been eliminated by arbitration or by contract negotiations. These disputes related to the settlement of boundaries, the definition of rights of navigation, transportation rights on both sides of the border, Atlantic fishing rights, and the interpretation of treaties. He held that a path was thus opened for the improvement of commercial relations, and that to improve the commercial well-being of the two nations it was essential that Congress should approve reciprocal tariff arrangements.

Unfortunately the farseeing efforts of President Taft proved unavailing, and the trade and commercial breach between Canada and the United States has widened ever since. We have built our tariff walls higher and higher, and the Canadians have responded in kind. Thus, we stand behind our high tariff walls with folded arms while Canada stands behind hers and thumbs her nose at us. Meanwhile business comes to a standstill.

Surely, Mr. President, the identity of interests of the American and Canadian markets, linked together as these nations are by race, language, political institutions, close blood relationships, and common sympathies, as well as geographical proximity, requires a reconsideration of this question of Canadian reciprocity! The rigors of the dreadful depression which has settled alike upon Canada and the United States would certainly be somewhat assauged by freer commercial intercourse. Canada touches our borders for 3,000 miles; her natural resources are similar to ours; the conditions of her wage earners are like ours; her farmers suffer as our farmers suffer. There have never been two countries so alike. The difference between the United States and Canada is only the difference that exists between any two of our States. Lowering the tariff barriers between the two countries, as President Taft so ably stated, "is not a violation of the protective principle, as that has been authoritatively announced by those who uphold it, because that principle does not call for a tariff between this country and one whose conditions as to population, production, and wages are so like ours, and when a common boundary line of 3,000 miles must in itself make a radical distinction between our commercial treatment of Canada and of any other country."

May I not, therefore, Mr. President, prevail upon you to open negotiations to the end that there may be adopted between this

country and Canada a sort of zollverein or customs union, so that the reciprocity agitated for so long a period may become finally a reality.

Our citizens are well aware that you are patiently and painstakingly endeavoring to relieve the country of its economic suffering. I personally applaud your desire to have the banks of the nation pool their interests so that the weaker financial institutions may continue to function. I cherish the hope also that the ideal of Canadian reciprocity may likewise be embraced by you and find a place in your program of constructive relief.

Respectfully yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Representative Tenth New York District.

No action was, however, taken upon my letter. But in an endeavor to follow it up I addressed another letter to the Premier of Canada, R. B. Bennett, under date of November 5, 1931, dealing with the same subject:

NOVEMBER 5, 1931.

The Hon. R. B. BENNETT,
Premier of the Dominion of Canada,
Ottawa, Canada.

MY DEAR MR. BENNETT: In my capacity as a citizen of the United States, rather than as a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States, I desire to acquaint you with the growing sentiment in the United States for a rapprochement between this country and the Dominion of Canada to the end that there may be readopted what is commonly known as Canadian reciprocity.

As you know, to create closer commercial relations between the two countries a reciprocity treaty was negotiated way back in 1854, and was in actual successful operation from 1855 to March 16, 1866, 11 years. Under that treaty, Canada became second only to Great Britain in foreign trade with the United States. This reciprocal arrangement largely contributed to the very considerable growth of trade in both countries.

Unfortunately, differences arose as a result of our Civil War. In 1864 the American Congress demanded abrogation of the treaty. Two years later, as such period of notice was required under the treaty, the arrangement came to an end.

In 1911, President Taft, despite opposition, was enabled, with the help of a Democratic Congress, to again pass a law providing for reciprocity with Canada. The Canadian Parliament, however, withheld ratification of the treaty embodying the bill. Your distinguished predecessor, Sir Wilfred Laurier, went down to defeat on that issue.

Much water has gone over the dam since then, and I believe that trade relations between the United States and Canada have reached a critical stage. We face two alternatives: Either higher tariffs and less trade, or lower tariffs, by reciprocity or otherwise, and more trade.

There are many in this country who deplored the passage of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill. They deplored the irritation that it was bound to cause the inhabitants of your fine country. They realized, furthermore, that the high tariff provided for in that bill was bound to cause retaliation. They knew that your people would not offer passive resistance, but, on the contrary, would offer active resistance to this tariff. As extremely important buyers of our American products, you are in a position of strength to bargain for better terms elsewhere if you can not get them from us. Conversely the same holds true for us. You buy from us in large quantities autos, gasoline, farm implements and machinery, cotton, tobacco, iron and steel products, radios, musical instruments, and all kinds of fruit and vegetables. America needs your forest products—nickel, asbestos, zinc, lead, silver, copper, and gold. You need our tourist trade, which yields you over $300,000,000 annually. Reciprocity between the two countries would tremendously increase mutual trade in mutual markets.

Your first reaction against the Hawley-Smoot tariff was the so-called "Dunning Budget," which went into effect May 1, 1930. Mr. C. A. Dunning, Liberal Minister of Finance, put through the most extensive tariff revision in the country, I believe, since 1907. The increases were directly aimed against American goods. As a result of your recent election you, Mr. Bennett, pledged yourself to a revision of tariff upward. On August 26 last your government took action against more American goods. Duties now, for example, on apples, onions, peaches, peas, tomatoes, etc., are well-nigh prohibitive. These increased Canadian duties are bound to have their further repercussions in the United States and may well give rise to further retaliation on our side of the border. Where will it all end?

Canada buys and sells more to the United States than to any other country, and the United States buys and sells more to Canada than to any other country. This trade would admittedly be far greater if there were no tariff barriers or if tariff barriers were reduced. North America is really a complete economic unit: Canada is the northern half, the United States the southern half, with the same language, habits, customs, and culture uniting them. Your radio broadcasts are heard by millions of Americans. Our "talkies" are seen and heard by millions of your people. The same newspapers, magazines, and books freely circulate on both sides of our boundary line. The 3,000 miles of border boasts of no gendarme or soldiering. There never have been two countries so alike. The differences between us are of the same nature as those between any two of our own States. As was pointed out by Alex Skelton in a recent article in The Nation, the following tables show exports of Canadian agricultural products to the United States 10 years ago, when the tariff rates were relatively low, as compared with to-day, when the Hawley-Smoot tariff has reached its pinnacle. You will note the decided loss to your people.

Exports from Canada to United States of principal farm products and United States tariff rates in force for 12 months ended June, 1921, and June, 1931

	Exports value June, 1921	12 months to June, 1931	Tariff rates in force	
			1921	1931
Cattle	$21,240,000	$764,000	Free	Under 700 pounds, 2½ cents per pound; over 700 pounds, 3 cents per pound.
Sheep	1,676,000	244	do	$3 per head.
Wheat	101,997,000	6,580,000	do	42 cents per bushel.
Flour	12,687,000	4,310	do	$1.04 per 100 pounds.
Beef	4,485,000	121,000	do	6 cents per pound.
Mutton	1,500,000	191	do	5 cents per pound (lamb, 7 cents per pound).
Butter	2,294,000	20,000	2½ cents per pound.	14 cents per pound.
Cream	2,087,000	1,348,800	Free	56.6 cents per gallon.
Flaxseed	5,045,000	1,088,000	20 cents per bushel.	65 cents per bushel.
Maple sugar	1,122,000	310,000	3 cents per pound.	8 cents per pound (now 4 cents per pound).
Wool	2,227,000	275,000	Free	24 to 37 cents per pound.

Statesmen in both countries must find the conclusion inescapable that the high tariff between the two countries has undoubtedly been detrimental to mutual trade. The official figures for the imports and exports in the first eight months of this current year as compared with the same period of the two preceding years show a very dangerous trend. The figures are as follows:

Jan. 1 to Aug. 31	Exports	Imports
1931	$293,000,000	$184,400,000
1930	480,500,000	289,000,000
1929	659,000,000	335,800,000

The depression can not be said to be responsible for all of this shrinkage. Indeed high tariff barriers have aggravated the depression which has descended upon Canada and the United States alike.

The floodgates of commerce between the two countries therefore should be opened and the waters of prosperity be permitted again to flow to all corners of Canada and the United States. There should be no vying for commercial supremacy by fomenting the trade disputes and rivalries that only retaliatory tariffs bring.

You have been elected upon a platform pledging you to a protective tariff, but lowering the tariff barriers between our countries, as our late President Taft so ably stated, "is not a violation of the protective principle, as that has been authoritatively announced by those who uphold it, because that principle does not call for a tariff between this country and one whose conditions as to population, production, and wages are so like ours, and when a common boundary line of 3,000 miles must, in itself, make a radical distinction between our commercial treatment of Canada and of any other country."

May I, therefore, cherish the hope, as an humble American citizen, that negotiations may be set afoot to the end that Canadian-American reciprocity will soon become fait accompli?

With assurances of highest esteem, I am, sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, D. C., United States of America.

At the present time there certainly is an opportunity for President Hoover to do as his predecessor, Mr. Taft, had done—bring about friendly trade relations with Canada and Great Britain. The President can now show of what metal his statesmanship is made.

Some of you may recall that I offered my House Concurrent Resolution 11 as an amendment to the recently passed H. R. 6662. An attempt was made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] to strike it out on a point of order; but he quickly realized his mistake, withdrew his objection, and said that the amendment was quite germane to the bill and should be voted on. This proposed amendment came at the very end of the discussion on the tariff bill, H. R. 6662, close to the end of the day, when the Members were fatigued and anxious to wind up their labors. As a consequence, it

was probably lost in the shuffle; sufficient consideration was not given to it, and it failed of passage.

I do, indeed, hope that in the not far-distant future this House Concurrent Resolution 11, having for its purpose the reestablishment of Canadian reciprocity, will find favorable consideration at your hands.

It has been argued that a reciprocal treaty of this character, either with Canada, with Great Britain, or with any other nation, offends the favored-nation clauses of our divers treaties with various other countries. I have grave doubts as to this contention, since in two important decisions—Bartram against Robertson, reported in volume 122 of the United States Reports, at page 116, and Whitney against Robertson, to be found in volume 124 of those reports, page 190, the United States Supreme Court, in effect, has laid down the law that reciprocal trade treaties do not in any respect violate the favored-nation clauses which may be found in most of our commercial treaties.

The headnotes of these two cases I shall now read:

BARTRAM *v.* ROBERTSON

The provisions in the treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation with the King of Denmark, concluded April 26, 1826, and revived by the convention of April 11, 1857, do not, by their own operation, authorize the importation, duty free, from Danish dominions, of articles made duty free by the convention of January 30, 1875, with the King of the Hawaiian Islands, but otherwise subject to duty by a law of Congress, the King of Denmark not having allowed to the United States the compensation for the concession which was allowed by the King of the Hawaiian Islands.

WHITNEY *v.* ROBERTSON

The treaty of February 8, 1867, with the Dominican Republic (art. 9) provides that "no higher or other duty shall be imposed on the importation into the United States of any article the growth, produce, or manufacture of the Dominican Republic, or of her fisheries, than are or shall be payable on the like articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of any foreign country or of its fisheries." The convention of January 30, 1875 with the King of the Hawaiian Islands provides for the importation into the United States, free of duty, of various articles, the produce and manufacture of those islands (among which were sugars) in consideration of certain concessions made by the King of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States. Held, that this provision in the treaty with the Dominican Republic did not authorize the admission into the United States, duty free, of similar sugars, the growth, produce, or manufacture of that Republic, as a consequence of the agreement made with the King of the Hawaiian Islands, and that there was no distinction in principle between this case and Bartram *v.* Robertson (122 U. S. 116).

Thus, my friends, we must state whether we are to continue or discontinue reciprocal commercial relations with Canada. Must we say that we have come to the parting of the ways, for we are, indeed, well on the road to that point where the ways, so far as Canadian trade is concerned, will, of necessity, part.

The figures which I set forth in my letter to the President indicate such a stupendous loss of exports and imports that we are indeed forced to pause and take heed. We set up a high tariff wall, and with the years that wall has been lifted higher and higher. A retaliatory tariff wall was thus set up by Canada against our products, and with the years that wall, too, has been lifted higher and higher. This so-called trade-protection inevitably breeds contempt; contempt breeds revenge; revenge may breed fear; and fear may breed war. This may sound somewhat far-fetched, but it certainly is within the realm of human possibility.

In any event, it is our duty to take this tariff question by the forelock and not only prevent these walls from going any higher, but, if possible, bring them down to a point where reciprocal relations with Canada will be resumed.

In a lecture recently delivered before the International Relations Study Club at Cornell University, Dr. James E. Boyle, professor of rural economy at that university, speaking on the subject of our trade relations with Canada, said:

Look, for instance, at foreign trade for a moment from Canada's standpoint. Take her 13 best customers in the two years, 1930 and 1931. The notable thing is the decline in the United States share of this trade. The decline is both sudden and violent, amounting as it does to 31 per cent in one year. Stated in the form of a table, the facts are as follows:

Canada's foreign trade with 13 leading customers (12 months ended March, 1930 and 1931)

[In millions of dollars]

	1930		1931	
	Imports	Exports	Imports	Exports
United States	847	515	584	350
United Kingdom	189	282	149	219
Germany	21	26	16	13
France	25	17	19	13
Japan	12	30	9	19
New Zealand	16	19	7	13
Argentina	10	19	7	10
Belgium	13	22	8	15
Netherlands	9	16	7	10
Australia	4	16	5	7
China	3	16	5	9
British India	9	9	8	7
Italy	5	11	5	14
Canada's total foreign trade, all countries	1,248	1,120	907	800

This table shows that for the period covered there was a slump of 28 per cent in Canada's total foreign trade, and a slump of 31 per cent in her trade with the United States. But since the period covered by these statistics ended in March, 1931, these figures do not show a full year of operation under the prohibitions of the Hawley-Smoot tariff of June, 1930. Statistics now available for the first nine months of 1931—January, 1932—show that the decline in United States trade with Canada is larger than 31 per cent. For this 9-month period—January to September, 1931—the decline in our exports to Canada was 39 per cent; our purchases from Canada, 34 per cent.

The flow of goods back and forth across the border, when not interrupted by artificial barriers such as tariffs, reflects the mutually advantageous investments by individuals of one country in the other, and the equally advantageous individual exchange of goods and services. So it came about naturally that citizens of the United States invested some three and a half billion dollars in Canada, while citizens of Canada invested $1,000,000,000 in the United States. It came about naturally that the merchandise trade between Canada and the United States was greater than that between any other two nations on the face of the globe. In normal times the tourists trade is also a big financial item; it is estimated that our visitors to Canada spend annually some $250,000,000 in that country. Visitors from Canada to the United States are supposed to spend in normal years about $100,000,000.

Unfortunately, in the last two years things have been happening, three things, in fact, which poison the relations between these two countries and which elevate to new and preposterous heights the 3,000 miles of tariff wall now separating them. These three malignant growths are the Hawley-Smoot tariff, the King-Dunning budget, and the Bennett tariff. These three measures are deliberate attempts to kill a large part of the commerce between these two neighbors. The philosophy back of these measures, if carried to its logical extreme, would lead to the following absurd conclusion:

1. It is best to keep your money at home—that is, in your own country.
2. It is best to keep your money in your own State (or province).
3. It is best to keep your money in your own town.
4. It is best to keep your money in your own pocket.
5. It is best to do no buying and selling but to draw your own water, hew your own wood, wash your own linen, and raise your own food.

And so, my friends, I maintain that the time has now arrived when this Congress, in cooperation with the President—if this is possible—should lend its efforts toward the establishing of firmer and improved trade conditions between the United States and Canada. This, we can readily see, will be the beginning of similar trade relations with other nations. England, as has been stated, is now making a bid for our trade—for better, freer, and friendlier trade relations with us. Other nations will follow this course.

I therefore do seriously hope that my words will meet with your favorable consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, a tax of 2 and 4 cents per gallon levied upon foreign oil and gasoline imported into this country would not increase the price of such products to the consumer but would produce revenue.

On the first proposition, that it would increase the price of such products to the consumer, it might be well to call attention to the fact that this contention or argument does not by any means hold good in all cases. It can be shown that in many instances a tariff levied on foreign products imported into this country in competition with domestic

products of which this country has an ample supply, has not had the effect of increasing the price of the articles produced in this country. I will give below a few illustrations of this fact.

Commodity	Duty or excise tax levied	1929 price before recent tariff law	1931 average price
Potatoes	75 cents per hundredweight	2.27	1.52
Wool	24 cents per pound	32.7	20.5
Oats	16 cents per bushel	48.6	27.8
Cattle hides	10 per cent ad valorem	[1] .118	[1] .057

[1] Per pound.

And a striking illustration is wheat. We have had for the past year or so a tariff of 42 cents per bushel on wheat. Those of us from wheat States like Kansas know that this 42-cent tariff has not had the effect of increasing the price of wheat produced in Kansas, or, for that matter, anywhere else in the United States, 42 cents a bushel. The real reason, as has often been stated, is because the competition on wheat within the United States and the oversupply have prevented the price from going up in the amount of the tariff. In this connection I call attention to the statement made by Hon. Wirt Franklin, president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, to the Ways and Means Committee last month. He said:

As to the price of oil to the consumer (if this tax is put on in the United States) you can well depend upon the competition of the independent branch of the producing and refining industry to take care of the price and hold it down to reasonable levels. If you allow that independent branch to be destroyed, then you do not have any protection for the American consumer whatever.

If these imported gasolines are a benefit to the consumer, why has not the price on the Atlantic seaboard for gasoline been less than it has been in the interior? They have held the price up to the very limit that it is possible to hold it, and that is well known, and the price has been just a little bit higher on the Atlantic seaboard, where they are buying foreign gasoline, than it has been in the interior.

It is also a well-known fact that notwithstanding the fact a few months ago crude oil was selling as low as 18 and 20 cents a barrel, the price of gasoline remained about the same as when it sold for more than $1 per barrel. And every driver of an automobile knows that the price of lubricating oil was not reduced one cent when the price of crude was reduced from $1.45 to 18 and 20 cents a barrel.

That this tax will produce revenue is shown by the report of the Tariff Commission. Congress created this Tariff Commission with power and authority to investigate, as has been done recently, to ascertain the difference in the cost of production of foreign and domestic petroleum and gasoline. That investigation and report has been made to Congress and shows conclusively that the average cost of production of foreign oil delivered to the Atlantic seaboard of the United States is 87 cents per barrel; that the sale value is $1.90 per barrel. Therefore, it can be seen that if a tax of 2 cents per gallon should be levied, which would amount to 84 cents per barrel, there being 42 gallons to the barrel, it would make the cost $1.71 per barrel. This would still leave a profit of 19 cents per barrel at the present selling price.

This same Tariff Commission report shows that the profit on the domestic crude delivered and refined at the Atlantic seaboard is 11 cents per barrel. Thus it can be seen that by levying a tax of 84 cents per barrel on imported oil we are still giving the foreign competitor of the American independent oil industry the best of it to the extent of 8 cents per barrel profit. To me it seems absurd for anyone who wants to be reasonable and fair to contend that, while the foreign oil importer can undersell the domestic producer at least 8 cents per barrel, that he will not take advantage of that and continue to import as he has heretofore. I can not believe that the Ways and Means Committee, or rather the men who constitute its personnel and who are working day after day searching for something to tax to produce revenue, can be made to believe the claims of those who solely from a selfish viewpoint contend that the proposed tax on foreign imports of oil and gasoline will not produce revenue.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. In the figures the gentleman has given has he taken into account the difference in the tariff rates in several countries, due to the fact that they have gone off the gold standard?

Mr. AYRES. I have not.

Mr. GOSS. That would make it even greater, would it not?

Mr. AYRES. I should say it would, but I have not considered that question in connection with what I have been discussing.

Mr. GOSS. It would be still farther out of line with those countries that are off the gold standard.

Mr. AYRES. No doubt the gentleman is correct in his statement.

In 1930 there was imported into the United States 62,129,419 barrels of oil of 42 gallons each, or 2,619,435,598 gallons. A 2-cent tax on that oil would have produced revenue of $52,188,711.96. In that same year there was imported 26,080,383 barrels of fuel oil, or 1,095,375,986 gallons. A 2 cents per gallon tax on that oil would have provided a revenue of $21,907,519.72. There was also imported into this country in 1930, 16,926,800 barrels of gasoline or 710,925,600 gallons. A tax of 4 cents per gallon would have provided a revenue of $28,437,024. There was also imported in 1930, 24,782 barrels of lubricating oil or 948,567 gallons. A tax of 4 cents per gallon would have provided revenue of $37,943.04. There are a few more refined products of petroleum imported but I am calling attention to the major items only, which alone would produce a revenue of $102,571,198.72 on the basis of the 1930 importations.

It seems that anyone who wants to be fair would not contend for a moment that a tax as suggested would stop the importation of foreign oil and its refined products, but that there will be just as much imported in the future as has been in the past. And it would seem that this substantial amount of revenue would be advantageous at this particular time.

Even if we should assume that the great oil importers are correct in their utterly undocumented assertion that a tariff or an excise tax would prevent the entrance of foreign oil and therefore not be productive of any revenue from duties, the net result would be the same. The revival of the American petroleum industry would restore lost sources of Federal taxation increasing the receipts from corporation taxes, income taxes, and so forth. At a time when we are seeking for potential sources of revenue we can not afford to ignore the tax-producing possibilities in this restoration of one of our basic industries which formerly paid large sums into the Federal Treasury, but which for the past few years has been the source of practically no revenue or greatly decreased revenue.

The Revenue Department reports show that the Federal Government collected $1,018,911,438 less tax in the fiscal year 1931 than in 1930; and that this decrease is due in the main to a falling off of income taxes, which in amount was $964,932,926.81. In my own State of Kansas there was more than $6,000,000 less income taxes paid last year than in 1927. This is due almost wholly to the fact that the oil producers of that State who have heretofore been heavy contributors to the Federal Government by the payment of income taxes, pay nothing now. What I have said regarding Kansas is true even in a more pronounced degree in other States in the mid-continent oil fields.

The friends of the oil producers of this country have shown the Ways and Means Committee, the members of which committee are striving to the breaking point to balance the Budget, by undisputed evidence a source of revenue of anywhere from $90,000,000 to $100,000,000 without injury to any industry of the United States, and which would at

the same time save from utter destruction the third greatest industry of the Nation. This is far better than to put another tax on gasoline, already overtaxed in many instances by many States and cities; or by putting a tax on every check and theater ticket and many other small revenue-producing nuisance taxes.

No one can claim that the American petroleum industry is asking for an unfair advantage over even its foreign competitors. It is asking less than it should be entitled to receive. It is conceding to its business rivals nearly double the amount of profit which is possible for the American industry to receive, as shown by the recent report of the Tariff Commission.

