2555. By Mr. ROBINSON: Resolution for the independence of the Philippine Islands, signed by Ernest M. Wright, field secretary Iowa State Dairy Association, Waterloo, Iowa, insisting that independence be granted the Philippine Islands at once. Until independence is granted the present situation compels farmers in the United States to meet unfair competition of the Philippine products on our domestic markets. By granting this independence we will be keeping our promise to these islands and at the same time preserving the American market for the American farmer. We urge that the Iowa State Dairy Association unite with all other farm and dairy groups and do everything possible to secure this independence. We believe the existing tariffs on dairy products should be maintained; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2556. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of Webster Groves Camp, No. 43, Department of Missouri, United Spanish War Veterans, Webster Groves, Mo., indorsing House bill No. 7230; to the Committee on Pensions.

2557. Also, petition