In spite of this handicap, which the American petroleum industry appears to be very willing to accept, there is every certainty that with even this degree of protection, confidence would be restored in our great oil-producing States, with the employment of hundreds of thousands of men, resulting in the renewed purchasing power of the residents in these States west of the Mississippi, and the consequent effect upon the demand for products from our industrial sections, the increased freight shipments, the reemployment of large numbers of men who are either the recipients of public charity or are approaching the time when they must be candidates for alms, unless some such step as this is taken for the revival of American prosperity. Then why not provide this revenue and at the same time give this protection to an American industry? [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, a well-organized movement seems to be on foot to bring about a radical change in administration and method of procedure in the improvement of our ports and other navigable waters. For more than 100 years this work has been carried on by the Corps of Engineers of the Army. It is now proposed to create a new department or Government agency of some kind to have supervision over it.

Congress should consider the matter very carefully before taking such a step. It is thought by many that we now have more governmental departments and bureaus than is consistent with the public good. Every agency of this kind, with its salaried officials and army of employees, only adds to the cost of government, already enormous and fast approaching the point of saturation.

Instead of creating additional and expensive governmental agencies, we should be exerting ourselves in an effort to dispense, if possible, with some of those we already have. Certainly no additional bureaus or commissions should be established at this time except possibly such as may be absolutely necessary in the program of relief from financial distress. Agencies for that purpose should be temporary only and should be abolished upon the return of normal conditions.

Aside from adding to the evils of bureaucracy by setting up a new and additional governmental department or commission, it is also a reasonable certainty that such an agency would also prove far less efficient than the system we now have.

A similar proposition was attempted in the construction of the Panama Canal. After Shonts, Wallace, and Stevens, all men of superior qualifications, had given up the job in disgust, Goethals, the Army engineer, was placed in charge. President Roosevelt soon found it necessary to issue an order to protect him from interference by the commission. The result is well known. The work was pushed to completion systematically in less time and at less cost than estimated.

The Board of Engineers, as we now have it, was created by the act of Congress of June 13, 1902. Its principal promoter and author was the late Theodore E. Burton, doubtless our foremost waterway authority. The efficiency of this service has been a monument to Mr. Burton. Prior to the creation of this board there was not sufficient uniformity in waterway improvements. Congress acted upon the report of the district engineer, which was usually transmitted by the Chief of Engineers, but without comment or recommendation. One district engineer might recommend a project, while another district engineer from another section might disapprove a project having more merit than the one recommended. There was no central board or authority to secure uniformity. That object has been accomplished through the board in that it is required to review all proposed improvements.

During the three decades of its operation our ports and inland waters are fast being brought to a standard of perfection unequaled in any other country in the world. Waterway improvements have been divorced from partisan politics and each project is considered scientifically upon its merits. Such measures are no longer referred to as the "pork barrel," but have been placed upon a higher plane, where they have the confidence and approval of the American people.

I include the following from the report on the river and harbor appropriation bill of March 10, 1902, by Theodore E. Burton, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors at that time:

Section 3 provides for the organization, in the office of the Chief of Engineers, of a board of five Engineer officers, whose duty it shall be to examine the reports upon examinations and surveys ordered by Congress, and submit recommendations thereon. Also to examine, either of their own accord or upon request transmitted to the Chief of Engineers by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, or the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, projects heretofore adopted. The object sought by the creation of this board is to secure greater uniformity in the recommendations and reports relating to various projects in the country, and the examination of existing projects the further prosecution of which is considered questionable.

As already stated, the total estimated cost of river and harbor improvements for which estimates have heretofore been made exceeds $300,000,000. It is evident that the prosecution of many of these improvements must be postponed for a long time or they must be rejected altogether. Under the present system, local engineers make recommendations as to improvements. Some of their reports—namely, those made by officers of a rank lower than that of lieutenant colonel—are submitted to a division engineer, who transmits them to the Chief of Engineers; others are transmitted directly. These engineers are located in different portions of the country, and each acts in making recommendations according to his own standard of the merits of the projects. An examination of their reports shows a marked absence of uniformity. It is thought that the organization of the board provided for will secure greater fairness to all localities and tend to exclude from consideration unworthy projects.

The following is an extract from the speech delivered by Mr. Burton on March 17, 1902, with reference to the above section:

Section 3 provides for a board of engineers, five in number, who shall review all projects examined by the local engineers. This subject was considered at considerable length during the discussions upon the bill last winter. The recommendations upon which items are included in this bill come now directly from those having the rank of lieutenant colonel, or a higher rank, to the Chief of Engineers. Those having a lower rank than that of lieutenant colonel transmit them to the division engineer, who then transmits them to the Chief of Engineers, with his approval or disapproval, then the Secretary of War transmits them to Congress.

The result is just what naturally would be expected. Each engineer has his own standard of the desirability of the work upon which he is called to report, and there comes to Congress and the committee a variety of opinions. It often occurs that an improvement of a certain quality, which will cost, say, $100,000, is recommended. Another report comes from another engineer more conservative in his disposition upon an improvement costing $25,000, which in fact is more beneficial, and yet he gives an adverse report upon it.

It is true that to an extent we can decide upon these reports and recognize the different standards adopted; but it is very desirable that a uniform standard should be adopted by the executive department, and that a board of engineers, five in number, familiar with all the works in the country, should review them before they are sent to Congress. There is also a provision in this section to the effect that the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House can call upon this board for a report upon any project already adopted. Occasionally there is a project upon which we are very doubtful and it seems desirable to have an expert opinion upon it.

Following is an editorial from the Duluth (Minn.) Herald of January 22, 1932:

[From the Duluth (Minn.) Herald, January 22, 1932]

KEEP THE ARMY ENGINEERS ON THE JOB

There is a bill before Congress taking river and harbor work out of the control of the Army Engineer Corps and putting it under the newly created Federal Board of Public Works.

* * * * * * *

But there is something in this situation that is stronger than mere logic, and that is the way the Army engineers have handled this work. In all the long history of river and harbor work under the flower of United States Army which is assembled in the Army Engineer Corps with its high standards, its noble traditions, and its freedom from politics, there is not, so far as we know, even the faintest suspicion of the graft and disorder and waste that all too commonly are associated with civilian handling of public works.

Indeed, if all public operations were handled as well as those for which the Army engineers are responsible, the case against Government ownership and operation would be nowhere near so strong as it is now.

In the face of this splendid record, it would be a grave mistake to remove this very important work from the Army and to turn it over to any political agency.

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. FIESINGER. Would the gentleman be willing to add this to his speech? It is a statement in a letter from Mr. Malia, secretary of the Great Lakes Harbors Association:

This public works administrator can, if he desires, call on the engineers for terms not exceeding two years. The result of the transfer of all this work to civilians would subject it to political pressure and control.

Now, while the corps may have worn a high hat in the past, and even if they have said "no" to me several times, they have always convinced me of their complete fairness, and I am certain that their system is correct. Any move to change it will result in a fight from me. As I see it, lake cities will stand to take an awful trimming if this work ever gets into the political field. We are bad enough off now, but the new plan would be ruinous.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to have that included in my remarks.

Waterway legislation now has more safeguards thrown around it than any other class of legislation with which Congress has to deal. I shall not attempt to describe the course of procedure that prevails. For that purpose I yield to one who certainly had no superior as a legislative authority. It was most appropriately described by the late James R. Mann in a speech in the House on January 22, 1917, as follows:

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not vote for this river and harbor bill, although that decision is entirely apart from the merits of the bill. I shall not vote for it because I think that we could do without an annual river and harbor bill in the present state of the Treasury. I shall take the time, however, to make a very slight statement, which I may not have time to complete, with reference to the formation of a river and harbor bill. There have been a great many suggestions made at different times. Whatever men may think about the merits of particular propositions in a bill, there is no legislation which comes before Congress which is so critically scanned by experts as are the river and harbor bills before they reach the House. In the first place, the War Department itself can not institute any recommendation upon its own motion. It is the only branch of the Government that is not permitted to do so. The Executive can not order the War Department to make a report or an estimate or a recommendation to Congress in reference to a river and harbor improvement. You can not reach the War Department through political influence exercised upon the President or the Secretary of War. A provision in the river and harbor bill begins with an item for a survey, and under the law the engineers can not make a survey until as experts they have made an examination as to the probable economy of the improvement, the use that will be made of it, and the benefit that it will be to the shipping industry and to the public.

The Board of Engineers of the United States Army are selected men from West Point who hold their office for life or for good behavior if they do their work. They are the least subject to political influence of anybody in the United States by reason of their position. They can not go to the political activities which exist in the War Department with reference to promotions, because all of their promotions are automatic except as to the Chief of Engineers. When we determine by reason of the activity of a Member of Congress representing his constituents to ask that board to make an examination, they have to first determine whether it will be a profitable adventure if entered upon, and then they are permitted to make an estimate of the cost and present the project to the House. The House itself can not order them to do this. It could at one time by a resolution. The Senate itself can not order them to do this. It is the only case in the Government service where the House can not by resolution ask Government officers to render a service, or where the Senate can not by a resolution ask Government officers to render a service. After they make their estimate, made by the local engineer aided by a civilian engineer working under him, also permanently employed, they have to go through the form—in many ceases it is a form, though in some cases it is the real thing—of having the report pass through the district engineer and the engineer of the enlarged district, whose title I do not now remember. Then the matter goes before the Board of Engineers. Then it comes before the Chief of Engineers. Then it comes before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. There are more processes involved and far more expert men, wholly disinterested, unbiased, uncontrolled by politics in reference to a river and harbor item than any other legislation provided by any legislative assembly in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield three minutes more to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, the river and harbor bill comes to the House. We call it a pork-barrel bill. It is in the sense that term is used. It comes to the House as an omnibus bill, with the items bunched together. If we had a thousand hours in the day and a thousand days in the year and could sit here all the time, possibly, but not probably, we might consider those items by themselves. It is never practicable to pass river and harbor items as separate bills, and with some experience in the House I venture to say that if the river and harbor items were introduced as separate bills by Members from their various districts, with those Members pulling and hauling, with the personal influence upon the committee, there would be more bad projects reported by that system than are reported now, because the committee then would say: "Oh, the items come up by themselves; the responsibility is not upon us; the responsibility is upon the House." It is an easy question to cite the Claims Committee of the House, a good committee, which has done excellent work, but which reports more bad bills through personal solicitation than all the other committees of the House combined, because they are separate bills. Pulling and hauling is what gets it. If we should make a lump-sum appropriation to the War Department, it would not benefit things at all, because half the scanning will be taken away. We do not provide for river and harbor bills until they have passed the War Department. Then they have to pass the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, they have to pass the House and Senate, though I do not know that that is very much under the circumstances, and the giving of a lump sum would only make it worse. But to let the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of War, and one other Secretary, as provided in this bill, select some chief clerk there or some high-priced clerk, wholly subject to political influence, wholly under the control of a superior officer, holding a tenure of office at the will of the man above him, without training, without expertness, for them to pass upon the methods now in existence of determining these things by the War Department would be to ask an ignorant man to judge of the literary ability of a distinguished scholar. What is the use?

[Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM].

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I regard it as my public duty not only to this House but to the country to review at this time the facts in the criminal case of the notorious Bishop James Cannon, jr.

Found guilty by the unanimous findings of a Senate investigating committee of violation of the Federal corrupt practices act in the presidential campaign of 1928, as I had charged, and indicted by a Federal grand jury last October, Bishop Cannon, according to the press, apparently will escape confinement at the Federal penitentiary at Atlanta by employing the same methods invoked by notorious gunmen and professional criminals, namely, by making a technical objection to the criminal indictment. The sum total of his objection to the indictment, which was sustained by the court, was that it did not allege as a fact that Miss Burroughs, treasurer of the political committee of which Bishop Cannon was chairman, a former secretary and employee of the bishop, knew that Bishop Cannon had received from E. C. Jameson the funds which were not reported under the Federal corrupt practices act. It is unusual even for gunmen and professional criminals to seek shelter behind a woman.

Bishop Cannon has repeatedly stated that he desired a judicial, not a political, determination of this issue; yet when a judicial determination could have been obtained, he made it impossible by evasion and technical objection.

Bishop Cannon did not dare to submit himself to cross-examination under oath before a jury in relation to the handling of the funds which he received for political purposes during the 1928 presidential campaign.

In November of 1929 I called to the attention of the so-called lobby investigating committee of the Senate headed by the late Senator Caraway the violation of the traditional American principle of the separation of church and state by certain ecclesiastical organizations through political dictation to the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government. Accepting an invitation to appear before the committee, I made charges against the Board of Temperance, Prohibition, and Public Morals of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and the Commission on Prohibition and Social Service of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of which Bishop Cannon was and is chairman.

During my testimony in relation to the Commission on Prohibition and Social Service and Bishop Cannon I brought to the attention of the committee that in the 1928 presidential campaign Bishop Cannon had organized and had been chairman of a partisan political committee known as the Anti-Smith Democrats, operating in two or more States and therefore subject to the provisions of the Federal corrupt practices act, that this committee had reported to the Clerk of the House of Representatives the receipt from E. C. Jameson of only $17,000, and this report was not made in conformity with the requirements of the Federal corrupt practices act, whereas E. C. Jameson had reported to the Senate special committee investigating presidential campaign expenditures appointed in 1928 that he had given Bishop Cannon $65,300 for the political purposes of the Anti-Smith Democrats.

When I first made my general charges against the ecclesiastical organizations, Bishop Cannon insisted that he be given an opportunity to testify if any of my charges involved him or his organization. Subsequently, early in June of 1930, he did appear before the committee voluntarily, but, once under oath and subject to cross-examination, he refused to answer any questions concerning the contributions received from E. C. Jameson and the failure to report or account for $48,300 of the $65,300 received, and he left the committee room.

In the meantime Mr. Jameson, summoned before the so-called lobby investigating committee, had testified to that committee also that he had given Bishop Cannon $65,300; that this amount was issued in a series of checks, most of which were made payable to "bearer" or to "cash," and which were so drawn, according to Mr. Jameson, at the request of Bishop Cannon. The canceled checks were before the committee.

Bishop Cannon did not dare to submit himself to cross-examination under oath before a senatorial committee in relation to the handling of the funds which he received for political purposes during the 1928 presidential campaign.

On June 17, 1930, after Bishop Cannon's refusal to testify before the Senate so-called lobby investigating committee, I addressed this House, and in detail and categorically, from evidence presented to the committee, I charged Bishop James Cannon, jr., with being a shameless violator of the Federal corrupt practices act in words which Bishop Cannon himself, in his declaration in his libel suit filed against me a year later, interprets as indicating that he had diverted to his own private use the whole or part of the unaccounted contributions received from E. C. Jameson.

Immediately thereupon Bishop Cannon publicly challenged me to make my charges off the floor of the House, divested of my congressional immunity, declaring that otherwise I should prove myself a "blustering, cowardly Congressman."

Summarizing my address to the House and divesting myself of my congressional immunity, on June 21, 1930, I publicly charged Bishop Cannon of being a shameless violator of the Federal corrupt practices act.

On November 15, 1930, I transmitted to the Attorney General of the United States a brief of the facts in the case as brought out by the so-called lobby investigating committee, and I formally and officially demanded that the evidence of the violation of the Federal corrupt practices act by Bishop Cannon be placed before a Federal grand jury. The Department of Justice took no action.

Early in 1931 the Select Committee on Senatorial Campaign Expenditures of the Senate, commonly known as the Nye committee, had its authority extended to investigate the charges against Bishop Cannon.

Bishop Cannon at once challenged the jurisdiction of the committee, and in the midst of the committee's investigations he filed suit in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia petitioning for a writ of prohibition to prevent the committee from taking further testimony or examining any of the books and papers which had been previously produced in response to lawfully issued subpœnas, and asking further that the testimony already existing, both in written and printed form, be destroyed. The petition was promptly denied by the court.

Again Bishop Cannon did not dare to submit himself to cross-examination under oath before a senatorial committee in relation to the handling of the funds which he received for political purposes during the 1928 presidential campaign.

Notwithstanding the refusal of Bishop Cannon and of other witnesses whom he controlled to testify, the Nye committee unanimously found—

First. That there were "numerous apparent violations of the Federal corrupt practices act, and many unexplained discrepancies between the bank accounts in which political funds were deposited and the reports rendered on behalf of the headquarters committee to the Clerk of the House."

Second. That whereas Miss Ada L. Burroughs, a former employee of Bishop Cannon, was the nominal treasurer of the headquarters committee, anti-Smith Democrats, the funds of that organization were in fact largely handled by the chairman, Bishop James Cannon, jr.

Third. That Bishop Cannon utilized 10 bank accounts to handle the funds of this committee, all of which, with the exception of one, were subject to check or withdrawal by James Cannon, jr., alone, and only one of which was in the name of the anti-Smith Democrats.

Fourth. That there were intricate and inexplicable transfers of money among these accounts which included personal accounts of Bishop Cannon and that frequent entries were also made by Bishop Cannon to a safe-deposit box which Bishop Cannon had in a Richmond bank.

Fifth. That a large amount of money was sent to a certain bank for the account of a company which had been defunct for seven years.

Sixth. That the committee received in excess of $130,000 during the campaign, although only $58,558.62 was accounted for in statements filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives under the Federal corrupt practices act.

Many other irregular and suspicious transactions were reported by the Nye committee.

This record upon its face makes it clear why Bishop Cannon did not dare to face the two senatorial committees and the Federal jury to be cross-examined under oath in relation to the disposition of the funds which he had received as chairman of the anti-Smith Democrats.

According to the press, Bishop Cannon has stated that upon the disposition of the appeal from the dismissal of his indictment in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, he will "present important facts giving such details as may be necessary to explain satisfactorily to every fair-minded person the many misleading statements which have been made before committees and which have appeared in the press" regarding his acts in the campaign against Alfred E. Smith in 1928. Unless Bishop Cannon's statements are made under oath when he is subject to cross-examination, they will be utterly worthless and will merely be a travesty upon the truth.

There is still a way, however, for this House and the country to learn the real and damning facts in this case. On June 3, 1931, almost a whole year after my charges were made public, Bishop Cannon, as I have stated, filed suit against me for libel, for $500,000 in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. In his declaration for damages

he made it a question for a jury whether he had honestly administered the funds received from E. C. Jameson during the 1928 presidential campaign.

To his declaration I filed a plea of justification; that is to say, I admitted the publication and stated it was true. I claimed no privilege or immunity which is accorded to Members of Congress by the Constitution of the United States, but I set out in an additional plea that Bishop Cannon, as he himself alleges in his declaration, was during the campaign of 1928 in the position of an active leader and participant in the political campaign, and that he was justly subject at the hands of a Member of Congress, who represents not only his own district but the whole people of the United States, to such criticism, as competent and undisputed evidence already produced before committees of Congress warranted; and I further pleaded that my statement was made at his express invitation and in response to a challenge by him that charged me with being a blustering, cowardly Congressman.

I have not pleaded and will not claim any constitutional or congressional immunity from the consequences of my statement made about him.

It is apparent, therefore, that the simple issue in this case is the truth of the statement I have made and the determination of the question of his honesty which he raises in his declaration for damages, and I challenge him to meet me in the forum, where that truth shall be determined upon his oath as well as upon mine.

In order completely to expose this spurious, self-designated, moral leader and ecclesiastical, whitened sepulcher, I challenge him to try his libel suit against me, and I hereby call upon him through his counsel to arrange with the counsel representing me for an early trial at this term of court before it adjourns at the end of June, that truth under oath shall be developed not only for the benefit of the jury sitting to try this case, but for the information and enlightenment of that larger jury, the American people.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The press reports that the gentleman's lawyer did claim immunity for the gentleman from Massachusetts, to wit, that under the Constitution the gentleman from Massachusetts, being a Congressman, did not have the right to waive immunity, and that the court sustained that plea, and that but for that plea there would be a trial on the merits. What about that?

Mr. TINKHAM. The statement in the papers was not correct.

Mr. BLANTON. Then there was no such claim made by the gentleman's attorney, that the gentleman, being a Congressman, had no right to waive immunity?

Mr. TINKHAM. Not that I know of. I was not present.

Mr. BLANTON. The press also reports that the gentleman's attorneys claimed that Bishop Cannon having dared the gentleman from Massachusetts to make the statement and to waive immunity, that the gentleman's accepting the dare did not take away from him the constitutional immunity that surrounds a Congressman and protects him.

Mr. TINKHAM. I think that is not good law, nor do I know that my attorney made any such claim. In any event, no such claim will be made by my attorney or by me, and no claim of constitutional immunity was made by me.

Mr. BLANTON. As I understand it, the only thing that stands in the way of a trial on its merits where the gentleman from Massachusetts will be heard under oath, and the bishop's lawyer can cross-examine the gentleman, and where Bishop Cannon will be heard under oath and the gentleman from Massachusetts and his lawyers can cross-examine him, is the fact that there is some law question raised by the gentleman's lawyer which prevents going to trial. Is that not the fact?

Mr. TINKHAM. No; that is not the fact.

Mr. BLANTON. I have understood that if the gentleman's lawyers will withdraw the law question, there will be a trial on its merits. That is what I have been informed.

Mr. TINKHAM. Well, that is not so. My pleadings have been filed in full. No demand was made, so far as I am concerned, for any immunity or congressional privilege, nor will my attorney make such claim, nor do I nor will I.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the gentleman has not won out on this damage suit, as the press reports?

Mr. TINKHAM. That was not correct either.

Mr. BLANTON. There has been no court ruling on the question at all in the gentleman's favor?

Mr. TINKHAM. Well, I think there has been some ruling.

Mr. BLANTON. What ruling was that? We would like to know about it.

Mr. TINKHAM. Well, I do not have the pleadings before me.

Mr. BLANTON. But what kind of a law question did the gentleman's lawyer raise that the court sustained him on?

Mr. TINKHAM. Bishop Cannon's attorney made a plea to strike out two or three parts of the answer.

Mr. BLANTON. As being scandalous?

Mr. TINKHAM. Not as being scandalous, but as not being in conformity with the practice in this district.

Mr. BLANTON. I am sure that the honorable court must have been wrong about that, because the gentleman from Massachusetts is such a distinguished lawyer and he has shown such ability before our Appropriations Committee in examining the Attorney General of the United States for about three and a half days that I know he would not put anything in his answer that was not proper and not in accordance with the procedure.

Mr. TINKHAM. I do not have the pleadings before me, and, of course, pleadings are somewhat complex. Each district or each State has its own rules as to pleadings.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will understand I hold no brief for Bishop Cannon.

Mr. TINKHAM. I understand that.

Mr. BLANTON. I am just interested in knowing what the real facts are that keep the gentleman and Bishop Cannon from going to bat. I want to go down there and hear his lawyer cross-examine the gentleman and I want to hear the gentleman cross-examine Bishop Cannon.

Mr. TINKHAM. I think I have made a clear statement that I desire to have a trial as soon as possible and that I have waived all congressional immunity in relation to the trial.

Mr. BLANTON. I heard one of the Bishop's friends say the other day that if the gentleman's lawyer will get the law cobwebs out of the way both of you will have a chance to testify on the witness stand.

Mr. TINKHAM. Well, the gentleman must not listen with a too-believing ear to everything he hears. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. GUYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield.

Mr. GUYER. Have the courts not decided that there was no violation of any Federal statute because electors are State officers and not national officers?

Mr. TINKHAM. That has not been decided by the court.

Mr. GUYER. It has not been finally decided, perhaps.

Mr. TINKHAM. It has not been decided finally.

Mr. GUYER. But as far as the court has gone it has, has it not?

Mr. TINKHAM. No; it has not. To the criminal indictment against him Bishop Cannon filed a demurrer and in the demurrer he raised the question of the constitutionality of the corrupt practices act, but the judge made no decision upon that, deciding only the point in the demurrer of which I have spoken in my statement.

Mr. GUYER. I understood the newspaper reports to be that the court decided that electors were State officers and not national officers, and therefore there was no violation of the corrupt practices act.

Mr. TINKHAM. As I stated before, the court made no ruling upon that. The decision of the court was on an entirely different question.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER].

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, I want to finish my remarks within the 20 minutes allotted me, and as I desire to make a connected statement, until I have finished what I have in mind to say, I will not yield to any of my colleagues; but after I have completed my statement I will be glad to answer any question that may be propounded.

For 35 years, continuously since March 4, 1897, the executive branch of our Government has been under the control of the Republican Party, with the exception of the Woodrow Wilson administration of eight years from March 4, 1913, to March 4, 1921. Since the last-mentioned date, the Republican Party has been in control of both the executive and legislative departments. During that long lease of power the Republican Party has worked its will and enacted legislation embodying its selfish and sordid political philosophy. It has placed on the statute books laws in harmony with its political theories. It has claimed that those laws would insure national tranquillity, economic stability, and universal prosperity.

It has argued that of the two great political parties in America, it alone had mastered the science of statecraft and was capable of piloting the ship of state. It alone could formulate and execute wise public policies. It alone could efficiently administer our domestic and international affairs. It alone could keep the tide of commerce flowing. It alone could keep the machinery in our mills and factories moving. It alone could wisely direct our great transportation systems, manage our exceedingly complicated financial affairs, stabilize business, prevent unemployment, and furnish the American workman with a full dinner pail.

It has argued that it alone could stimulate productive industry, inspire confidence, maintain a high-wage scale, and guaranty to the American farmer a price for his commodities which would insure a handsome profit over and above the cost of production. In short, the high priests of Republicanism, without a modicum of modesty and claiming plenary inspiration, have boldly asserted and plausibly maintained that they were the Lord's annointed, and the instrument by which a divine providence would open the doors of heaven and pour out a flood of prosperity so great that our banks, trust companies, safe-deposit vaults, and storehouses would overflow with our ever-increasing golden treasures.

They inoculated the voters with the baseless belief that the Republican Party had a monopoly upon political wisdom; that the Democratic Party was inept, destitute of constructive ability, and a leaderless mob of hair-brained, wild-eyed incompetents. All this they claimed and much more.

If the heavens sent refreshing showers and auspicious seasons to ripen bumper crops, the spokesmen of the G. O. P. in stentorian tones shouted, "Look what the Republican Party did for you!" If the gardens, orchards, and vineyards each yielded its fruit in season, Republicans claimed the credit. If our foreign markets, captured and built up under the wise and far-seeing administration of Woodrow Wilson, called more and more for the products of the farms, factories, mills, and mines, Republican orators pointed with pride to our rapidly growing international trade, and forthwith proceeded to enact new tariff laws to unconscionably increase the unearned and undeserved bounty of the beneficiaries of special privilege.

If our banks were no longer sufficiently spacious to hold the $133,000,000,000 of new wealth that accrued to the American people in the eight years of Woodrow Wilson's administration, a "holier than thou" provincial Republican President forthwith issued a pronunciamento crediting the Republican Party with everything of value that had accrued to the Nation, copyrighted the terms "economy" and "prosperity," and used them as a screen behind which to practice reckless extravagance, inaugurated a reckless riot of special privilege, and called on the American voters to smite the Democrats hip and thigh for the alleged reasons that Republicans alone were capable of efficiently administering our national affairs, and that Republicans, like Midas, turn everything they touch into gold.

During the eight years of Democratic administration, from 1913 to 1921, all vocational groups enjoyed the greatest prosperity and increase of national wealth in our history. From 1913 to 1921 the wealth of the American people increased from $187,000,000,000 to $330,000,000,000. It is significant that almost as much new wealth was created and acquired in the eight years of Democratic administration as had been accumulated in the preceding 300 years, a record unsurpassed in this or any other nation in all the tide of time. Think of it; $133,000,000,000 was added to the stock of American national wealth during the eight years of the last Democratic administration, while from the colonial period down to 1913 the American people had only accumulated $187,000,000,000 of national wealth.

Before the Republican medicine makers and Republican prosperity fakers seized the reins of government in 1921, the American people were enjoying genuine and generous prosperity. During the Wilson administration each occupational class received its equitable share of the prosperity and new wealth that flowed like a golden river into the pockets of the American people. Under the last Democratic administration we did not have a sectional, lopsided or jug-handled prosperity, but every section, class, and group, shared in the new wealth which annually accrued to the American people. Budgets were balanced, interest paid, taxes met, and every maturing liability found the debtor with money in bank with which to discharge his obligations. Never before or since did such real and abundant prosperity dominate our economic life.

But what an odious and vulnerable record has been written in the last 11 years by the faithless leaders of the Republican Party. What a miserable mess they have made of their opportunities. [Applause.] What a base betrayal of the people. What an inexcusable sacrifice of national interests and national dignity. What a reign of extravagance, graft, and maladministration. Let us glance at this invidious record, this partisan salmagundi. Here is a general inventory of the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations:

Eleven years of class legislation, special privilege, governmental favoritism, and servile surrender to tariff lords and big business buccaneers. [Applause.] Eleven years of contemptuous indifference to the just demands of the agricultural classes for economic equality with the other vocational groups. Eleven years of decreasing prestige abroad and rapidly growing disfavor among the nations of the earth. Eleven years of economic riot, prostitution of power, empty promises, unfulfilled pledges. Eleven years of economic injustice that has beggared millions. Eleven years of artificial, unnatural, unreasonable, and unnecessary stimulation of industry, resulting in such grossly abnormal production as to make inevitable the industrial collapse which now threatens the economic life of the Nation.

Eight thousand banks, that under Democratic administration had been prosperous and filled to overflowing, closed their doors under the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations, beggaring their depositors and stockholders, and precipitating business chaos and nation-wide distress.

Railroads, that under Democratic administration had functioned efficiently, borne the terrific strain of the most destructive war in human history, and carried a volume of commerce that staggers human comprehension, began to sicken and languish under the so-called business administrations of the Republican Party. In many instances their income declined, their rolling stock deteriorated, their roadbeds crumbled, their dividends ceased, the market price of their stocks fell to unprecedented low levels, and receiverships became almost as common as under the Roosevelt and Taft administrations; and the stock market, the special pet of the Republican Party, and which typified its worship of Mammon, crashed like the collision of continents and the wreck of spheres.

Farmers who were never so prosperous as under the last Democratic administration, were, under succeeding Republican administrations, unable to balance their budgets, pay

their taxes, and meet maturing interest obligations; and, although they had stirred the soil into generous productivity, Republican high tariff laws and Republican maladministration of our domestic and international affairs provoked other nations to enact retaliatory tariffs, and as a result of these and other shortsighted policies, the markets for farm products were destroyed, and prices fell to the lowest level in history.

Farm lands and farm commodities that under Democratic administration had enriched rural sections and created an independent, self-sustaining, self-respecting agrarian population, became a drug on the market under short-sighted and self-serving Republican policies, and under the clumsy manipulation of the Republican Farm Board. An innumerable host of the American farmers have been swept into bankruptcy, their farms sold on the block at sacrificial prices, dissipating the earnings and accumulations of a lifetime. Under 11 years of Republican rule, what has become of the prosperous, forward-looking, upstanding, hopeful, and self-reliant farmers of America? Millions have been broken on the rock of insolvency. Millions of their fellows have abandoned hope and with aching hearts, crushed spirits, and empty purses, are with their families, marching with unsteady step toward a condition of peasantry comparable with that which prevails in many European states.

Under Republican administration what has become of the small tradesman, the small retail merchant, the small shopkeeper? Echo answers, they are stumbling down the steep path of insolvency to the bottomless pit of financial ruin. Under Republican rule the development of our national resources has been halted. What has happened to the once flourishing irrigation and reclamation districts? Why are large areas of fruitful, reclaimed western lands reverting to desert? Why are the productive, reclaimed swamp and overflowed lands in the Middle West returning to a state of nature and rapidly becoming a wilderness?

Friends, the explanation is found in the fact that the Republican Party, by the selfish and sordid policies of its blind leaders, has impoverished the so-called common people, the wayfaring men and women of the Nation. By burdensome tariffs and other taxes, by extravagance in public expenditures, by special privileges to certain favored groups, by penalizing agriculture for the enrichment of industry, by creating departments, bureaus, and commissions with an army of employees as numerous as the swarms of locusts with which Jehovah afflicted Egypt, the masses of the American people have been bled white, deprived of their substance, and reduced to penury. Under Republican administrations the greatest industrial, financial, and business structures in the world have been undermined and brought dangerously close to destruction.

If the Republican Party has a monopoly on economic and business genius and if it is the master of governmental efficiency, why does unprecedented stagnation clog every avenue of business? Why is insolvency increasing so rapidly? In a period of plenty, why does gaunt famine stalk abroad over the land, touching with his bony fingers millions of underfed and undernourished men, women, and children, who under the last Democratic administration never felt the pangs of hunger or the pinch of penury? [Applause.]

In the greatest industrial nation on earth, why are seven or eight million men idle, walking the streets, seeking employment, begging for bread?

If the Republican Party is the party of prosperity and plenty; if it has a magic wand with which it may touch the slumbering industrial forces of the Nation, quicken them to new life, and create a condition of affluence and contentment; if it is the one and only master of business economics; if it is the divinely anointed and appointed guardian and curator of prosperity, why, in the name of a long-suffering public, does it not function and lift the pall of depression from a sorely afflicted people? If Mr. Hoover and his oligarchy are such miracle-working masters of statecraft, why do these intolerable conditions prevail?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOZIER. Not now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Will the gentleman reserve enough time to answer a few questions?

Mr. LOZIER. The gentleman knows that I have declined to yield until I have finished my statement, after which I will yield to him if I have any time remaining.

The plain truth of the matter is that the Republican Party is stewing in its own juice. Its present leaders obtained and are now holding control of our Government by false pretences and false promises. Their ruthless exercise of embezzled power has impoverished the Nation. The Republican leaders have used the agencies and instrumentalities of the Government in such a prodigal and reckless manner as to nearly destroy our economic, industrial, agricultural, and business structures. Instead of the present leaders of the Republican Party being miracle-working masters of statecraft, experience has demonstrated that they are richly caparisoned economic mountebanks, blowing partisan tin whistles, granting special privileges, making false prophesies, exploiting the masses, and industriously carrying on the ancient and none too honorable game of fooling the people.

Please do not misunderstand me; I acquit the rank and file of the Republican Party of responsibility for the shortsighted and pernicious policies and egregious blunders of the Republican leaders. The individual Republicans are not to blame for the colossal failures of the men who are now in control of the Republican Party. These self-constituted leaders have ignored the wishes and been indifferent to the welfare of both Republicans and Democrats.

The Republican Party has been in control and made the laws which it claimed would usher in an economic millennium, but which have brought the American people to the brink of disaster. After aggravating economic and industrial forces that create unemployment, the Republican Party has done nothing to remedy our present unhappy economic conditions. By the reckless enactment of special privilege legislation, the Republican Party has reduced the masses of the American people to a tragic state of economic vassalage. It has babied, petted, and toadied big business at the expense of the unorganized millions.

In a spirit of unbridled arrogance, the present faithless leaders of the Republican Party have oppressed the American people with a man-destroying, hope-wrecking, heartbreaking, poverty-producing administration of our public affairs. They have ravished our national interests, flouted social justice, been indifferent to our national welfare, and in supreme wantonness of power have wrecked or grievously burdened practically every home in America.

To paraphrase the language of Don Quixote, "in voting the Republican Party into power the American people went out for wool, and came home shorn themselves." Instead of a song of joy, the Republican Party has given us only grief and pain as a perpetual reminder of the ignoble failure of the present occupant of the White House and his party associates. Generous in promises but scant in fulfillment, 11 years of Republican administration have produced only a harvest of barren regrets, "like Dead Sea fruit that tempt the eye but turn to ashes on the lips."

As half-starved spiders prey on half-starved flies, so under the administration of the great engineer, half-insolvent bankers prey on half-bankrupt bankers. What a grotesque image Uncle Sam presents when he sees himself in the warped mirror of Hoover prosperity.

What Heraclitus would not laugh at or what Democritus would not weep over the political and social condition to which Republican maladministration of our national affairs has brought the American people? Under the stupid manipulation of the Farm Board, sharp misery has worn the American farmer to the bones, and practically every allied industry to destruction. Under the administration of the miracle-working engineer in the White House industrial chaos, commercial stagnation, transportation inertia, agricultural disaster, and business calamity now sit in the seat of the mighty and hold high carnival, while a great Nation stands helpless and sees its matchless economic structure wrecked.

Try as it may, the Republican Party can not evade responsibility for present deplorable economic conditions. During its long control of our Government, it has legislated for the classes, discriminated against the masses, exploited and unduly burdened the common people, made a football of agriculture, cluttered our statutes with class legislation, taxed the many for the enrichment of the few, and supinely turned over our executive and legislative departments to certain favored groups, and allowed them to exploit the people and use the agencies and instrumentalities of the Government to accomplish their selfish, sordid, and sinister purposes.

The policies of the Republican Party have brought our Nation dangerously close to an economic abyss.

The great trouble is that by a system of class legislation, the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations have unjustly distributed the burdens and benefits of government, and have destroyed the buying power of the common people.

Until and unless the buying power of the people is restored, until the farmer can sell his commodities at prices that will not only return the cost of production, but afford a substantial profit, until there is a radical narrowing of the spread between what the farmer pays for his supplies and what he gets for his commodities, all the legislation you enact will be disappointing and ineffective. Before there can be any worthwhile economic rehabilitation you must restore the buying power of the common people. [Applause.]

If you start your mills and factories to-morrow morning it would be a question of only a few days or weeks until you would be compelled to shut them down for you could not find a market for the products of those mills and factories, because the people have only a limited, and in most cases no, purchasing power.

All the legislation this Congress enacts, all the legislation any Congress can enact, will be palliative only and will not result in a rehabilitation of industrial and commercial activities unless some way is devised to restore the buying power of the so-called common people and middle classes.

There are in the United States 30,000,000 people who either directly or indirectly depend upon agriculture for a livelihood. The policies of the Republicans for the last 11 years have driven these 30,000,000 people dangerously close to penury, peasantry, and pauperism.

Until you can restore the buying power of those 30,000,000 people, until all vocational groups are placed on the basis of economic equality, until we abandon the present much-overworked system of privilege and class legislation, there can be no rehabilitation of any of our great vocational groups. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SWANK].

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Chairman, the World War was officially ended by resolution of Congress July 2, 1921, although the armistice was signed November 11, 1918. Since the war was ended there has been much agitation—and rightfully so—for legislation to take the profits out of war, for the American people do not want another war. The horribleness of the World War is still fresh in the memory of the American people, and especially of the mothers who reared the boys that did the fighting. All Americans are ready and willing to fight in the necessary self-defense of their country against all foes, but in such a war we do not want the profiteers with us even when absolutely necessary to fight. We should at all times have an Army and Navy adequate for all purposes of defense in the protection of our people, but that does not mean that we need the greatest Army and Navy in the world. We are far away from other countries and those near us are our friends, and if not, can be made so by proper and just treatment. America—and what American does not thrill at the word—wants none of the possessions of any other country in all the world. We want to live in peace with them. Another war might destroy all living things in the world. Before the great World War no person would have thought, or even imagined, the horrors of that war. No citizen knew of the wicked liquid fire, poisonous gas, and other instruments of death used in that war. No one could have believed that civilized and Christian nations would have resorted to the use of such weapons for the purpose of taking human life. June 27, 1930, a joint resolution by the Senate and House of Representatives was approved creating a commission to consider legislation to take the profits out of war. Following is the resolution:

[PUBLIC RESOLUTION NO. 98, SEVENTY-FIRST CONGRESS]

[H. J. Res. 251]

Joint resolution to promote peace and to equalize the burdens and to minimize the profits of war

Resolved, etc., That a commission is hereby created to study and consider amending the Constitution of the United States to provide that private property may be taken by Congress for public use during war and methods of equalizing the burdens and to remove the profits of war, together with a study of policies to be pursued in event of war. The commission shall report definite recommendations to the President of the United States to be by him transmitted to the Congress not later than the first Monday in December, 1931, together with copies of its proceedings and hearings and to report if, in their opinion, any constitutional amendment be necessary to accomplish the purposes desired: *Provided*, That said commission shall not consider and shall not report upon the conscription of labor.

SEC. 2. That said commission shall be composed of four Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and four Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor, and the Attorney General.

SEC. 3. The said members to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate shall meet as soon as possible after the enactment of this resolution in the city of Washington, D. C. The Secretary of War shall supply from the War Department all necessary office and clerical assistance.

SEC. 4. When said commission shall meet it shall organize by electing one of its number as chairman, and another as vice chairman, and shall appoint a secretary.

SEC. 5. That no compensation shall be paid any member of said commission, and no expenses shall be incurred by them except the actual expenses of sustenance and travel for the members of the commission, and printing and clerical assistance that can not be reasonably provided by the War Department.

Approved June 27, 1930.

Under that resolution, the commission was to report the different recommendations to the President of the United States, to be by him transmitted to Congress not later than the first Monday in December, 1931. That time has been extended, and we hope when the recommendations are made they will contain proper suggestions and steps to be taken for this necessary legislation. If such a law can be enacted, it will do more to discourage wars in the future than all the peace conferences combined. Congress should give notice now to those who profit by war that there will be no profit if we are ever engulfed in another war. Makers and traders in war material during the last war made unreasonable and outrageous profits, while the boys who did the fighting received the sum of $1 per day. They left their homes and their positions on the farms, in every hamlet, village, and city in this country. They left their families and loved ones, in many instances never to see them again. I favor legislation in conformity with this resolution, but let not Congress and this administration now in power delay longer with this important legislation. Some plan can be devised by this commission in its extensive study of this question.

Mr. Chairman, another good and effective method to take the profits out of war is to take the profits out of the last war. This can be done by providing proper, effective, and adequate allowance and treatment for the veterans of that war and providing compensation for their wives and children when the soldier husband and father has left them. No soldier should be permitted to suffer and neither should his family. Taxes should be increased on the higher incomes and an effective levy should be made on estates, inheritances, and gifts, to help defray these expenses. No person in this country should escape these taxes. The great and powerful corporations made their billions of dollars in the World War, and now let them pay. When they know that Congress means business, they will then realize that there will be no money made out of another war.

The Committee on Pensions has favorably reported a bill to Congress for its consideration granting pensions and allowances to the widows of all war veterans alike. This bill, if enacted into law, as it should be, will grant pensions to these widows at the rate of from $20 per month to $50 per month, and additional allowances for minor children under 16 years of age. Those persons and corporations who made so much money in the last war will oppose these bills, but when these measures come before Congress we will enact them into law. I have always favored such a bill and shall exert every effort to have it passed.

Another bill that these same individuals and corporations oppose at this time is a bill providing for immediate cash payment to veterans of the World War of the face value of their adjusted-service certificates, and the elimination of interest on these certificates. This one bill will cause to be placed in circulation the sum of $2,000,000,000, and our veterans never needed that money more than they need it now. It will also revive and stimulate business. This can be paid by issuing Treasury notes in small denominations that will circulate as other money, without interest and without increasing taxes. Enact these two bills and you will do a lot to take the profits out of war.

When the French debt to the United States was funded more than $2,000,000,000 of that debt was canceled, and when the Italian debt was funded $1,500,000,000 of that debt was likewise canceled. Then a few days ago, when the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act was passed, it provided for raising $2,000,000,000 more. If this can be done for these foreign countries that owe us and an act can be passed for the benefit of big business, it can also be done for these boys who so valiantly fought and won the greatest war in all history.

If a soldier can carry a gun for $1 per day, then a man can manage those institutions that profited so much in making war material for the same price per day. Why should one man be permitted to make billions manufacturing war material to destroy human lives, and a soldier march and lie out in the rain and mud for $1 per day? No one would even attempt to answer—no one can answer. A soldier can manage those manufacturing establishments just as well as he can carry a gun and fight, and why not do it for the same pay? It can and should be done.

The money cost of the World War to the United States June 30, 1930, amounted to the enormous sum of $51,546,619,000. The obligations of foreign governments to the United States December 31, 1930, amounted to $11,678,093,000. Payments on these debts on June 31, 1930, amounted to the sum of $2,515,013,000. The gross debt of the United States June 30, 1931, amounted to $16,801,281,000. These figures show the enormous cost of the war in money, but that is not as important as the cost in human life.

Every American likes to hear and read of the heroic achievements of our soldiers on the fields of battle. Every heart is thrilled by the courageous deeds of American soldiers on a thousand battlefields. America must keep her promise and continue to do everything possible to care for her soldiers, their wives, and children, and we shall continue to rejoice at their wonderful and heroic achievements.

Let us cheer for those boys to the ends of the earth,
From the mountain's heights to the sea,
In the land where freedom had its birth,
Where manhood still is the highest worth
In the hearts of the noble free.

Let us drink to those boys who march no more
To the call of the drum and the fife,
Who sail the seas with the soundless shore,
Far out from the harbor of life.

Across the sea they bore our flag;
Across the sea they brought it back;
Nor did its shining stars e'er drag,
From sea to sea, from crag to crag,
Along war's grim and gory track.

But, Mr. Chairman, when we think of the 34,249 American boys killed in France during the World War, the 224,089 wounded soldiers, many of whom afterwards died, and the 75,212 little white crosses marking the silent and sleeping dust of American soldiers in a foreign land, it is a different story. We think of the many anxious American mothers still looking for their boys who will never return to them. It is then that we hope there will never be another war. We all suffer in war, but those who suffer the most are the mothers of these soldier boys.

Oh, the bravest battle that ever was fought;
Shall I tell you where and when?
On the map of the world you will find it not;
'Twas fought by the mothers of men.
'Twas not with cannon or battle shot,
With sword or noble pen;
'Twas not with eloquent word or thought,
From lips of wonderful men;
But deep in a welled-up woman's heart;
A woman who would not yield,
But bravely, silently bore her part—
Lo, there is that battlefield.

American lives should not be sacrificed to protect property in foreign lands. Human life is more sacred than any property rights. In China now there are about 9,000 Americans, in addition to the soldiers we have there. American investments in China amount to $250,000,000 in stocks, bonds, and other property. In October, 1929, the administration sent 24 officers and 295 enlisted men to Nicaragua. There are now in Nicaragua 110 officers and 880 enlisted men of the Marine Corps. The first contingent of the marines landed there January 10, 1927. They were sent there to protect interests of certain wealthy Americans who own property in Nicaragua to the amount of $15,000,000. The Government should recall them, that no more of our boys shall be killed in foreign lands.

Mr. Chairman, let us do our utmost to promote the principles of peace and brotherhood throughout the world, and return to the gentle and Christian teachings of the Saviour of Mankind. It is time to act and not delay this legislation longer. I hope Congress does not adjourn until a law is enacted to take the profits out of war. We should never permit ourselves and our Nation to be placed in such a position as to embarrass our country by foreign investments, and the best way to avoid this is to have proper national leadership. Let us remember the enormous profits made during the World War by these cowardly and unscrupulous profiteers who profited on the blood of American boys and upon the sadness and tears of American mothers and fathers, and enact legislation that will forever put an end to such profiteering. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

WHY THE ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES SHOULD BE PAID IN CASH NOW

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have been informed today by Mr. John Arthur Shaw, Director of the Veterans' Employment Service, Department of Labor, that there are 750,000 able-bodied World War veterans unemployed, 75,000 veterans with disabilities unemployed, and 800,000 veterans who are working part time from one to four days a week and in most cases at greatly reduced wages. This statement by Mr. Shaw, which is the very best information obtainable on the subject, discloses that at least 1,600,000 veterans need their money at this time.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the following is inserted:

Three million six hundred thousand adjusted-service certificates are held by that number of veterans of the World War. These veterans reside in every nook and corner of America. The average value of the certificates is $1,000. The certificates do not represent a bonus; they represent an honest debt that has been confessed by Congress for services rendered. Each holder of a certificate was really due an amount equal to the face or maturity value of his certificate October 1, 1931. Two billion two hundred million dollars will pay this debt in full.

The average veteran has borrowed 50 per cent of his certificate, the limit allowed by law. He is paying compound interest on this loan to a bank or to the Government—the one holding his certificate as collateral security for the 50

per cent loan. If the remaining 50 per cent is not paid to the veteran now, it will practically be consumed by compound interest. The veterans and their families need the money much worse than the banks or the Government need it in compound interest. If it is paid now, the entire Nation will be benefited by the additional purchasing power being placed into the hands of so many consumers who will put it into circulation. It will not be hoarded.

At least 2,500,000 of these veterans need their money to purchase comforts and necessities of life or to pay debts which they owe and on which they are paying as high as 10 per cent interest. More than 720,000 of these veterans were unemployed when they obtained their 50 per cent loans, so an investigation made by the Veterans' Administration disclosed.

We have sufficient idle gold in the Treasury of the United States to authorize the issuance of Treasury notes—legal-tender currency—to pay this debt in full. Experts tell us that our country needs a moderate expansion of the currency. In this way the debt can be paid without a bond issue, without increasing taxes, and without additional interest payments. The debt must be paid some time. Everybody will be helped if it is paid now.

The Government will be saved tens of millions of dollars annually in administration expenses if the certificates are paid now.

Through the cooperation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars a statement has been prepared which shows the amount of money that will be paid to the veterans in each county in each State in the United States if H. R. 1, the full-payment bill, becomes a law. This statement shows the amount due after deducting prior loans and interest on these loans. You may examine the statement and determine for yourself the question—which will promote the general welfare of the people of this Nation to the greatest extent, to pay this money now or permit the banks and the Government to consume it by compound interest?

The following table, compiled from information obtained from the Veterans' Administration, is self-explanatory:

Column 1: Names of counties, except in Louisiana, where the names of the parishes are given.

Column 2: The approximate amount that will be paid to holders of adjusted-service certificates in each county if H. R. 1 becomes a law.

Counties and amount to be paid to holders of adjusted-service certificates if H. R. 1 becomes a law

ALABAMA

Autauga	$222,345.26	Jackson	$416,386.49
Baldwin	319,382.81	Jefferson	4,871,555.97
Barbour	366,078.25	Lamar	203,231.29
Bibb	234,606.20	Lauderdale	464,357.70
Blount	316,345.80	Lawrence	304,175.18
Bullock	225,980.64	Lee	407,151.27
Butler	340,901.55	Limestone	413,541.41
Calhoun	627,848.19	Lowndes	258,292.62
Chambers	443,843.77	Macon	305,992.87
Cherokee	228,272.51	Madison	729,593.67
Chilton	277,496.91	Marengo	411,249.54
Choctaw	231,591.77	Marion	293,167.43
Clarke	293,720.64	Marshall	449,364.58
Clay	200,600.72	Mobile	1,336,318.27
Cleburne	145,381.33	Monroe	339,490.30
Coffee	367,557.24	Montgomery	1,113,995.59
Colbert	337,119.40	Morgan	521,327.04
Conecuh	287,093.41	Perry	297,886.65
Coosa	140,673.40	Pickens	281,143.58
Covington	466,909.24	Pike	363,989.60
Crenshaw	267,076.24	Randolph	303,260.69
Cullman	463,465.79	Russell	309,086.33
Dale	261,645.75	St. Clair	276,717.90
Dallas	622,011.26	Shelby	311,333.04
De Kalb	452,774.16	Sumter	304,028.41
Elmore	387,021.20	Talladega	510,770.89
Escambia	315,702.27	Tallapoosa	352,112.52
Etowah	715,774.71	Tuscaloosa	724,287.37
Fayette	208,221.47	Walker	671,134.05
Franklin	286,449.88	Washington	184,760.85
Geneva	339,874.16	Wilcox	280,895.20
Greene	222,921.05	Winston	176,078.84
Hale	296,531.85		
Henry	257,637.80	Total	29,876,139.92
Houston	518,606.15		

ARIZONA

Apache	$302,182.65	Navajo	$360,646.02
Cochise	697,375.98	Pima	947,048.76
Coconino	239,228.64	Pinal	375,597.81
Gila	527,582.16	Santa Cruz	164,724.84
Graham	176,444.73	Yavapai	484,274.70
Greenlee	168,160.86	Yuma	303,050.16
Maricopa	2,567,999.70		
Mohave	94,779.72	Total	7,409,096.73

ARKANSAS

Arkansas	305,064.00	Lincoln	277,020.00
Ashley	344,065.68	Little River	212,245.20
Baxter	130,219.92	Logan	329,824.80
Benton	482,261.04	Lonoke	461,823.12
Boone	204,338.16	Madison	182,409.12
Bradley	239,317.92	Marion	121,423.68
Calhoun	133,407.36	Miller	418,416.48
Carroll	216,417.60	Mississippi	947,873.52
Chicot	309,797.28	Monroe	282,505.68
Clark	341,069.76	Montgomery	147,306.24
Clay	373,163.04	Nevada	279,167.76
Cleburne	155,582.64	Newton	144,515.52
Cleveland	174,337.92	Ouachita	408,895.20
Columbia	373,737.60	Perry	105,267.60
Conway	300,262.32	Phillips	556,543.44
Craighead	612,043.20	Pike	161,314.56
Crawford	308,470.32	Poinsett	406,227.60
Crittenden	543,328.56	Polk	203,243.76
Cross	351,890.64	Pope	363,162.96
Dallas	200,699.28	Prairie	207,758.16
Desha	298,415.52	Pulaski	1,884,105.36
Drew	272,615.04	Randolph	230,795.28
Faulkner	388,252.08	St. Francis	456,829.92
Franklin	215,624.16	Saline	214,228.80
Fulton	148,209.12	Scott	161,465.04
Garland	492,904.08	Searcy	151,246.08
Grant	134,529.12	Sebastian	744,547.68
Greene	357,417.36	Sevier	223,859.52
Hempstead	421,986.96	Sharp	146,581.20
Hot Spring	247,676.40	Stone	109,344.24
Howard	239,249.52	Union	763,344.00
Independence	331,398.00	Van Buren	163,640.16
Izard	176,088.96	Washington	537,008.40
Jackson	382,260.24	White	523,519.92
Jefferson	877,626.72	Woodruff	310,289.76
Johnson	263,873.52	Yell	291,561.84
Lafayette	231,657.12		
Lawrence	296,349.84	Total	25,369,313.76
Lee	364,394.16		

CALIFORNIA

Alameda	11,416,187.32	Placer	588,210.72
Alpine	5,793.64	Plumas	190,228.52
Amador	204,195.76	Riverside	1,947,816.96
Butte	819,595.72	Sacramento	3,413,655.96
Calaveras	144,432.32	San Benito	271,916.44
Colusa	246,602.32	San Bernardino	3,218,956.00
Contra Costa	1,889,736.32	San Diego	5,040,202.36
Del Norte	113,925.56	San Francisco	15,250,831.76
Eldorado	200,133.00	San Joaquin	2,474,677.60
Fresno	3,470,871.16	San Luis Obispo	711,896.52
Glenn	262,877.40	San Mateo	1,860,816.20
Humboldt	1,039,321.32	Santa Barbara	1,566,614.68
Imperial	1,464,108.12	Santa Clara	3,488,636.72
Inyo	157,582.20	Santa Cruz	899,889.32
Kern	1,984,982.80	Shasta	334,805.08
Kings	610,255.40	Sierra	58,224.88
Lake	172,270.64	Siskiyou	612,539.20
Lassen	302,639.56	Solano	981,649.36
Los Angeles	53,092,147.68	Sonoma	1,495,816.88
Madera	412,622.56	Stanislaus	1,361,649.64
Marin	1,001,217.92	Sutter	351,416.72
Mariposa	77,721.32	Tehama	333,338.64
Mendocino	565,060.20	Trinity	67,528.36
Merced	883,421.92	Tulare	1,861,705.68
Modoc	193,233.52	Tuolumne	222,874.84
Mono	32,694.40	Ventura	1,321,623.04
Monterey	1,291,068.20	Yolo	568,401.76
Napa	550,443.88	Yuba	272,397.24
Nevada	254,727.84		
Orange	2,852,922.96	Total	136,481,114.04

COLORADO

Adams	420,488.65	Crowley	123,249.18
Alamosa	178,663.54	Custer	44,115.48
Arapahoe	470,378.19	Delta	295,017.08
Archuleta	66,547.08	Denver	5,978,872.97
Baca	219,538.90	Dolores	29,327.24
Bent	189,713.18	Douglas	72,653.46
Boulder	674,111.12	Eagle	81,501.48
Chaffee	168,777.02	Elbert	136,666.60
Cheyenne	77,326.71	El Paso	1,029,568.90
Clear Creek	44,759.35	Fremont	392,469.92
Conejos	203,608.31	Garfield	207,180.75
Costilla	120,029.83	Gilpin	25,173.24

COLORADO—continued

Grand	$43,783.16	Ouray	37,053.68
Gunnison	114,795.79	Park	42,620.04
Hinsdale	9,325.73	Phillips	120,403.69
Huerfano	354,377.74	Pitkin	36,762.90
Jackson	28,787.22	Prowers	306,606.74
Jefferson	452,993.70	Pueblo	1,371,609.26
Kiowa	78,635.22	Rio Blanco	61,894.60
Kit Carson	201,983.25	Rio Grande	206,723.81
Lake	101,752.23	Routt	194,241.04
La Plata	269,490.75	Saguache	129,812.50
Larimer	688,255.49	San Juan	40,189.95
Las Animas	747,886.16	San Miguel	45,361.68
Lincoln	163,044.50	Sedgwick	115,896.60
Logan	414,278.42	Summit	20,499.99
Mesa	538,109.16	Teller	86,008.57
Mineral	13,292.80	Washington	199,205.07
Moffat	100,962.97	Weld	1,352,064.69
Montezuma	161,964.46	Yuma	282,742.01
Montrose	243,881.34		
Morgan	379,758.68	Total	21,513,379.07
Otero	506,580.30		

CONNECTICUT

Fairfield	7,196,524.22	New London	2,213,957.26
Hartford	7,836,615.17	Tolland	533,343.99
Litchfield	1,536,367.16	Windham	1,006,540.46
Middlesex	956,330.68		
New Haven	8,624,785.89	Total	29,904,464.83

DELAWARE

Kent	523,466.04	Sussex	748,135.08
New Castle	2,647,366.08		
		Total	3,918,967.20

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Total	18,198,685.00

FLORIDA

Alachua	570,115.35	Lee	248,684.10
Baker	104,069.07	Leon	389,466.84
Bay	200,589.69	Levy	206,645.04
Bradford	156,028.95	Liberty	67,471.53
Brevard	220,364.97	Madison	259,036.26
Broward	333,359.46	Manatee	373,308.18
Calhoun	121,073.82	Marion	490,699.02
Charlotte	66,575.67	Martin	84,791.49
Citrus	91,510.44	Monroe	226,022.16
Clay	113,790.81	Nassau	155,531.25
Collier	47,828.97	Okaloosa	164,191.23
Columbia	242,844.42	Okeechobee	68,500.11
Dade	2,371,623.45	Orange	825,136.83
De Soto	128,489.55	Osceola	177,496.41
Dixie	106,491.21	Palm Beach	859,046.79
Duval	2,579,794.77	Pasco	175,422.66
Escambia	889,124.46	Pinellas	1,031,051.91
Flagler	40,910.94	Polk	1,199,307.69
Franklin	104,234.97	Putnam	300,212.64
Gadsden	495,875.10	St. Johns	309,834.84
Gilchrist	68,632.83	St. Lucie	117,075.63
Glades	45,821.58	Santa Rosa	233,636.97
Gulf	52,789.38	Sarasota	206,379.60
Hamilton	156,841.86	Seminole	310,813.65
Hardee	171,673.32	Sumter	176,583.96
Hendry	57,932.28	Suwannee	260,977.29
Hernando	82,087.32	Taylor	217,926.24
Highlands	152,495.28	Union	123,230.52
Hillsborough	2,546,880.21	Volusia	709,338.63
Holmes	214,409.16	Wakulla	90,714.12
Indian River	111,551.16	Walton	241,815.84
Jackson	530,365.71	Washington	202,066.20
Jefferson	222,438.72		
Lafayette	72,348.99	Total	24,357,620.49
Lake	384,240.99		

GEORGIA

Appling	161,099.40	Candler	108,791.10
Atkinson	83,417.40	Carroll	414,691.20
Bacon	85,365.50	Catoosa	113,994.10
Baker	94,597.80	Charlton	53,010.10
Baldwin	276,823.80	Chatham	1,275,715.10
Banks	117,406.30	Chattahoochee	107,617.40
Barrow	150,052.10	Chattooga	186,424.70
Bartow	306,904.40	Cherokee	242,036.30
Ben Hill	157,868.70	Clarke	309,917.30
Berrien	177,216.60	Clay	84,010.30
Bibb	932,208.20	Clayton	124,146.00
Bleckley	110,509.30	Clinch	84,881.50
Brantley	83,426.50	Cobb	428,436.80
Brooks	258,093.00	Coffee	238,841.90
Bryan	72,019.20	Colquitt	370,526.20
Bulloch	320,758.90	Columbia	106,395.30
Burke	353,610.40	Cook	136,863.10
Butts	113,074.50	Coweta	304,036.70
Calhoun	127,969.60	Crawford	84,942.00
Camden	76,689.80	Crisp	209,850.30
Campbell	119,826.30	Dade	50,166.60

GEORGIA—continued

Dawson	$42,374.20	Monroe	$140,432.60
Decatur	285,826.20	Montgomery	121,242.00
De Kalb	850,363.80	Morgan	111,501.50
Dodge	261,347.90	Murray	696,451.80
Dooly	218,102.50	Muscogee	209,209.00
Dougherty	269,902.60	Newton	151,104.80
Douglas	114,478.10	Oconee	97,792.20
Early	221,103.30	Oglethorpe	156,416.70
Echols	33,202.40	Paulding	149,156.70
Effingham	122,984.40	Peach	124,242.80
Elbert	223,668.50	Pickens	117,212.70
Emanuel	291,622.10	Pierce	151,516.20
Evans	85,934.20	Pike	131,321.30
Fannin	156,924.90	Polk	304,206.10
Fayette	104,846.50	Pulaski	108,960.50
Floyd	588,870.70	Putnam	101,240.70
Forsyth	128,550.40	Quitman	46,222.00
Franklin	192,414.20	Rabun	76,605.10
Fulton	3,854,902.70	Randolph	207,805.40
Gilmer	88,862.40	Richmond	883,179.00
Glascock	53,094.80	Rockdale	87,688.70
Glynn	234,740.00	Schley	64,698.70
Gordon	203,836.60	Screven	248,086.30
Grady	232,320.00	Seminole	89,406.90
Greene	152,653.60	Spalding	284,289.50
Gwinnett	337,021.30	Stephens	142,054.00
Habersham	154,250.80	Stewart	134,479.40
Hall	366,787.30	Sumter	324,280.00
Hancock	158,147.00	Talbot	102,341.80
Haralson	158,147.00	Taliaferro	74,681.20
Harris	134,794.00	Tattnall	186,473.10
Hart	183,605.40	Taylor	128,465.70
Heard	110,134.20	Telfair	181,463.70
Henry	192,680.40	Terrell	221,309.00
Houston	136,488.00	Thomas	394,605.20
Irwin	147,607.90	Tift	194,422.80
Jackson	261,468.90	Toombs	207,696.50
Jasper	103,987.40	Towns	52,586.60
Jeff Davis	98,227.80	Treutlen	90,604.80
Jefferson	250,796.70	Troup	444,699.20
Jenkins	156,186.80	Turner	135,471.60
Johnson	153,440.10	Twiggs	101,301.20
Jones	108,803.20	Union	76,714.00
Lamar	117,914.50	Upson	236,058.90
Lanier	62,799.00	Walker	317,092.60
Laurens	395,585.30	Walton	255,527.80
Lee	100,768.80	Ware	321,351.80
Liberty	98,651.30	Warren	135,290.10
Lincoln	94,948.70	Washington	302,863.00
Long	50,578.00	Wayne	153,028.70
Lowndes	362,927.40	Webster	60,387.20
Lumpkin	59,616.70	Wheeler	110,702.90
McDuffie	109,069.40	White	73,277.60
McIntosh	69,732.30	Whitfield	251,776.80
Macon	201,380.30	Wilcox	162,611.90
Madison	180,544.10	Wilkes	192,922.40
Marion	84,312.80	Wilkinson	131,212.40
Meriwether	271,487.70	Worth	255,237.40
Miller	109,819.60		
Milton	81,433.00		35,192,922.60
Mitchell	285,802.00		

IDAHO

Ada	702,750.25	Idaho	187,282.71
Adams	53,125.51	Jefferson	169,938.63
Bannock	579,358.98	Jerome	154,873.74
Bear Lake	145,868.16	Kootenai	360,760.57
Benewah	118,054.63	Latah	329,796.94
Bingham	343,935.33	Lemhi	86,034.79
Blaine	69,821.04	Lewis	97,060.16
Boise	34,224.91	Lincoln	60,074.26
Bonner	243,706.56	Madison	154,095.48
Bonneville	364,373.92	Minidoka	155,707.59
Boundary	84,404.15	Nez Perce	325,961.23
Butte	35,837.02	Oneida	108,771.10
Camas	26,145.83	Owyhee	76,028.59
Canyon	573,132.90	Payette	135,602.54
Caribou	39,302.13	Power	82,588.21
Cassia	243,039.48	Shoshone	353,181.80
Clark	20,790.66	Teton	66,207.69
Clearwater	122,279.45	Twin Falls	552,712.84
Custer	58,591.86	Valley	64,632.64
Elmore	83,218.23	Washington	147,535.86
Franklin	173,792.87	Yellowstone National Park	18.53
Fremont	183,891.72		
Gem	137,474.07		
Gooding	140,457.40	Total	8,246,442.96

ILLINOIS

Adams	1,293,350.40	Carroll	379,719.80
Alexander	464,365.20	Cass	340,622.20
Bond	296,763.60	Champaign	1,324,023.80
Boone	310,606.80	Christian	773,282.80
Brown	162,575.20	Clark	368,163.20
Bureau	800,207.00	Clay	332,793.00
Calhoun	165,500.40	Clinton	440,201.40

ILLINOIS—continued

Coles	$768, 689. 00	Marion	$734, 081. 00
Cook	82, 031, 733. 80	Marshall	268, 273. 80
Crawford	434, 351. 00	Mason	311, 369. 00
Cumberland	214, 631. 40	Massac	290, 068. 60
De Kalb	672, 466. 40	Menard	217, 845. 00
De Witt	383, 118. 80	Mercer	342, 804. 60
Douglas	369, 028. 40	Monroe	254, 801. 40
De Page	1, 895, 158. 80	Montgomery	726, 726. 80
Edgar	514, 299. 60	Morgan	705, 344. 00
Edwards	171, 041. 80	Moultrie	272, 888. 20
Effingham	391, 667. 80	Ogle	579, 230. 80
Fayette	483, 832. 20	Peoria	2, 911, 686 40
Ford	319, 073. 40	Perry	469, 000. 20
Franklin	1, 224, 505. 20	Piatt	321, 112. 80
Fulton	906, 049. 80	Pike	501, 754 20
Gallatin	207, 874. 60	Pope	164, 717. 60
Greene	420, 590. 20	Pulaski	305, 580. 40
Grundy	384, 766. 80	Putnam	107, 841. 00
Hamilton	267, 697. 00	Randolph	603, 847. 80
Hancock	544, 252. 00	Richland	289, 491. 80
Hardin	143, 273. 00	Rock Island	2, 022, 734. 60
Henderson	180, 826. 80	St. Clair	3, 250, 165. 00
Henry	903, 330. 60	Saline	764, 260. 00
Iroquois	678. 007. 80	Sangamon	2, 301, 699. 80
Jackson	735, 008. 00	Schuyler	240, 525. 60
Jasper	263, 865. 40	Scott	175, 903. 40
Jefferson	639, 300. 40	Shelby	524, 702. 60
Jersey	258, 653. 60	Stark	189, 190. 40
Jo Daviess	416, 841. 00	Stephenson	825, 318. 40
Johnson	210, 181. 80	Tazewell	949, 289. 20
Kane	2, 581, 736. 20	Union	409, 589. 80
Kankakee	1, 031, 957. 00	Vermilion	1, 840, 383. 40
Kendall	217, 433. 00	Wabash	271, 858. 20
Knox	1, 057, 521. 60	Warren	447, 947. 00
Lake	2, 150, 372. 20	Washington	335, 491. 60
La Salle	2, 012, 517. 00	Wayne	394, 078. 00
Lawrence	450, 831. 00	White	373, 869. 40
Lee	665, 977. 40	Whiteside	803, 791. 40
Livingston	805, 295. 20	Will	2, 281, 079. 20
Logan	594, 577. 80	Williamson	1, 109, 928. 00
McDonough	562, 977. 40	Winnebago	2, 417, 883. 80
McHenry	722, 627. 40	Woodford	387, 115. 20
McLean	1, 506, 210. 20		
Macon	1, 683, 658. 60		
Macoupin	1, 003, 281. 80	Total	157, 191, 472. 40
Madison	2, 962, 898. 00		

INDIANA

Adams	365, 013. 53	Madison	1, 516, 021. 52
Allen	2, 683, 929. 47	Marion	7, 730, 561. 14
Bartholomew	454, 762. 56	Marshall	458, 658. 33
Benton	217, 394. 94	Martin	184, 783. 87
Blackford	249, 054. 93	Miami	530, 995. 28
Boone	407, 684. 10	Monroe	657, 964. 46
Brown	94, 522. 72	Montgomery	493, 464. 20
Carroll	275, 246. 21	Morgan	355, 264. 96
Cass	631, 334. 22	Newton	179, 991. 89
Clark	562, 673. 56	Noble	409, 769. 16
Clay	484, 300. 91	Ohio	68, 532. 63
Clinton	499, 847. 41	Orange	319, 325. 11
Crawford	185, 826. 40	Owen	207, 609. 79
Daviess	472, 467. 28	Parke	302, 900. 69
Dearborn	385, 114. 24	Perry	304, 071. 25
Decatur	316, 563. 32	Pike	299, 242. 69
De Kalb	455, 622. 19	Porter	417, 396. 09
Delaware	1, 230, 368. 30	Posey	326, 531. 37
Dubois	375, 914: 37	Pulaski	204, 756. 55
Elkhart	1, 259, 723. 75	Putnam	373, 993. 92
Fayette	351, 954. 47	Randolph	454, 671. 11
Floyd	633, 839. 95	Ripley	330, 646. 62
Fountain	328, 689. 59	Rush	355, 045. 48
Franklin	265, 168. 42	St. Joseph	2, 927, 003. 57
Fulton	275, 045. 02	Scott	121, 884. 56
Gibson	534, 104. 58	Shelby	485, 636. 08
Grant	933, 997. 14	Spencer	305, 680. 77
Greene	575, 787. 49	Starke	194, 239. 80
Hamilton	428, 790. 76	Steuben	244, 829. 94
Hancock	303, 705. 45	Sullivan	514, 552. 57
Harrison	315, 575. 66	Switzerland	154, 221. 28
Hendricks	360, 770. 25	Tippecanoe	869, 415. 15
Henry	644, 503. 02	Tipton	278, 154. 32
Howard	854, 069. 84	Union	107, 545. 20
Huntington	531, 745. 17	Vanderburg	2, 072, 622. 80
Jackson	434, 039. 99	Vermillion	425, 023. 02
Jasper	244, 866. 52	Vigo	1, 808, 167. 69
Jay	381, 273. 34	Wabash	460, 359. 30
Jefferson	350, 838. 78	Warren	167, 664. 43
Jennings	215, 822. 00	Warrick	333, 426. 70
Johnson	397, 002. 74	Washington	297, 852. 65
Knox	801, 339. 77	Wayne	1, 002, 456. 61
Kosciusko	502, 755. 52	Wells	336, 737. 19
Lagrange	252, 036. 20	White	289, 548. 99
Lake	4, 779, 359. 90	Whiteley	291, 377. 99
La Porte	1, 106, 362. 10		
Lawrence	650, 813. 07	Total	59, 232, 219. 87

IOWA

Adair	$261, 845. 35	Johnson	$570, 702. 60
Adams	196, 737. 45	Jones	362, 033. 10
Allamakee	307, 782. 80	Keokuk	360, 939. 80
Appanoose	468, 139. 75	Kossuth	479, 770. 20
Audubon	231, 176. 40	Lee	777, 901. 80
Benton	430, 741. 35	Linn	1, 552, 033. 60
Black Hawk	1, 303, 402. 10	Louisa	218, 188. 75
Boone	551, 758. 35	Lucas	284, 898. 90
Bremer	321, 317. 10	Lyon	288, 273. 05
Buchanan	368, 517. 50	Madison	270, 139. 35
Buena Vista	351, 872. 95	Mahaska	486, 405. 40
Butler	332, 080. 45	Marion	484, 953. 95
Calhoun	331, 854. 25	Marshall	635, 753. 95
Carroll	420, 845. 10	Mills	299, 074. 10
Cass	366, 104. 70	Mitchell	265, 125. 25
Cedar	315, 926. 00	Monona	343, 315. 05
Cerro Gordo	725, 272. 60	Monroe	282, 938. 50
Cherokee	353, 192. 45	Montgomery	315, 775. 20
Chickasaw	275, 907. 45	Muscatine	553, 907. 25
Clarke	195, 738. 40	O'Brien	347, 009. 65
Clay	303, 616. 95	Osceola	191, 930. 70
Clayton	462, 937. 15	Page	488, 290. 40
Clinton	836, 506. 45	Palo Alto	290, 252. 30
Crawford	396, 377. 80	Plymouth	455, 397. 15
Dallas	480, 543. 05	Pocahontas	295, 699. 95
Davis	210, 177. 50	Polk	3, 257, 977. 45
Decatur	280, 921. 55	Pottawattamie	1, 317, 388. 80
Delaware	341, 599. 70	Poweshiek	353, 003. 95
Des Moines	719, 353. 70	Ringgold	225, 559. 10
Dickinson	207, 010. 70	Sac	332, 532. 85
Dubuque	153, 883. 90	Scott	1, 457, 708. 20
Delaware	242, 335. 60	Shelby	322, 919. 35
Emmet	549, 383. 25	Sioux	505, 293. 10
Fayette	368, 027. 40	Story	587, 007. 85
Floyd	308, 800. 70	Tama	414, 454. 95
Franklin	292, 797. 05	Taylor	280, 092. 15
Fremont	311, 552. 80	Union	328, 649. 75
Greene	266, 407. 05	Van Buren	237, 566. 55
Grundy	326, 557. 40	Wapello	763, 048. 00
Guthrie	395, 435. 30	Warren	333, 645. 00
Hamilton	279, 017. 70	Washington	373, 644. 70
Hancock	432, 550. 95	Wayne	259, 834. 95
Hardin	469, 308. 45	Webster	762, 011. 25
Harrison	332, 891. 00	Winnebago	247, 745. 55
Henry	246, 595. 70	Winneshiek	407, 725. 50
Howard	248, 857. 70	Woodbury	1, 916, 460. 65
Humboldt	224, 937. 05	Worth	210, 441. 40
Ida	326, 708. 20	Wright	381, 071. 60
Iowa	348, 366. 85		
Jackson	620, 843. 60	Total	46, 577, 200. 15
Jasper	306, 142. 85		
Jefferson			

KANSAS

Allen	397, 230. 87	Jackson	274, 390. 32
Anderson	248, 002. 35	Jefferson	262, 375. 53
Atchison	444, 658. 65	Jewell	268, 559. 34
Barber	189, 005. 46	Johnson	504, 714. 03
Barton	367, 240. 32	Kearny	59, 349. 72
Bourbon	415, 708. 02	Kingman	216, 786. 18
Brown	381, 669. 21	Kiowa	112, 069. 95
Butler	666, 737. 28	Labette	582, 095. 22
Chase	129, 098. 64	Lane	62, 618. 04
Chautauqua	192, 236. 64	Leavenworth	792, 437. 61
Cherokee	584, 156. 49	Lincoln	180, 258. 99
Cheyenne	129, 024. 36	Linn	251, 326. 38
Clark	89, 061. 72	Logan	76, 972. 65
Clay	270, 304. 92	Lyon	542, 986. 80
Cloud	334, 371. 42	McPherson	438, 029. 16
Coffey	253, 536. 21	Marion	385, 123. 23
Comanche	97, 269. 66	Marshall	428, 149. 92
Cowley	759, 568. 71	Meade	127, 353. 06
Crawford	916, 039. 53	Miami	394, 482. 51
Decatur	164, 641. 62	Mitchell	237, 213. 18
Dickinson	480, 405. 90	Montgomery	954, 702. 27
Doniphan	261, 149. 91	Morris	220, 221. 63
Douglas	466, 905. 51	Morton	75, 988. 44
Edwards	135, 468. 15	Nemaha	340, 610. 94
Elk	171, 029. 70	Neosha	420, 889. 05
Ellis	295, 392. 99	Ness	155, 208. 06
Ellsworth	188, 151. 24	Norton	217, 287. 57
Finney	204, 529. 98	Osage	325, 680. 66
Ford	333, 414. 79	Osborne	214, 817. 76
Franklin	408, 985. 68	Ottawa	182, 338. 83
Geary	266, 776. 62	Pawnee	195, 170. 70
Gove	104, 790. 51	Phillips	225, 792. 63
Graham	144, 326. 04	Pottawatomie	294, 557. 34
Grant	57, 418. 44	Pratt	247, 203. 84
Gray	115, 338. 27	Rawlins	136, 712. 34
Greeley	31, 791. 84	Reno	887, 367. 45
Greenwood	357, 193. 95	Republic	273, 814. 65
Hamilton	61, 800. 96	Rice	256, 266. 00
Harper	238, 123. 11	Riley	369, 208. 74
Harvey	410, 768. 40	Rooks	177, 046. 38
Haskell	52, 088. 85	Rush	168, 857. 01
Hodgeman	77, 195. 49	Russell	205, 105. 65

KANSAS—continued

Saline	$544,788.09	Thomas	$136,192.38
Scott	73,834.32	Trego	120,147.90
Sedgwick	2,531,648.10	Wabaunsee	201,113.10
Seward	149,952.75	Wallace	53,518.74
Shawnee	1,582,164.00	Washington	317,769.84
Sheridan	112,125.66	Wichita	47,892.03
Sherman	137,418.00	Wilson	346,256.22
Smith	251,530.65	Woodson	158,327.82
Stafford	194,242.20	Wyandotte	2,622,288.27
Stanton	39,962.64		
Stevens	86,443.35	Total	34,930,151.43
Sumner	537,787.20		

KENTUCKY

Adair	238,798.56	Larue	132,394.08
Allen	221,020.80	Laurel	307,347.04
Anderson	123,672.64	Lawrence	243,341.28
Ballard	144,289.60	Lee	141,654.24
Barren	376,288.64	Leslie	156,738.40
Bath	161,252.00	Letcher	519,821.12
Bell	564,156.32	Lewis	208,426.40
Boone	139,703.20	Lincoln	257,522.72
Bourbon	262,953.60	Livingston	125,332.48
Boyd	638,441.44	Logan	318,500.00
Boyle	237,065.92	Lyon	124,196.80
Bracken	140,008.96	McCracken	673,705.76
Breathitt	307,842.08	McCreary	212,969.12
Breckinridge	252,878.08	McLean	161,208.32
Bullitt	129,118.08	Madison	402,161.76
Butler	183,747.20	Magoffin	228,868.64
Caldwell	200,651.36	Marion	225,665.44
Calloway	257,158.72	Marshall	187,663.84
Campbell	1,068,572.96	Martin	124,983.04
Carlisle	107,205.28	Mason	274,630.72
Carroll	118,736.80	Meade	117,091.52
Carter	347,095.84	Menifee	72,188.48
Casey	243,836.32	Mercer	210,697.76
Christian	499,160.48	Metcalfe	136,470.88
Clark	256,838.40	Monroe	190,401.12
Clay	269,738.56	Montgomery	169,769.60
Clinton	131,098.24	Morgan	220,292.80
Crittenden	173,715.36	Muhlenberg	550,135.04
Cumberland	148,570.24	Nelson	240,982.56
Daviess	637,422.24	Nicholas	124,793.76
Edmondson	167,076.00	Ohio	356,268.64
Elliott	110,233.76	Oldham	107,773.12
Estill	248,670.24	Owen	155,937.60
Fayette	997,936.08	Owsley	105,166.88
Fleming	188,275.36	Pendleton	158,354.56
Floyd	610,675.52	Perry	614,228.16
Franklin	306,691.84	Pike	921,167.52
Fulton	217,337.12	Powell	84,448.00
Gallatin	64,602.72	Pulaski	518,918.40
Garrard	168,342.72	Robertson	48,688.64
Grant	143,794.56	Rockcastle	220,569.44
Graves	448,127.68	Rowan	158,602.08
Grayson	248,320.80	Russell	173,700.80
Green	165,998.56	Scott	209,664.00
Greenup	357,506.24	Shelby	257,406.24
Hancock	89,500.32	Simpson	165,052.16
Hardin	304,493.28	Spencer	96,183.36
Harlan	939,949.92	Taylor	175,404.32
Harrison	216,347.04	Todd	196,851.20
Hart	235,420.64	Trigg	182,451.36
Henderson	382,855.20	Trimble	77,866.88
Henry	182,931.84	Union	248,291.68
Hickman	127,036.00	Warren	490,322.56
Hopkins	545,257.44	Washington	183,790.88
Jackson	152,399.52	Wayne	230,746.88
Jefferson	5,173,896.00	Webster	298,975.04
Jessamine	180,995.36	Whitley	432,868.80
Johnson	334,414.08	Wolfe	122,668.00
Kenton	1,361,855.04	Woodford	159,883.36
Knott	221,748.80		
Knox	382,432.96	Total	38,068,415.84

LOUISIANA

Acadia	583,204.58	Evangeline	377,912.89
Allen	226,320.63	Franklin	452,759.90
Ascension	273,435.54	Grant	232,964.47
Assumption	237,131.70	Iberia	418,087.36
Avoyelles	517,952.58	Iberville	365,381.54
Beauregard	216,058.27	Jackson	204,772.64
Bienville	352,790.87	Jefferson	593,674.56
Bossier	420,994.04	Jefferson Davis	293,114.95
Caddo	1,848,856.10	Lafayette	575,804.41
Calcasieu	622,311.29	La Fourche	480,773.77
Caldwell	154,676.90	La Salle	173,036.44
Cameron	89,780.82	Lincoln	338,450.26
Catahoula	184,648.33	Livingston	269,994.98
Claiborne	478,786.55	Madison	219,914.07
Concordia	189,497.74	Morehouse	351,307.87
De Soto	459,967.28	Natchitoches	570,613.91
East Baton Rouge	1,011,524.64	Orleans	6,803,440.46
East Carroll	234,536.45	Ouachita	805,817.71
East Feliciana	258,768.67	Plaquemines	142,486.64
		Pointe Coupee	311,533.81

LOUISIANA—continued

Rapides	$970,697.65	Tensas	$223,873.68
Red River	238,436.74	Terrebonne	442,171.28
Richland	391,126.42	Union	307,440.73
Sabine	357,551.30	Vermilion	499,533.72
St. Bernard	96,572.96	Vernon	297,297.01
St. Charles	179,606.13	Washington	443,476.32
St. Helena	125,936.36	Webster	436,862.14
St. James	227,462.54	West Baton Rouge	144,088.28
St. John the Baptist	208,776.74	West Carroll	206,062.85
St. Landry	890,897.42	West Feliciana	162,002.92
St. Martin	322,804.61	Winn	218,979.78
St. Mary	435,957.51		
St. Tammany	310,377.07	Total	31,166,624.19
Tangipahoa	685,546.41		

MAINE

Androscoggin	1,202,804.46	Penobscot	1,560,281.31
Aroostook	1,483,668.27	Piscataquis	307,921.59
Cumberland	2,274,154.05	Sagadahoc	285,897.03
Franklin	336,803.49	Somerset	660,584.79
Hancock	518,877.69	Waldo	342,630.54
Kennebec	1,193,970.99	Washington	638,881.14
Knox	467,734.77	York	1,231,855.26
Lincoln	261,761.22		
Oxford	700,647.87	Total	13,468,474.47

MARYLAND

Allegany	1,509,980.82	Howard	308,666.21
Anne Arundel	1,053,138.03	Kent	271,879.78
Baltimore	2,377,945.85	Montgomery	939,342.54
Baltimore City	15,365,044.66	Prince Georges	1,147,213.55
Calvert	181,389.52	Queen Annes	278,160.39
Caroline	331,917.83	St. Marys	289,958.01
Carroll	686,820.02	Somerset	446,362.38
Cecil	493,037.43	Talbot	354,749.47
Charles	308,608.94	Washington	1,257,687.38
Dorchester	511,860.17	Wicomico	596,161.61
Frederick	1,039,259.60	Worcester	412,802.16
Garrett	380,043.72		
Harford	603,301.27	Total	31,145,831.34

MASSACHUSETTS

Barnstable	702,310.70	Middlesex	20,325,247.76
Berkshire	2,624,018.00	Nantucket	79,959.72
Bristol	7,926,186.60	Norfolk	6,509,521.24
Dukes	107,678.22	Plymouth	3,528,641.14
Essex	10,827,389.60	Suffolk	19,121,112.64
Franklin	1,078,564.88	Worcester	10,679,601.08
Hampden	7,293,683.04		
Hampshire	1,582,693.74	Total	92,386,608.36

MICHIGAN

Alcona	88,005.96	Lapeer	500,058.72
Alger	164,528.28	Leelanau	144,753.84
Allegan	687,501.36	Lenawee	879,336.36
Alpena	327,645.36	Livingston	339,993.36
Antrim	176,029.56	Luce	115,153.92
Arenac	141,243.48	Mackinac	154,932.12
Baraga	161,723.52	Macomb	1,360,855.44
Barry	369,169.92	Manistee	307,094.76
Bay	1,225,521.36	Marquette	777,500.64
Benzie	116,194.68	Mason	330,855.84
Berrien	1,430,004.24	Mecosta	277,618.32
Branch	422,478.00	Menominee	417,221.28
Calhoun	1,535,438.52	Midland	337,806.00
Cass	368,464.32	Missaukee	123,338.88
Charlevoix	211,344.84	Monroe	925,835.40
Cheboygan	202,895.28	Montcalm	484,588.44
Chippewa	441,829.08	Montmorency	49,638.96
Clare	124,044.48	Muskegon	1,492,873.20
Clinton	426,429.36	Newaygo	300,391.56
Crawford	54,631.08	Oakland	3,726,467.64
Delta	569,419.20	Oceana	243,520.20
Dickinson	528,159.24	Ogemaw	116,335.80
Eaton	559,681.92	Ontonagon	196,050.96
Emmet	266,522.76	Osceola	225,897.84
Genesee	3,733,347.24	Oscoda	30,481.92
Gladwin	130,959.36	Otsego	97,972.56
Gogebic	557,018.28	Ottawa	967,695.12
Grand Traverse	352,994.04	Presque Isle	199,861.20
Gratiot	533,645.28	Roscommon	36,250.20
Hillsdale	483,635.88	Saginaw	2,129,447.88
Houghton	932,291.64	St. Clair	1,191,811.32
Huron	549,168.48	St. Joseph	540,101.52
Ingham	2,056,594.68	Sanilac	489,527.64
Ionia	619,040.52	Schoolcraft	149,075.64
Iosco	132,599.88	Shiawassee	697,079.88
Iron	367,000.20	Tuscola	580,955.76
Isabella	372,662.64	Van Buren	575,716.68
Jackson	1,628,242.56	Washtenaw	1,155,949.20
Kalamazoo	1,611,731.52	Wayne	33,321,007.44
Kalkaska	67,014.36	Wexford	296,828.28
Kent	4,242,614.04		
Keweenaw	89,540.64	Total	85,418,613.00
Lake	71,724.24		

MINNESOTA

Aitkin	$310,836.39	Marshall	$352,132.13
Anoka	381,374.65	Martin	463,924.71
Becker	466,037.13	Meeker	370,998.94
Beltrami	428,841.97	Mille Lacs	291,513.96
Benton	311,809.76	Morrison	526,903.82
Big Stone	203,744.98	Mower	581,226.15
Blue Earth	700,971.37	Murray	287,910.42
Brown	485,193.88	Nicollet	342,750.50
Carlton	439,714.72	Nobles	385,578.78
Carver	350,744.56	Norman	291,203.31
Cass	322,889.61	Olmsted	733,672.46
Chippewa	326,431.02	Otter Tail	1,056,334.26
Chisago	273,144.19	Pennington	217,185.77
Clay	478,815.20	Pine	419,667.44
Clearwater	197,697.66	Pipestone	253,448.98
Cook	50,428.85	Polk	745,953.49
Cottonwood	306,135.22	Pope	270,990.35
Crow Wing	530,735.17	Ramsey	5,937,991.91
Dakota	716,400.32	Red Lake	142,629.77
Dodge	251,150.17	Redwood	427,040.20
Douglas	389,617.23	Renville	489,687.95
Faribault	448,205.82	Rice	620,761.54
Fillmore	512,531.08	Rock	227,023.02
Freeborn	595,226.11	Roseau	261,380.91
Goodhue	648,575.07	St. Louis	4,237,183.16
Grant	197,946.18	Scott	292,342.36
Hennepin	10,723,327.35	Sherburne	201,073.39
Houston	286,729.95	Sibley	328,564.15
Hubbard	198,733.16	Stearns	1,286,525.91
Isanti	250,197.51	Steele	382,617.25
Itasca	563,809.04	Stevens	210,931.35
Jackson	328,522.73	Swift	305,161.85
Kanabec	177,236.18	Todd	541,980.70
Kandiyohi	488,217.54	Traverse	164,395.98
Kittson	200,638.48	Wabasha	364,765.23
Koochiching	291,555.38	Wadena	227,602.90
Lac qui Parle	318,892.58	Waseca	298,472.52
Lake	146,378.28	Washington	512,634.63
Lake of the Woods	86,857.74	Watonwan	265,129.42
Le Sueur	372,572.90	Wilkin	202,771.61
Lincoln	234,085.13	Winona	727,832.24
Lyon	400,241.46	Wright	561,634.49
McLeod	425,010.62	Yellow Medicine	344,303.75
Mahnomen	127,428.63	Total	53,099,466.63

MISSISSIPPI

Adams	251,663.52	Lincoln	281,492.76
Alcorn	252,614.04	Lowndes	320,261.16
Amite	210,524.16	Madison	382,301.28
Attala	278,053.80	Marion	212,777.64
Benton	104,802.84	Marshall	265,600.92
Bolivar	758,824.68	Monroe	385,985.88
Calhoun	193,094.40	Montgomery	160,296.12
Carroll	211,090.20	Neshoba	285,059.88
Chickasaw	222,517.80	Newton	244,678.80
Choctaw	131,780.52	Noxubee	272,980.80
Claiborne	129,783.36	Oktibbeha	204,190.92
Clarke	210,171.72	Panola	305,960.64
Clay	191,503.08	Pearl River	207,245.40
Coahoma	494,772.36	Perry	87,543.96
Copiah	337,637.52	Pike	343,906.68
Covington	160,499.04	Pontotoc	235,323.12
De Soto	271,677.84	Prentiss	205,750.20
Forrest	321,628.20	Quitman	270,246.72
Franklin	131,022.24	Rankin	217,370.04
George	80,345.64	Scott	223,361.52
Greene	113,677.92	Sharkey	148,206.36
Grenada	179,445.36	Simpson	223,179.96
Hancock	121,912.20	Smith	196,565.40
Harrison	471,447.24	Stone	60,918.72
Hinds	909,060.24	Sunflower	708,767.52
Holmes	411,543.12	Tallahatchie	379,866.24
Humphreys	264,105.72	Tate	188,726.28
Issaquena	61,239.12	Tippah	199,267.44
Itawamba	194,643.00	Tishomingo	175,269.48
Jackson	170,591.64	Tunica	226,768.44
Jasper	199,011.12	Union	227,142.24
Jefferson	152,627.88	Walthall	148,142.28
Jefferson Davis	152,521.08	Warren	382,183.80
Jones	443,134.56	Washington	580,030.80
Kemper	233,689.08	Wayne	163,350.60
Lafayette	213,365.04	Webster	129,527.04
Lamar	137,216.64	Wilkinson	149,060.76
Lauderdale	563,348.64	Winston	226,832.52
Lawrence	133,190.28	Yalobusha	189,570.00
Leake	232,856.04	Yazoo	397,958.16
Lee	377,142.84		
Leflore	571,444.08	Total	21,464,888.28

MISSOURI

Adair	361,898.32	Barry	424,591.86
Andrew	250,792.78	Barton	271,107.20
Atchison	249,899.02	Bates	410,906.16
Audrain	411,073.74	Benton	218,002.96

MISSOURI—continued

Bollinger	$228,448.78	Marion	$623,639.66
Boone	577,126.90	Mercer	174,097.00
Buchanan	1,836,546.46	Miller	311,475.36
Butler	441,238.14	Mississippi	293,488.44
Caldwell	232,917.58	Moniteau	226,661.26
Callaway	370,966.26	Monroe	250,736.92
Camden	170,224.04	Montgomery	242,264.82
Cape Girardeau	618,239.86	Morgan	204,224.16
Carroll	371,282.80	New Madrid	563,478.44
Carter	102,465.86	Newton	501,976.58
Cass	390,312.44	Nodaway	491,028.02
Cedar	207,352.32	Oregon	227,536.40
Chariton	364,728.56	Osage	232,042.44
Christian	245,206.78	Ozark	177,578.94
Clark	190,929.48	Pemiscot	694,228.08
Clay	499,220.82	Perry	255,224.34
Clinton	251,463.10	Pettis	645,443.68
Cole	574,389.76	Phelps	285,034.96
Cooper	363,499.64	Pike	335,178.62
Crawford	210,163.94	Platte	257,309.78
Dade	219,045.68	Polk	331,491.86
Dallas	196,273.42	Pulaski	200,258.10
Daviess	268,574.88	Putnam	214,185.86
De Kalb	191,227.40	Ralls	199,308.48
Dent	204,335.88	Randolph	492,145.22
Douglas	259,916.58	Ray	369,532.52
Dunklin	666,577.38	Reynolds	166,146.26
Franklin	568,263.78	Ripley	208,097.12
Gasconade	226,642.64	St. Charles	453,471.48
Gentry	267,159.76	St. Clair	247,441.18
Greene	1,544,137.98	St. Francois	667,191.84
Grundy	300,433.70	St. Louis	3,939,861.66
Harrison	320,878.46	St. Louis City	15,304,895.20
Henry	426,975.22	Ste. Genevieve	188,006.14
Hickory	119,726.60	Saline	569,734.76
Holt	236,846.40	Schuyler	129,427.62
Howard	251,183.80	Scotland	164,842.86
Howell	366,292.64	Scott	463,880.06
Iron	179,534.04	Shannon	202,846.28
Jackson	8,759,853.48	Shelby	223,123.46
Jasper	1,374,342.20	Stoddard	511,156.24
Jefferson	513,223.06	Stone	216,252.68
Johnson	417,330.06	Sullivan	283,247.44
Knox	179,831.96	Taney	165,103.54
Laclede	303,878.40	Texas	345,959.60
Lafayette	544,802.58	Vernon	466,077.22
Lawrence	442,671.88	Warren	150,486.84
Lewis	225,171.66	Washington	269,059.00
Lincoln	259,357.98	Wayne	227,964.66
Linn	434,572.18	Webster	300,675.76
Livingston	346,611.30	Worth	121,681.70
McDonald	259,488.32	Wright	311,717.42
Macon	429,563.40		
Madison	175,363.16	Total	67,578,813.54
Maries	155,812.16		

MONTANA

Beaverhead	141,397.50	Mineral	34,552.50
Big Horn	181,538.75	Missoula	462,867.50
Blaine	191,377.50	Musselshell	153,892.50
Broadwater	58,182.50	Park	232,092.50
Carbon	267,133.75	Petroleum	43,456.25
Carter	87,890.00	Phillips	174,420.00
Cascade	874,352.50	Pondera	147,985.00
Chouteau	183,493.75	Powder River	83,066.25
Custer	238,892.50	Powell	131,792.50
Daniels	118,001.25	Prairie	83,746.25
Dawson	209,971.25	Ravalli	219,193.75
Deer Lodge	346,226.25	Richland	204,701.25
Fallon	97,070.00	Roosevelt	226,780.00
Fergus	351,283.75	Rosebud	156,123.75
Flathead	408,000.00	Sanders	120,955.00
Gallatin	342,635.00	Sheridan	209,716.25
Garfield	90,355.00	Silver Bow	1,210,591.25
Glacier	112,561.25	Stillwater	132,876.25
Golden Valley	45,177.50	Sweet Grass	83,810.00
Granite	64,026.25	Teton	128,945.00
Hill	292,718.75	Toole	142,672.50
Jefferson	87,826.25	Treasure	35,296.25
Judith Basin	111,307.50	Valley	237,596.25
Lake	202,746.25	Wheatland	79,708.75
Lewis and Clark	387,260.00	Wibaux	58,798.75
Liberty	46,707.50	Yellowstone	654,181.25
Lincoln	150,641.25	Yellowstone Park	1,105.00
McCone	104,787.50		
Madison	134,363.75		
Meagher	48,280.00	Total	11,424,127.50

NEBRASKA

Adams	461,914.50	Box Butte	208,516.38
Antelope	267,321.48	Boyd	126,031.02
Arthur	23,627.52	Brown	101,471.76
Banner	29,464.08	Buffalo	427,862.04
Blaine	27,846.72	Burt	229,629.96
Boone	259,094.04	Butler	253,327.80

NEBRASKA—continued

Cass	$310,884.72	Lancaster	$1,763,695.92
Cedar	288,786.66	Lincoln	450,522.66
Chase	96,408.72	Logan	35,406.12
Cherry	191,586.84	Loup	31,960.44
Cheyenne	179,087.46	McPherson	23,873.64
Clay	238,578.18	Madison	457,730.46
Colfax	201,009.72	Merrick	186,682.02
Cuming	251,868.66	Morrill	174,921.00
Custer	460,402.62	Nance	153,262.44
Dakota	167,097.90	Nemaha	217,218.48
Dawes	202,046.94	Nuckolls	222,017.82
Dawson	314,242.50	Otoe	349,859.58
Deuel	70,179.36	Pawnee	165,656.34
Dixon	203,681.88	Perkins	102,561.72
Dodge	444,299.34	Phelps	162,808.38
Douglas	4,095,823.56	Pierce	194,786.40
Dundy	98,623.80	Platte	372,361.98
Fillmore	228,030.18	Polk	177,417.36
Franklin	159,872.52	Redwillow	243,641.22
Frontier	142,644.12	Richardson	348,541.08
Furnas	213,421.20	Rock	59,174.28
Gage	531,654.36	Saline	287,538.48
Garden	89,640.42	Sarpy	182,867.16
Garfield	56,379.06	Saunders	354,535.86
Gosper	75,365.46	Scotts Bluff	503,561.52
Grant	25,086.66	Seward	280,190.04
Greeley	148,410.36	Sheridan	189,740.94
Hall	476,716.86	Sherman	160,364.76
Hamilton	213,755.22	Sioux	82,045.86
Harlan	157,464.06	Stanton	137,282.22
Hayes	63,340.74	Thayer	240,564.72
Hitchcock	127,789.02	Thomas	26,545.80
Holt	290,228.22	Thurston	183,921.96
Hooker	20,744.40	Valley	167,590.14
Howard	176,151.60	Washington	212,630.10
Jefferson	288,470.22	Wayne	185,750.28
Johnson	160,980.06	Webster	179,491.80
Kearney	142,292.52	Wheeler	41,049.30
Keith	118,155.18	York	303,061.62
Keyapaha	56,308.74		
Kimball	82,186.50	Total	24,224,589.54
Knox	335,953.80		

NEVADA

Churchill	110,838.00	Mineral	40,687.92
Clark	186,338.88	Nye	87,119.76
Douglas	40,185.60	Ormsby	48,506.64
Elko	217,526.40	Pershing	37,919.68
Esmeralda	23,521.68	Storey	14,567.28
Eureka	29,112.72	Washoe	593,130.72
Humboldt	82,832.80	White Pine	257,078.64
Lander	37,433.76		
Lincoln	78,645.84	Total	1,988,706.72
Lyon	83,210.40		

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Belknap	393,187.74	Merrimack	975,921.76
Carroll	248,134.26	Rockingham	934,175.00
Cheshire	585,445.30	Strafford	670,520.40
Coos	677,107.42	Sullivan	422,090.68
Grafton	744,142.08		
Hillsborough	2,436,067.70	Total	8,086,792.34

NEW JERSEY

Atlantic	2,387,863.99	Monmouth	2,816,108.17
Bergen	6,982,010.01	Morris	2,112,812.85
Burlington	1,789,439.33	Ocean	632,609.97
Camden	4,826,728.56	Passaic	5,779,727.77
Cape May	564,067.18	Salem	704,634.42
Cumberland	1,337,091.35	Somerset	1,245,975.16
Essex	15,945,103.69	Sussex	532,387.90
Gloucester	1,354,442.26	Union	5,838,648.17
Hudson	13,213,664.90	Warren	943,472.47
Hunterdon	664,346.64		
Mercer	3,580,045.59	Total	77,310,719.42
Middlesex	4,059,539.04		

NEW MEXICO

Bernalillo	671,455.40	Otero	144,533.62
Catron	48,507.96	Quay	160,037.84
Chaves	288,934.22	Rio Arriba	316,011.18
Colfax	233,140.46	Roosevelt	164,191.02
Curry	233,657.02	Sandoval	164,708.32
De Baca	42,758.54	San Juan	217,280.78
Dona Ana	405,784.90	San Miguel	349,340.08
Eddy	234,144.76	Santa Fe	289,200.26
Grant	281,559.00	Sierra	76,619.52
Guadalupe	103,859.06	Socorro	142,050.58
Harding	65,342.38	Taos	212,743.32
Hidalgo	74,239.94	Torrance	136,995.82
Lea	90,808.32	Union	163,112.08
Lincoln	106,386.44	Valencia	239,229.08
Luna	92,330.66		
McKinley	505,103.54	Total	6,256,625.26
Mora	152,559.16		

NEW YORK

Albany	$4,141,561.62	Oneida	$3,883,829.02
Allegany	743,008.50	Onondaga	5,697,981.24
Bronx	24,723,141.32	Ontario	1,060,553.04
Broome	2,872,809.88	Orange	2,547,683.82
Cattaraugus	1,414,656.92	Orleans	562,654.30
Cayuga	1,265,234.54	Oswego	1,360,863.30
Chautauqua	2,470,969.78	Otsego	912,713.40
Chemung	1,459,247.20	Putnam	268,557.76
Chenang	677,354.10	Queens	21,086,180.66
Clinton	912,263.98	Rensselaer	2,340,520.74
Columbia	813,196.18	Richmond	3,094,080.84
Cortland	619,593.86	Rockland	1,164,564.46
Delaware	804,325.02	St. Lawrence	1,777,358.40
Dutchess	2,060,727.48	Saratoga	1,237,155.56
Erie	14,897,452.32	Schenectady	2,442,910.34
Essex	663,558.86	Schoharie	384,293.18
Franklin	892,860.76	Schuyler	252,241.86
Fulton	909,782.40	Seneca	488,167.82
Genesee	868,904.72	Steuben	1,615,391.34
Greene	504,288.32	Suffolk	3,147,014.70
Hamilton	76,772.66	Sullivan	689,214.88
Herkimer	1,250,677.24	Tioga	497,879.20
Jefferson	1,633,035.96	Tompkins	810,714.60
Kings	50,030,235.54	Ulster	1,566,228.70
Lewis	458,154.38	Warren	667,759.96
Livingston	733,922.40	Washington	908,258.28
Madison	777,496.60	Wayne	976,902.30
Monroe	8,282,634.74	Westchester	10,179,304.38
Montgomery	1,173,885.04	Wyoming	562,048.56
Nassau	5,921,655.62	Yates	329,209.92
New York	36,487,276.48		
Niagara	2,917,888.66	Total	245,970,809.64

NORTH CAROLINA

Alamance	515,793.60	Jones	127,638.72
Alexander	158,165.28	Lee	208,031.04
Alleghany	87,956.64	Lenoir	437,163.84
Anson	359,231.76	Lincoln	279,953.28
Ashe	257,272.56	McDowell	248,912.64
Avery	144,468.72	Macon	167,345.28
Beaufort	428,718.24	Madison	248,545.44
Bertie	316,330.56	Martin	286,416.00
Bladen	274,041.36	Mecklenburg	1,566,365.04
Brunswick	193,612.32	Mitchell	170,894.88
Buncombe	1,198,748.88	Montgomery	198,508.32
Burke	359,978.40	Moore	345,351.60
Cabarrus	542,611.44	Nash	646,051.68
Caldwell	342,915.84	New Hanover	526,442.40
Camden	66,842.64	Northampton	332,450.64
Carteret	206,856.00	Onslow	187,137.36
Caswell	222,939.36	Orange	259,133.04
Catawba	538,449.84	Pamlico	113,819.76
Chatham	295,926.48	Pasquotank	234,310.32
Cherokee	197,688.24	Pender	191,996.64
Chowan	138,091.68	Perquimans	130,576.32
Clay	66,512.16	Person	269,757.36
Cleveland	635,427.36	Pitt	666,663.84
Columbus	461,692.80	Polk	125,043.84
Craven	375,339.60	Randolph	443,810.16
Cumberland	553,480.56	Richmond	416,355.84
Currituck	82,130.40	Robeson	814,106.88
Dare	63,672.48	Rockingham	625,255.92
Davidson	585,867.60	Rowan	693,579.60
Davie	176,084.64	Rutherford	495,132.48
Duplin	429,660.72	Sampson	490,603.68
Durham	822,479.04	Scotland	246,929.76
Edgecombe	586,222.56	Stanly	369,843.84
Forsyth	1,366,975.44	Stokes	272,829.60
Franklin	360,541.44	Surry	486,527.76
Gaston	955,858.32	Swain	141,592.32
Gates	129,144.24	Transylvania	117,369.36
Graham	71,493.84	Tyrrell	63,207.36
Granville	351,569.52	Union	501,582.96
Greene	228,349.44	Vance	334,078.56
Guilford	1,628,042.40	Wake	1,159,825.68
Halifax	651,731.04	Warren	285,975.36
Harnett	464,030.64	Washington	142,020.72
Haywood	346,061.52	Watauga	185,619.60
Henderson	286,464.96	Wayne	648,879.12
Hertford	214,714.08	Wilkes	442,622.88
Hoke	174,346.56	Wilson	549,747.36
Hyde	104,652.00	Yadkin	220,442.40
Iredell	571,522.32	Yancey	177,308.64
Jackson	214,432.56		
Johnston	705,281.04	Total	38,804,178.24

NORTH DAKOTA

Adams	90,704.90	Cass	696,910.50
Barnes	268,897.20	Cavalier	208,122.20
Benson	190,576.10	Dickey	155,541.10
Billings	44,902.00	Divide	137,794.80
Bottineau	212,397.90	Dunn	136,793.80
Bowman	73,201.70	Eddy	90,747.80
Burke	142,971.40	Emmons	178,278.10
Burleigh	282,696.70	Foster	90,847.90

NORTH DAKOTA—continued

Golden Valley	$58,944.60	Ransom	$157,056.90
Grand Forks	456,970.80	Renville	103,860.90
Grant	144,916.20	Richland	300,414.40
Griggs	98,512.70	Rolette	153,868.00
Hettinger	125,782.80	Sargent	132,961.40
Kidder	114,843.30	Sheridan	105,433.90
La Moure	164,693.10	Sioux	67,024.10
Logan	115,672.70	Slope	59,345.00
McHenry	220,777.70	Stark	219,362.00
McIntosh	137,580.30	Steele	99,699.60
McKenzie	138,838.70	Stutsman	373,230.00
McLean	257,271.30	Towner	120,019.90
Mercer	136,078.80	Traill	180,180.00
Morton	280,952.10	Walsh	286,672.10
Mountrail	193,679.20	Ward	480,437.10
Nelson	145,902.90	Wells	189,975.50
Oliver	60,946.60	Williams	279,607.90
Pembina	211,025.10		
Pierce	129,758.20	Total	9,736,033.50
Ramsey	232,403.60		

OHIO

Adams	361,355.13	Logan	513,833.13
Allen	1,230,798.87	Lorain	1,936,222.38
Ashland	476,351.91	Lucas	6,164,880.57
Ashtabula	1,212,040.53	Madison	359,085.69
Athens	783,222.75	Mahoning	4,186,797.66
Auglaize	497,042.82	Marion	805,296.60
Belmont	1,679,367.87	Medina	526,173.21
Brown	357,224.04	Meigs	424,828.53
Butler	2,022,709.32	Mercer	444,952.08
Carroll	284,690.61	Miami	909,566.73
Champaign	427,346.19	Monroe	326,692.98
Clark	1,612,295.28	Montgomery	4,848,818.13
Clermont	528,105.78	Morgan	240,826.59
Clinton	382,028.31	Morrow	256,889.97
Columbiana	1,533,361.32	Muskingum	1,194,966.54
Coshocton	513,744.48	Noble	265,258.53
Crawford	626,666.85	Ottawa	427,452.57
Cuyahoga	21,301,797.15	Paulding	271,286.73
Darke	673,899.57	Perry	557,519.85
Defiance	402,719.22	Pickaway	482,929.74
Delaware	461,263.68	Pike	246,021.48
Erie	747,018.09	Portage	756,751.86
Fairfield	780,297.30	Preble	398,127.15
Fayette	367,986.15	Putnam	444,552.02
Franklin	6,401,505.15	Richland	1,168,442.46
Fulton	416,247.21	Ross	801,059.13
Gallia	408,676.50	Sandusky	704,430.63
Geauga	273,290.22	Sioto	1,440,048.33
Greene	589,682.07	Seneca	849,993.93
Guernsey	735,546.78	Shelby	441,902.52
Hamilton	10,449,281.88	Stark	3,932,230.32
Hancock	716,362.92	Summit	6,101,442.63
Hardin	489,968.55	Trumbull	2,181,906.99
Harrison	334,104.12	Tuscarawas	1,209,061.89
Henry	399,350.52	Union	340,274.16
Highland	450,625.68	Van Wert	465,820.29
Hocking	361,816.11	Vinton	182,388.51
Holmes	296,551.98	Warren	484,880.04
Huron	597,501.00	Washington	752,408.01
Jackson	443,959.20	Wayne	833,735.52
Jefferson	1,565,683.11	Williams	431,122.68
Knox	520,162.74	Wood	892,173.60
Lake	738,880.02	Wyandot	337,508.28
Lawrence	789,711.93		
Licking	1,063,126.26	Total	117,845,937.81

OKLAHOMA

Adair	245,244.72	Harmon	229,921.08
Alfalfa	253,089.36	Harper	128,987.82
Atoka	241,538.46	Haskell	269,509.92
Beaver	190,332.24	Hughes	504,151.08
Beckham	481,830.42	Jackson	480,484.20
Blaine	339,912.24	Jefferson	289,055.04
Bryan	536,443.74	Johnston	217,422.84
Caddo	843,946.98	Kay	834,091.32
Canadian	467,271.30	Kingfisher	265,255.20
Carter	688,383.78	Kiowa	492,450.60
Cherokee	290,351.40	Latimer	185,878.08
Choctaw	401,240.04	Le Flore	712,931.52
Cimarron	89,880.96	Lincoln	560,725.56
Cleveland	414,635.76	Logan	461,387.82
Coal	191,479.02	Love	160,200.18
Comanche	570,348.54	McClain	358,576.50
Cotton	256,646.04	McCurtain	577,694.58
Craig	300,024.24	McIntosh	414,236.88
Creek	1,065,591.30	Major	202,863.72
Custer	457,332.54	Marshall	183,252.12
Delaware	255,449.40	Mayes	297,215.46
Dewey	220,215.00	Murray	206,254.20
Ellis	175,191.42	Muskogee	1,103,966.88
Garfield	757,672.56	Noble	251,610.18
Garvin	521,884.62	Nowata	226,214.82
Grady	791,743.56	Okfuskee	482,245.92
Grant	235,173.00	Oklahoma	3,685,285.56
Greer	337,086.84	Okmulgee	939,993.96

OKLAHOMA—continued

Osage	$786,691.08	Stephens	$549,606.78
Ottawa	640,568.04	Texas	234,342.00
Pawnee	330,438.84	Tillman	405,361.80
Payne	613,361.10	Tulsa	3,117,479.88
Pittsburg	843,930.36	Wagoner	372,753.36
Pontotoc	539,634.78	Washington	461,653.74
Pottawatomie	1,106,426.64	Washita	489,209.70
Pushmataha	245,045.28	Woods	282,623.10
Roger Mills	235,405.68	Woodward	263,327.28
Rogers	315,048.72		
Seminole	1,323,301.02	Total	39,822,184.80
Sequoyah	324,173.10		

OREGON

Baker	403,603.86	Lane	1,312,736.37
Benton	398,809.95	Lincoln	238,563.27
Clackamas	1,113,078.45	Linn	595,023.00
Clatsop	508,877.16	Malheur	271,470.21
Columbia	482,932.23	Marion	1,458,432.69
Coos	683,505.57	Morrow	119,028.69
Crook	80,364.24	Multnomah	8,148,225.69
Curry	78,461.13	Polk	406,109.22
Deschutes	355,303.41	Sherman	71,740.02
Douglas	529,136.85	Tillamook	284,840.16
Gilliam	83,520.03	Umatilla	587,771.91
Grant	143,094.60	Union	421,382.28
Harney	142,612.80	Wallowa	188,239.26
Hood River	215,316.42	Wasco	304,642.14
Jackson	792,994.62	Washington	729,324.75
Jefferson	55,190.19	Wheeler	67,427.91
Josephine	276,986.82	Yamhill	530,847.24
Klamath	780,684.63		
Lake	116,426.97	Total	22,976,704.74

PENNSYLVANIA

Adams	666,447.60	Lancaster	3,534,031.90
Allegheny	24,670,659.50	Lawrence	1,745,781.10
Armstrong	1,423,399.10	Lebanon	1,204,498.85
Beaver	2,675,662.90	Lehigh	3,103,429.35
Bedford	669,696.55	Luzerne	7,989,706.55
Berks	4,159,320.15	Lycoming	1,676,906.95
Blair	2,510,128.00	McKean	990,247.65
Bradford	880,250.05	Mercer	1,781,465.70
Bucks	1,736,249.65	Mifflin	724,013.25
Butler	1,444,616.00	Monroe	507,733.70
Cambria	3,646,470.70	Montgomery	4,771,181.80
Cameron	95,260.65	Montour	260,580.15
Carbon	1,137,671.00	Northampton	3,039,006.80
Centre	830,977.30	Northumberland	2,306,646.80
Chester	2,272,990.55	Perry	390,304.80
Clarion	619,831.45	Philadelphia	35,019,749.95
Clearfield	1,556,749.65	Pike	134,319.85
Clinton	580,126.05	Potter	313,927.55
Columbia	876,013.85	Schuylkill	4,227,314.75
Crawford	1,130,491.00	Snyder	338,106.20
Cumberland	1,224,836.20	Somerset	1,449,713.80
Dauphin	2,965,896.45	Sullivan	134,607.05
Delaware	5,030,738.80	Susquehanna	606,817.70
Elk	600,086.45	Tioga	572,084.45
Erie	3,146,222.15	Union	313,550.60
Fayette	3,563,828.90	Venango	1,134,906.70
Forest	92,981.00	Warren	744,081.35
Franklin	1,166,929.50	Washington	3,676,195.90
Fulton	165,696.45	Wayne	510,139.00
Greene	749,717.65	Westmoreland	5,295,160.25
Huntingdon	700,426.95	Wyoming	278,530.15
Indiana	1,353,340.25	York	3,000,073.25
Jefferson	935,446.30		
Juniata	257,133.75	Total	172,882,732.50
Lackawanna	5,571,626.15		

RHODE ISLAND

Bristol	501,027.33	Washington	585,799.98
Kent	1,026,258.30		
Newport	832,109.96	Total	13,729,315.09
Providence	10,784,119.52		

SOUTH CAROLINA

Abbeville	286,406.44	Edgefield	237,323.28
Aiken	582,108.84	Fairfield	285,964.36
Allendale	163,250.32	Florence	749,411.56
Anderson	994,053.72	Georgetown	266,942.64
Bamberg	238,354.80	Greenville	1,436,870.52
Barnwell	260,593.88	Greenwood	443,037.84
Beaufort	267,888.20	Hampton	211,744.04
Berkeley	273,058.08	Horry	483,537.28
Calhoun	205,161.96	Jasper	122,652.64
Charleston	1,240,894.00	Kershaw	393,819.60
Cherokee	395,428.28	Lancaster	343,594.40
Chester	390,540.84	Laurens	516,914.32
Chesterfield	421,621.52	Lee	295,898.88
Clarendon	368,842.08	Lexington	448,146.32
Colleton	317,081.88	McCormick	140,863.88
Darlington	508,723.56	Marion	334,273.88
Dillon	316,001.24	Marlboro	388,465.52
Dorchester	232,779.68	Newberry	425,882.68

SOUTH CAROLINA—continued

Oconee	$409,759.04	Sumter	$563,676.56
Orangeburg	784,249.92	Union	379,697.60
Pickens	413,946.52	Williamsburg	428,743.92
Richland	1,076,550.76	York	655,973.04
Saluda	222,857.44		
Spartanburg	1,428,446.44	Total	21,352,034.20

SOUTH DAKOTA

Armstrong	1,509.60	Jerauld	109,747.92
Aurora	134,712.93	Jones	59,949.99
Beadle	432,443.79	Kingsbury	241,630.35
Bennett	86,613.30	Lake	233,591.73
Bon Homme	221,477.19	Lawrence	262,670.40
Brookings	317,902.89	Lincoln	262,632.66
Brown	593,612.46	Lyman	119,541.45
Brule	139,939.92	McCook	194,662.92
Buffalo	36,437.97	McPherson	165,565.38
Butte	162,074.43	Marshall	180,019.80
Campbell	106,219.23	Meade	216,665.34
Charles Mix	315,185.61	Mellette	99,878.91
Clark	207,985.14	Miner	158,055.12
Clay	190,360.56	Minnehaha	959,954.64
Codington	329,413.59	Moody	181,208.61
Corson	179,925.45	Pennington	378,890.73
Custer	101,011.11	Perkins	164,489.79
Davison	317,412.27	Potter	108,728.94
Day	275,615.22	Roberts	297,806.34
Deuel	164,772.84	Sanborn	138,241.62
Dewey	122,202.12	Shannon	76,574.46
Douglas	136,543.32	Spink	288,786.48
Edmunds	164,395.44	Stanley	44,929.47
Fall River	164,942.67	Sully	72,687.24
Faulk	130,108.65	Todd	111,295.26
Grant	202,456.23	Tripp	239,875.44
Gregory	215,495.40	Turner	280,993.17
Haakon	88,292.73	Union	216,627.60
Hamlin	156,602.13	Walworth	165,886.17
Hand	178,981.95	Washabaugh	46,684.38
Hanson	115,691.97	Washington	34,475.49
Harding	67,724.43	Yankton	313,034.43
Hughes	132,259.83	Ziebach	76,215.93
Hutchinson	262,368.48		
Hyde	69,630.30		13,074,060.63
Jackson	49,741.32		

TENNESSEE

Anderson	272,163.60	Lawrence	369,508.80
Bedford	290,862.60	Lewis	72,560.40
Benton	155,070.60	Lincoln	350,823.60
Bledsoe	98,366.40	Loudon	245,709.00
Blount	469,048.20	McMinn	400,462.20
Bradley	315,606.00	McNairy	274,633.80
Campbell	370,212.60	Macon	191,433.60
Cannon	123,303.00	Madison	704,614.20
Carroll	360,621.60	Marion	242,176.20
Carter	403,277.40	Marshall	214,921.20
Cheatham	124,545.00	Maury	469,420.80
Chester	146,321.40	Meigs	84,552.60
Claiborne	335,519.40	Monroe	295,002.60
Clay	132,162.60	Montgomery	426,171.60
Cocke	300,495.00	Moore	55,710.60
Coffee	231,853.80	Morgan	187,721.40
Crockett	239,554.20	Obion	401,386.80
Cumberland	157,872.00	Overton	249,490.20
Davidson	3,075,385.20	Perry	98,628.60
Decatur	139,462.80	Pickett	77,487.00
De Kalb	196,139.40	Polk	216,466.80
Dickson	255,175.80	Putman	327,874.20
Dyer	433,389.00	Rhea	191,419.80
Fayette	398,695.80	Roane	337,782.60
Fentress	152,296.80	Robertson	389,035.80
Franklin	300,784.80	Rutherford	445,546.80
Gibson	642,086.40	Scott	194,304.00
Giles	386,620.80	Sequatchie	55,848.60
Grainger	175,770.60	Sevier	282,624.00
Greene	484,642.20	Shelby	4,229,451.60
Grundy	134,094.60	Smith	213,527.40
Hamblen	229,300.80	Stewart	183,236.40
Hamilton	2,201,058.60	Sullivan	705,000.60
Hancock	133,487.40	Sumner	394,983.60
Hardeman	306,263.40	Tipton	379,472.40
Hardin	223,739.40	Trousdale	77,680.20
Hawkins	332,814.60	Unicoi	174,956.40
Haywood	359,669.40	Union	156,919.80
Henderson	243,639.00	Van Buren	48,520.80
Henry	364,761.60	Warren	278,884.20
Hickman	187,859.40	Washington	632,109.00
Houston	76,659.00	Wayne	167,449.20
Humphreys	166,138.20	Weakley	403,815.60
Jackson	187,528.20	White	214,493.40
Jefferson	247,213.20	Williamson	315,261.00
Johnson	168,484.20	Wilson	330,220.20
Knox	2,151,447.60		
Lake	144,706.80	Total	36,108,472.80
Lauderdale	323,002.80		

TEXAS

Anderson	$568,838.06	Hall	$278,581.72
Andrews	12,085.12	Hamilton	222,047.66
Angelina	456,525.26	Hansford	58,258.16
Aransas	36,435.98	Hardeman	238,615.44
Archer	159,011.28	Hardin	228,829.12
Armstrong	54,662.18	Harris	5,900,165.76
Atascosa	257,038.68	Harrison	803,545.54
Austin	309,681.20	Hartley	35,877.70
Bailey	85,154.12	Haskell	273,704.98
Bandera	62,133.28	Hays	244,904.30
Bastrop	392,240.96	Hemphill	76,139.54
Baylor	121,803.56	Henderson	502,172.86
Bee	258,138.82	Hidalgo	1,264,405.68
Bell	821,492.60	Hill	706,651.12
Bexar	4,803,391.86	Hockley	152,673.16
Blanco	63,085.64	Hood	111,311.18
Borden	24,712.10	Hopkins	482,912.20
Bosque	258,615.00	Houston	492,879.14
Bowie	797,404.46	Howard	375,820.96
Brazoria	378,546.68	Hudspeth	61,213.76
Brazos	358,530.70	Hunt	804,842.72
Brewster	108,766.08	Hutchinson	243,804.16
Briscoe	91,787.80	Irion	33,644.58
Brooks	96,894.42	Jack	148,535.32
Brown	433,192.44	Jackson	180,291.60
Burleson	325,904.16	Jasper	280,190.88
Burnet	170,029.10	Jeff Davis	29,556.00
Caldwell	515,538.74	Jefferson	2,190,280.22
Calhoun	88,421.70	Jim Hogg	80,769.93
Callahan	209,929.70	Jim Wells	220,947.52
Cameron	1,273,206.80	Johnson	547,065.14
Camp	165,234.46	Jones	397,905.86
Carson	127,172.90	Karnes	382,848.72
Cass	493,092.60	Kaufman	671,660.10
Castro	77,502.40	Kendall	81,607.40
Chambers	93,758.20	Kenedy	11,510.42
Cherokee	709,015.60	Kent	63,233.42
Childress	263,442.48	Kerr	166,679.42
Clay	238,828.90	Kimble	67,633.98
Cochran	32,232.46	King	19,589.06
Coke	86,254.26	Kinney	65,351.60
Coleman	388,644.98	Kleberg	204,445.42
Collin	758,275.60	Knox	186,662.56
Collingsworth	237,449.62	Lamar	796,846.18
Colorado	314,098.18	Lamb	286,561.84
Comal	196,777.28	Lampasas	142,476.34
Comanche	302,620.60	La Salle	135,103.76
Concho	125,530.90	Lavaca	452,371.00
Cooke	396,313.12	Lee	219,863.80
Coryell	328,383.58	Leon	326,725.16
Cottle	154,265.90	Liberty	326,232.56
Crane	36,468.82	Limestone	648,540.74
Crockett	42,527.80	Lipscomb	74,087.04
Crosby	180,997.66	Live Oak	147,057.52
Culberson	20,163.76	Llano	90,933.96
Dallam	128,568.60	Loving	3,201.90
Dallas	5,347,846.22	Lubbock	642,087.68
Dawson	222,868.66	Lynn	203,148.24
Deaf Smith	98,175.18	McCulloch	227,958.86
Delta	215,725.96	McLennan	1,620,358.44
Denton	538,937.24	McMullen	22,183.42
De Witt	450,581.22	Madison	200,767.34
Dickens	141,228.42	Marion	170,291.82
Dimmit	144,955.76	Martin	94,989.70
Donley	168,502.04	Mason	90,490.62
Duval	200,176.22	Matagorda	290,272.76
Eastland	560,841.52	Maverick	100,490.40
Ector	64,990.36	Medina	229,699.38
Edwards	45,384.88	Menard	73,019.74
Ellis	885,629.12	Midland	131,442.10
El Paso	2,160,822.74	Milam	622,564.30
Erath	341,601.68	Mills	136,171.06
Falls	686,619.82	Mitchell	232,884.86
Fannin	675,896.46	Montague	314,590.78
Fayette	504,225.36	Montgomery	239,534.96
Fisher	222,704.46	Moore	25,533.10
Floyd	203,755.78	Morris	164,659.76
Foard	103,692.30	Motley	111,853.04
Fort Bend	487,969.56	Nacogdoches	497,361.80
Franklin	139,471.48	Navarro	993,524.94
Freestone	870,911.38	Newton	205,644.08
Frio	154,528.62	Nolan	317,283.66
Gaines	45,976.00	Nueces	850,211.18
Galveston	1,057,464.42	Ochiltree	85,778.08
Garza	91,722.12	Oldham	23,053.68
Gillespie	180,948.40	Orange	248,746.58
Glasscock	20,738.46	Palo Pinto	288,597.92
Goliad	165,727.06	Panola	395,114.46
Gonzales	465,293.54	Parker	308,022.78
Gray	362,717.80	Parmer	96,368.98
Grayson	1,081,142.06	Pecos	128,273.04
Gregg	259,074.76	Polk	288,253.10
Grimes	371,781.64	Potter	756,633.60
Guadalupe	474,948.50	Presidio	166,728.68
Hale	331,503.38	Rains	116,811.88
		Randall	116,105.82

TEXAS—continued

Reagan	$49,719.76	Titus	$262,769.26
Real	36,074.74	Tom Green	591,661.86
Red River	507,755.66	Travis	1,277,098.34
Reeves	105,202.94	Trinity	223,919.54
Refugio	126,286.22	Tyler	187,976.16
Roberts	23,923.94	Upshur	366,116.74
Robertson	447,280.80	Upton	97,994.56
Rockwall	125,744.36	Uvalde	212,556.90
Runnels	358,300.82	Val Verde	245,052.08
Rusk	533,387.28	Van Zandt	530,612.30
Sabine	197,007.16	Victoria	329,188.16
San Augustine	204,773.82	Walker	304,229.76
San Jacinto	159,454.62	Waller	164,429.88
San Patricio	391,387.12	Ward	75,515.58
San Saba	168,682.66	Washington	416,969.48
Schleicher	51,985.72	Webb	691,741.76
Scurry	200,126.96	Wharton	487,362.02
Schackelford	109,931.90	Wheeler	255,413.10
Shelby	470,055.34	Wichita	1,221,910.72
Sherman	37,995.88	Wilbarger	403,587.18
Smith	872,279.66	Willacy	172,393.58
Somervell	49,522.72	Williamson	724,877.32
Starr	187,335.78	Wilson	289,090.52
Stephens	271,915.20	Winkler	111,393.28
Sterling	23,497.02	Wise	314,902.76
Stonewall	93,052.14	Wood	397,084.86
Sutton	46,090.94	Yoakum	20,738.46
Swisher	120,572.06	Young	330,501.76
Tarrant	3,243,820.26	Zapata	47,076.14
Taylor	673,597.66	Zavala	169,930.58
Terrell	43,677.20		
Terry	145,858.86	Total	95,641,820.30
Throckmorton	86,254.26		

UTAH

Beaver	90,290.88	Rich	32,927.34
Box Elder	313,099.80	Salt Lake	3,412,313.16
Cache	482,113.92	San Juan	61,459.68
Carbon	312,888.84	Sanpete	281,666.76
Daggett	7,225.38	Sevier	196,878.42
Davis	246,489.18	Summit	167,484.66
Duchesne	145,263.54	Tooele	165,480.54
Emery	123,798.36	Uintah	158,835.30
Garfield	81,606.36	Utah	861,789.18
Grand	31,872.54	Wasatch	99,080.88
Iron	127,050.66	Washington	130,443.60
Juab	151,275.90	Wayne	36,337.86
Kane	39,291.30	Weber	917,183.76
Millard	174,833.10		
Morgan	44,582.38	Total	8,927,950.26
Piute	34,386.48		

VERMONT

Addison	279,692.16	Orange	260,092.52
Bennington	337,384.90	Orleans	358,900.88
Caledonia	424,601.74	Rutland	754,897.74
Chittenden	739,598.18	Washington	650,200.14
Essex	110,103.86	Windham	405,313.70
Franklin	467,010.50	Windsor	582,941.28
Grand Isle	61,447.52		
Lamoille	170,554.26	Total	5,602,739.38

VIRGINIA

Accomac	607,008.22	Dinwiddie	313,069.56
Albermarle	456,788.33	Petersburg city	483,588.52
Charlottesville city	258,097.85	Elizabeth City	335,806.55
Alleghany	341,782.84	Hampton city	108,047.26
Clifton Forge City	115,784.27	Essex	118,103.68
Amelia	152,014.47	Fairfax	427,719.52
Amherst	322,008.60	Fauquier	356,732.03
Appomattox	142,245.86	Floyd	198,047.14
Arlington	450,591.95	Fluvanna	126,399.38
Alexandria city	408,842.57	Franklin	412,025.41
Augusta	646,099.59	Frederick	222,917.31
Staunton city	202,990.70	Winchester city	183,775.15
Bath	137,759.41	Giles	216,771.72
Bedford	492,510.63	Gloucester	186,551.67
Bland	102,104.83	Goochland	134,644.29
Botetourt	261,687.01	Grayson	338,887.81
Brunswick	346,827.98	Greene	101,241.40
Buchanan	283,408.20	Greensville	226,653.84
Buckingham	225,422.95	Halifax	698,921.19
Campbell	387,443.05	Hanover	287,962.37
Lynchburg city	688,390.73	Henrico	513,148.30
Caroline	258,402.59	Richmond city	3,096,987.97
Carroll	374,847.13	Henry	340,089.84
Charles City	82,635.33	Martinsville city	130,445.65
Charlotte	271,912.73	Highland	76,608.25
Chesterfield	441,009.57	Isle of Wight	227,014.37
Clarke	121,337.31	James City	65,671.47
Craig	60,304.66	Williamsburg city	63,961.54
Culpeper	225,270.58	King and Queen	128,972.74
Cumberland	127,567.55	King George	89,678.21
Dickenson	273,639.59	King William	134,237.97

VIRGINIA—continued

Lancaster	$150,609.28	Pulaski	$348,182.38
Lee	514,993.67	Rappahannock	130,648.81
Loudon	336,094.36	Richmond	116,444.54
Louisa	242,251.37	Roanoke	597,442.77
Lunenburg	238,001.94	Roanoke city	1,171,657.58
Madison	151,557.36	Rockbridge	353,870.86
Mathews	133,476.12	Buena Vista city	67,753.86
Mecklenburg	552,290.46	Rockingham	502,973.37
Middlesex	123,131.89	Harrisonburg city	122,437.76
Montgomery	331,912.65	Russell	439,452.01
Radford city	105,423.11	Scott	409,384.33
Nansemond	381,432.90	Shenandoah	349,689.15
Suffolk city	173,888.03	Smyth	425,366.25
Nelson	276,720.85	Southampton	454,909.10
New Kent	72,799.00	Spotsylvania	170,248.08
Norfolk	509,288.26	Fredericksburg city	115,445.67
South Norfolk city	133,019.01	Stafford	136,286.50
Norfolk city	2,195,990.30	Surry	120,135.28
Portsmouth city	773,768.72	Sussex	204,853.00
Northampton	314,305.45	Tazewell	549,835.61
Northumberland	187,601.33	Warren	141,196.20
Nottoway	251,681.38	Warwick	149,474.97
Orange	204,345.10	Newport News	582,679.81
Page	251,444.36	Washington	573,080.50
Patrick	267,273.91	Bristol city	149,661.20
Pittsylvania	1,039,908.32	Westmoreland	143,854.21
Danville city	376,641.71	Wise	866,257.31
Powhatan	104,000.99	Wythe	350,518.72
Prince Edward	245,823.60	York	128,921.95
Prince George	174,565.23		
Hopewell city	191,766.11	Total	41,001,937.43
Prince William	236,190.43		
Princess Anne	275,654.26		

WASHINGTON

Adams	186,954.18	Lincoln	287,636.72
Asotin	197,053.92	Mason	243,653.20
Benton	265,257.44	Okanogan	448,530.18
Chelan	766,175.48	Pacific	362,573.40
Clallam	495,274.78	Pend Oreille	173,294.10
Clark	976,453.52	Pierce	3,968,253.24
Columbia	128,971.50	San Juan	75,009.34
Cowlitz	772,763.32	Skagit	851,139.24
Douglas	183,127.42	Skamania	70,020.02
Ferry	103,952.24	Snohomish	1,910,013.42
Franklin	148,638.14	Spokane	3,644,552.94
Garfield	88,693.64	Stevens	449,281.00
Grant	137,230.52	Thurston	759,321.22
Grays Harbor	1,452,764.04	Wahkiakum	93,537.64
Island	130,037.18	Walla Walla	688,841.02
Jefferson	202,140.12	Whatcom	1,432,080.16
King	11,226,381.74	Whitman	678,499.08
Kitsap	745,394.72	Yakima	1,874,676.44
Kittitas	439,689.83		
Klickitat	237,961.50	Total	37,865,451.12
Lewis	969,623.48		

WEST VIRGINIA

Barbour	279,792.56	Mingo	575,551.38
Berkeley	421,010.60	Monongalia	752,246.66
Boone	369,281.72	Monroe	179,473.98
Braxton	339,136.58	Morgan	126,258.12
Brooke	370,438.26	Nicholas	310,703.72
Cabell	1,363,605.72	Ohio	1,082,596.54
Calhoun	163,207.32	Pendleton	145,093.20
Clay	197,137.50	Pleasants	98,305.90
Doddridge	157,529.76	Pocahontas	218,616.10
Fayette	1,082,191.00	Preston	436,225.86
Gilmer	159,827.82	Putnam	251,389.74
Grant	126,783.82	Raleigh	1,022,441.44
Greenbrier	538,887.56	Randolph	376,235.98
Hampshire	177,776.72	Ritchie	234,221.88
Hancock	428,235.22	Roane	292,559.56
Hardy	147,436.32	Summers	307,429.36
Harrison	1,180,076.34	Taylor	287,092.28
Jackson	242,182.48	Tucker	200,877.48
Jefferson	237,015.60	Tyler	192,030.70
Kanawah	2,368,158.34	Upshur	269,518.88
Lewis	327,345.88	Wayne	468,714.12
Lincoln	287,723.12	Webster	213,524.32
Logan	879,180.68	Wetzel	335,456.68
McDowell	1,358,994.58	Wirt	95,497.16
Marion	1,001,158.10	Wood	848,945.42
Marshall	598,261.62	Wyoming	314,308.52
Mason	312,235.76		
Mercer	921,071.46	Total	25,972,659.10
Mineral	301,661.68		

WISCONSIN

Adams	142,773.52	Burnett	182,556.72
Ashland	375,603.36	Calumet	300,568.32
Barron	611,929.84	Chippewa	666,181.28
Bayfield	267,707.04	Clark	609,503.60
Brown	1,253,242.16	Columbia	544,173.52
Buffalo	273,487.20	Crawford	299,373.04

WISCONSIN—continued

Dane	$2,011,228.08	Outagamie	$1,120,173.60
Dodge	929,321.28	Ozaukee	310,308.96
Door	324,366.88	Pepin	132,908.00
Douglas	831,040.72	Pierce	375,407.12
Dunn	482,340.08	Polk	473,955.28
Eau Claire	732,992.08	Portage	603,473.68
Florence	67,221.12	Price	308,346.56
Fond du Lac	1,068,312.72	Racine	1,609,471.28
Forest	198,345.12	Richland	348,326.00
Grant	686,286.96	Rock	1,323,835.04
Green	390,160.80	Rusk	286,885.04
Green Lake	248,207.92	St. Croix	454,117.20
Iowa	357,495.76	Sauk	571,415.20
Iron	177,204.72	Sawyer	158,383.52
Jackson	293,789.12	Shawano	597,925.44
Jefferson	656,244.40	Sheboygan	1,270,832.40
Juneau	307,989.76	Taylor	315,500.40
Kenosha	1,128,861.68	Trempealeau	426,554.40
Kewaunee	286,100.08	Vernon	509,100.08
La Crosse	971,477.20	Vilas	130,124.96
Lafayette	332,698.16	Walworth	554,074.72
Langlade	384,344.96	Washburn	198,077.52
Lincoln	375,924.48	Washington	473,669.84
Manitowoc	1,046,744.16	Waukesha	934,066.72
Marathon	1,260,021.36	Waupaca	597,871.92
Marinette	598,175.20	Waushara	257,377.68
Marquette	167,481.92	Winnebago	1,366,936.48
Milwaukee	12,938,691.92	Wood	675,511.60
Monroe	512,703.76		
Oconto	470,726.24	Total	52,431,867.04
Oneida	283,638.16		

WYOMING

Albany	376,040.43	Park	256,304.61
Big Horn	350,463.06	Platte	302,774.85
Campbell	209,865.60	Sheridan	527,006.25
Carbon	355,740.93	Sublette	60,711.12
Converse	223,138.35	Sweetwater	567,292.95
Crook	166,549.59	Teton	62,553.69
Fremont	327,602.70	Uinta	205,243.56
Goshen	367,077.42	Washakie	128,324.07
Hot Springs	171,015.48	Weston	145,937.79
Johnson	150,403.68	Yellowstone National Park (part)	6,246.00
Laramie	838,369.35		
Lincoln	340,219.62		
Natrona	758,014.56		
Niobrara	147,499.29	Total	7,044,394.95

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McREYNOLDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 9349 and had come to no resolution thereon.

HORACIO DE JESUS CASTILLO (H. DOC. NO. 256)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State recommending the enactment of legislation authorizing an appropriation in the sum of $1,000, in settlement of the claim presented against the Government of the United States on behalf of Horacio de Jesus Castillo, a citizen of Nicaragua, as compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as the result of an assault alleged to have been committed upon him by a member of the United States Marine Corps, at Matagalpa, Nicaragua, on February 24, 1931.

I recommend that the Congress enact legislation authorizing an appropriation in the amount mentioned in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 18, 1932.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DREWRY, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

WREATH ON THE GRAVE OF THE MOTHER OF WASHINGTON

The SPEAKER laid before the House, House Concurrent Resolution 19, providing wreath to be placed on the grave of the mother of Washington, on February 22, 1932, with a Senate amendment thereto.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us the program for the next two days, and the first part of the next week?

Mr. RAINEY. We expect to convene at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning and at 11 o'clock on Saturday morning, and at the present time we expect to hold a session on Monday, commencing at 1 o'clock, but that is subject to amendment. We will announce the program definitely to-morrow.

Mr. SNELL. I apprehend that the exercises will take only a very short time on Monday.

Mr. RAINEY. The exercises will commence at 11.30 o'clock a. m. and end at 12.30 p. m. We could hold a session at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, unless there is too much objection to it. I shall make that announcement to-morrow.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman know what will come up the first part of next week?

Mr. RAINEY. We expect to go ahead with this present bill and to pass it by Tuesday night. Wednesday will be Calendar Wednesday, and on Thursday we will take up the Treasury Department appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 81. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Catawissa Railroad Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near Catawissa, Pa.;

H. R. 6304. An act to transfer Lavaca County from the Houston division to the Victoria division of the southern judicial district of Texas;

H. R. 7247. An act authorizing the Rhode Island State Board of Public Roads and the State Highway Department of the State of Connecticut to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pawcatuck River near the location of the present Broad Street Bridge between Westerly, Rhode Island, and Stonington, Conn.; and

H. J. Res. 271. Joint resolution amending section 1 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved July 3, 1930, relating to the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Illinois River and Minneapolis.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order heretofore made, the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Friday, February 19, 1932. at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. RAINEY submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Friday, February 19, 1932, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

(10.30 a. m.)

To fill vacancies in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (S. J. Res. 37).

Legislative Reference Service (H. J. Res. 131).

Accepting the statue of John Sevier of Tennessee (H. Con. Res. 14).

Accepting writings of George Washington for the bicentennial (S. 1851).

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10 a. m.)

Railroad holding companies (H. R. 9059).

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

(10.30 a. m.)

Protection of Palo Verde Valley, State of California (H. R. 7415).

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(10 a. m.)

Relating to short selling (H. R. 4, 4604, 4638, 4639).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS (SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE BILLS)

(10.30 a. m.)

Private bills.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CHAVEZ: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 6679. A bill granting certain public lands to the State of New Mexico for the use and benefit of the Eastern New Mexico Normal School, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rep. No. 544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KNIFFIN: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 5329. A bill to amend section 24 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve," as amended by the act of March 2, 1929; without amendment (Rept. No. 545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SUTPHIN: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 6599. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith," approved June 24, 1926, with reference to the number of enlisted pilots in the Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 546). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COYLE: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 5344. A bill to regulate the distribution, promotion, retirement, and discharge of commissioned officers of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAINES: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 5612. A bill to limit the purchases of the Post Office Department, so far as possible, to articles of the growth, production, or manufacture of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 549). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WEST: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 7119. A bill to authorize the modification of the boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 550). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5450. A bill for the relief of Seth B. Simmons; without amendment (Rept. No. 547). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARLAN: A bill (H. R. 9485) to authorize an appropriation for the construction of one barracks building at the Veterans' Administration home at Dayton, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 9486) to authorize the purchase of tobacco from funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. YATES: A bill (H. R. 9487) to provide for the construction of a post-office building at Pittsfield, Ill.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 9488) to reduce existing tariff duties upon table, household, kitchen, and hospital utensils, and hollow and flat ware; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 9489) for temporary relief of water users on irrigation projects constructed and operated under the reclamation law; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 9490) to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 9491) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear claims of the Stockbridge and Munsee Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 9492) to authorize the President of the United States to reorganize the executive departments of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MALONEY: A bill (H. R. 9493) to amend the interstate commerce act, as amended; to the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 9494) granting relief to persons who served in the Military Telegraph Corps of the Army during the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 9495) to establish the boundary lines of the Chippewa Indian territory in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 9496) to provide for the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Tribes, Oklahoma, and for an extension of time within which purchasers of such deposits may complete payments; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GAVAGAN: A bill (H. R. 9497) to authorize the Secretary of War to prosecute the work of improvement of the New York State Barge Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 9498) to reduce certain naturalization fees; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BLACK: Resolution (H. Res. 149) authorizing the investigation of the sale of real-estate mortgage bonds; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEAVEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 299) to request the President and the Secretary of State to complete negotiations for a treaty that will permit the early completion of the St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 9499) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 9500) for the relief of Lewis H. Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9501) granting a pension to Mary E. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9502) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Rairden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 9503) for the relief of Maj. W. P. Scobey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9504) for the relief of William Utly; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARLEY: A bill (H. R. 9505) for the relief of Fred C. Van Duyne; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: A bill (H. R. 9506) granting a pension to Anna Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARKE of New York: A bill (H. R. 9507) granting a pension to Annie L. C. Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9508) for the relief of Richard L. Meares, administrator of Armand D. Young, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOKE: A bill (H. R. 9509) granting a pension to Mary Boltz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWE: A bill (H. R. 9510) granting a pension to John Crutchfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9511) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Moffatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOMINICK: A bill (H. R. 9512) granting a pension to Etta Whitehead; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 9513) granting a pension to Frank C. Tyson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALL of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 9514) for the relief of Walter W. Johnston; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9515) providing for the sale of Ship Island Reservation in Mississippi; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HANCOCK of New York: A bill (H. R. 9516) granting a pension to Nettie J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 9517) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Cooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9518) granting an increase of pension to Rhoda A. Hedge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9519) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMNECK: A bill (H. R. 9520) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Franks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 9521) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe B. Bunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McMILLAN: A bill (H. R. 9522) for the relief of C. O. Crosby, to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON of Maine: A bill (H. R. 9523) granting an increase of pension to Harriet M. Chamberlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 9524) granting an increase of pension to Martha Sabins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. OWEN: A bill (H. R. 9525) granting a pension to Shelton Pridgeon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARTRIDGE: A bill (H. R. 9526) granting a pension to Georgie S. Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEAVEY: A bill (H. R. 9527) granting an increase of pension to Olive Dupree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 9528) granting a pension to Paul A. Parent; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 9529) for the relief of James Dillon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TABER: A bill (H. R. 9530) granting a pension to Anna L. Rumsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 9531) granting a pension to Ida B. Cutright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 9532) for the relief of the heirs at law of J. R. Welch; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WARREN: A bill (H. R. 9533) granting a pension to Susie A. Harmon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 9534) extending the benefits of the emergency officers' retirement act to Thomas Joseph McHugh; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9535) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hershey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9536) granting a pension to Lilly Shipley; 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:

2283. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Petition of 92 citizens of the fortieth congressional district in Niagara Falls, N. Y., supporting the Beck-Linthicum resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2284. Also, resolution adopted by 256 members of the Wilson Methodist Episcopal Church of Wilson, N. Y.; 125 members of the Women's Association of St. James Methodist Episcopal Church of Niagara Falls, N. Y.; and 500 members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church Sunday schools of Buffalo, N. Y.; supporting the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2285. Also, petition of 113 members of the fortieth congressional district, supporting the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2286. Also, resolution adopted by Chamber of Commerce of the Tonawandas (Tonawanda and North Tonawanda), N. Y., supporting House bill 5090; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2287. Also, petition of Hill Mortgage Corporation, Buffalo, N. Y., urging opposition to the House bill 7620; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2288. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of the Senate of the State of Rhode Island, adopted unanimously, urging passage of House Joint Resolutions 208 and 209, which provide for amendment of the Constitution of the United States for the purpose of enabling the various States to provide for the regulation of manufacture, transportation, sale, and use of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2289. Also, petition of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island, urging passage of House Joint Resolutions 208 and 209, which provide for amendment of the Constitution of the United States for the purpose of enabling the various States to provide for the regulation of manufacture, transportation, sale, and use of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2290. By Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa: Petition of 40 voters of Sac County, Iowa, urging the passage of House bill 1 providing for the payment of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2291. By Mr. CHINDBLOM: Resolution of the Woman's Society of the First Baptist Church of Evanston, Ill., representing 284 people, opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or by State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2292. Also, resolution of the Niles Center Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Niles Center, Ill., representing 10 people, opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or by State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2293. By Mr. CLAGUE: Petition of A. J. Webber, of Sherburn, Minn., and others, protesting against the passage of House bill 8092 compelling barbers to observe Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2294. Also, petition of J. B. Dietz, of Wabasso, Minn., and others, asking for passage of the Frazier-Sinclair bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2295. By Mr. CLARKE of New York: Petition of 44 residents of Oneonta, N. Y., opposing the repeal, resubmission, or any modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2296. Also, petition of C. S. Coon and 61 residents of De Ruyter, N. Y., opposing the passage of Senate bill 1202 or any other compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2297. Also, petition of C. K. Beaman and eight residents of Otego, N. Y., opposing the passage of Senate bill 1202 or any other compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2298. By Mr. CONDON: Petition of William E. Bradley and 76 other citizens of Rhode Island, requesting the Government to bring the United States Navy up to the treaty maximum strength; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2299. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of Emma V. Yoder and several hundred other citizens from Los Angeles County, Calif. protesting against any legislation which would resubmit, revise, repeal, or nullify the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2300. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the thirty-second regular convention of the United Mine Workers of America at Indianapolis, urging favorable legislation for bills introduced by Senators LA FOLLETTE and COSTIGAN; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2301. Also, petition of citizens and carriers opposing star-route plan; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2302. By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of the Exchange Club of Rutland, Vt.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2303. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Coventry, Vt.; to the Committee on the Judiicary.

2304. Also, petition of American Legion Post, No. 67, of Chester, Vt.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2305. By Mr. GILLEN: Petition of Krietenstein Post, American Legion Auxiliary 104, Terre Haute, on World War veterans' legislation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2306. Also, petition of James H. Stitzle and others, of Brazil, Ind., protesting against increase in taxes on motor vehicles, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2307. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Olive M. Powell and 24 others, of Kingsdown, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement, and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2308. Also, petition of J. W. Barron and 86 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.

2309. Also, petition of Mrs. Fred C. Ferguson and 63 others, of Attica, Kans., favoring prohibition and its enforcement, and protesting against modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2310. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Thorndale Auto Co., of Thorndale, Tex., opposing a Federal sales tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2311. Also, petition of post-office clerks of Hearne, Tex., indorsing House bill 6305; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2312. Also, petition of Will S. Knight, chief of police of Corsicana, Tex., indorsing House bill 4537; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2313. By Mr. KELLER: Petition of Gertrude Ward and others, of Carterville, Ill., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2314. Also, petition of Local Union No. 1421, United Mine Workers of America, Buckner, Ill., urging the erection of a veterans' hospital for southern Illinois; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2315. Also, petition of members of Local Union No. 789 United Mine Workers of America, at Frankfort Heights, Ill., urging the erection of a veterans' hospital in southern Illinois; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2316. By Mr. KINZER: Petition of Virginia Grosh and 304 other voters, of Lititz, Pa., 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 petition be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2317. Also, petition of Rev. Edward W. White and 27 members of the Landenberg Methodist Episcopal Church, Landenberg, Pa., favoring prohibition and its enforcement, and protesting against modification or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2318. Also, petition of 37 citizens, of Chester County, Pa., protesting against the modification, resubmission, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2319. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. L. A. Eddy and 36 other persons, of Topeka, Kans., urging the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, and opposing any measure of repeal, modification, or resubmission to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2320. Also, petition of D. M. Dill and 21 other citizens, of Winchester, Kans., opposing the proposed increase in postal rates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2321. Also, petition of 329 members of the Kansas Grocers League of Kansas, favoring the proposed legislation on radio broadcasting to prevent its use for direct sales of commodities, and favoring Senate bills 2626, 2627, and 2628, by Senator NYE, the purpose of which is to check secret price discriminations and allowances, destructive competition, and similar unfair trade practices, which tend to wipe out individual, independent business concerns in this country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2322. By Mr. MURPHY: Resolution of Local Union 186, of the Carpenters and Joiners of Steubenville, Ohio, condemning the position taken by the American Federation of Labor, and demanding a system of Government insurance for unemployed to be administered without discrimination; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2323. By Mr. PRATT: Petition of 27 members of Canaan Grange, of Canaan, Columbia County, N. Y., praying for maintenance of the prohibition laws, and opposing repeal, modification, or resubmission to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2324. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Linnaean Society of New York, favoring the establishment of the Everglades national park in Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2325. Also, petition of C. J. Tagliabue Manufacturing Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring a tariff on crude oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2326. Also, petition of the American Agricultural Chemical Co., New York, favoring a balanced Budget at the earliest possible moment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2327. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Nellie Luce and other citizens of Rochester, and sent in by Mrs. S. Cook, of Rochester, N. Y., supporting the prohibition law and its enforcement, and against modification, resubmission, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2328. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of Hillview Cooperative Creamery, of Sebeka, Minn., urging that Congress take immediate action in giving Philippine Islands their freedom, and also to levy duty on oils imported from the Philippines which go into competition with products of American farms; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

2329. Also, petition of George H. Miller, of Otter Tail; Henry Glodback, of Richville; and 31 other citizens of Otter Tail County, all of the State of Minnesota, urging prompt enactment of Frazier bill, S. 1197, without amendment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2330. Also, petition of Oak Valley Cooperative Creamery Association, Deer Creek, Minn., urging Congress to grant Philippine Islands their independence, thereby removing unfair competition to American farmers caused by duty-free imports of oils produced in these islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

2331. Also, petition of Minnesota Telephone Association, opposing the imposition of a tax on telephone-toll messages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2332. Also, petition of Farmers Union, Arco, Minn., Lincoln County unit, urging enactment of House bill 7797 and Senate bills 1197 and 2487, regarding refinancing, remonetization, and marketing, to make possible for citizens to retain their homes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2333. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the State Highway Commission of the State of New Jersey, requesting special appropriation of $125,000,000 for Federal aid in road construction; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2334. By Mr. SWICK: Petition of Sons of the American Revolution, New Castle, Lawrence County, Pa., W. O. Rugh, president, urging the approval by Congress of the War Department appropriations as recommended by the Budget; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2335. By Mr. SWING: Petition of 177 residents of La Verne, Calif., supporting 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.

2336. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Chartiers United Presbyterian Church, Canonsburg, Pa., supporting the eighteenth amendment, and protesting against the submission of an amendment to the States repealing the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2337. By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: Resolution offered by railroad and business men of Ashland, Ky., signed by W. F. Watson, E. Hall, L. C. DeHart, C. L. Jones, Charles Keith, H. M. Greene, Arthur Tackett, E. Littleton, H. W. Hall, Virgil Goodman, and others, favoring a 5-day week and 6-hour day; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2338. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition of the Southern Civic Clubs of California, favoring restriction of migration of Filipinos and Mexicans to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2339. By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Petition of members of Tippecanoe County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, supporting 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.

2340. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of the congregation of the First Church of God, Arnold, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing a modification or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2341. Also, petition of members of the First Baptist Church of Jeannette, Westmoreland County, Pa., with membership of about 460, standing solidly for the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2342. Also, petition of officers and members of the Allegheny United Presbyterian Church, opposing modification of the Volstead Act and enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2343. Also, petition of Temperance and Reform Section, Women's Missionary Society, opposing the Beck-Linthicum resolution or any modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2344. Also, petition of members of the Charlotte V. Fleming Sunday School Class of the First Presbyterian Church of West Newton, Pa., opposing modification of the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2345. Also, petition of Westmoreland County Christian Endeavor Union, urging support and enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2346. Also, petition of members of the Brotherhood Sunday School Class of the First Presbyterian Church of West Newton, Pa., opposing modification of the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2347. Also, petition of members of the First Lutheran Church, Westmoreland County, New Kensington, Pa., requesting the enforcement of the present prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2348. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Westmoreland City, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing any change in eighteenth amendment and Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2349. Also, petition of United Presbyterian Church of Ligonier, Westmoreland County, Pa., representing membership of 258 persons, protesting against any change or interference with present prohibition laws, and opposing resubmission of question of repeal of eighteenth amendment to States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2350. Also, petition of United Presbyterian Church of Trafford, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing resubmission of eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or by State legislatures, and urging Representatives in Congress and Senators to vote against such resolutions and to vote for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2351. Also, petition of Puckety United Presbyterian Church, New Kensington, Pa., opposing repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2352. Also, petition of George R. Ankeny, of Manor, Westmoreland County, Pa., protesting against any change in present prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2353. Also, petition of Helen B. Ankeny and 11 other citizens, of Manor, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing any change in present prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2354. Also, petition of Pucketos Men's Alliance, representing men of the rural churches in Allegheny, Lower Burrell, Upper Burrell, Washington, Bell, and Franklin townships, in Westmoreland County, opposing modification or repeal of the present Volstead Act and the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2355. Also, petition of officers of the First Presbyterian Sabbath School of Vandergrift, Pa., representing more than 700 members, urging support of the eighteenth amendment, Volstead Act, and other enforcement measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2356. Also, petition of members of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Ligonier, Pa., representing 475 members, opposing modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2357. Also, petition of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of New Alexandria, Pa., opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or State legislatures, and urging Representatives in Congress and Senators to vote against such resolutions and for adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2358. Also, petition of officers and members of the First United Presbyterian Bible school of Vandergrift, Pa., opposing modification or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2359. Also, petition of officers and members of the Sunday school of the First Presbyterian Church of Avonmore, Pa., opposing repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2360. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Greensburg, representing 1,500 people, opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or State legislatures, and urging Representatives in Congress and Senators to vote against such resolutions and for adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2361. Also, petition of the sixth Sunday-school district of Westmoreland County Sunday School Association, representing 21 schools and over 3,000 scholars, opposing modi-

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

2362. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Ruffsdale and Tarr, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or State legislatures, and urging Representative in Congress and Senators to vote against such resolutions, and for adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2363. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Korean National Organization, urging the United States Government to continue its efforts to induce, by truce or international arbitration, an immediate cessation of hostilities in Manchuria and Shanghai; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1932

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 17, 1932)

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

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

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 amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 19) providing a wreath to be placed on the grave of the mother of Washington on February 22, 1932.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

H. R. 81. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Catawissa Railroad Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near Catawissa, Pa.;

H. R. 6304. An act to transfer Lavaca County from the Houston division to the Victoria division of the southern judicial district of Texas;

H. R. 7247. An act authorizing the Rhode Island State Board of Public Roads and the State Highway Department of the State of Connecticut to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pawcatuck River near the location of the present Broad Street Bridge between Westerly, R. I., and Stonington, Conn.; and

H. J. Res. 271. Joint resolution amending section 1 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved July 3, 1930, relating to the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Illinois River and Minneapolis.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] has the floor on Senate bill 3616, the unfinished business.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me to enable me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield for that purpose?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] is still detained from the Senate by illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GEORGE. My colleague the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] is detained from the Senate by continued illness. I request that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. TOWNSEND. My colleague the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. BLAINE. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is unavoidably absent, and I shall let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness.

I also wish to announce that the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is necessarily absent on public business.

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

PLACING OF WREATH ON GRAVE OF MOTHER OF WASHINGTON

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, in accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution No. 19, appoints the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] to place on behalf of the Senate a wreath on the grave of Mary, the mother of Washington, at Fredericksburg, Va., on February 22, 1932.

ADDITIONAL AWARDS TO PUEBLO INDIANS, NEW MEXICO

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, amounting to $55,502.02, required for the payment of additional awards in favor of the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FROM EXPLOSIONS AT AMMUNITION DEPOT, LAKE DENMARK, N. J.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a reinvestigation of certain personal injury and property-damage claims received from the explosions at the naval ammunition depot, Lake Denmark, N. J., July 10, 1926, together with his recommendations thereon, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

THE MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Tuesday, when the unfinished business is reached at the end of the morning hour, I shall address the Senate on the subject of the moving-picture industry.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of South Carolina, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

A concurrent resolution relating to a preferential excise tax on tobacco products manufactured from tobacco purchased from the farmers of South Carolina

Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury has recommended a material increase in the excise taxes on manufactured tobacco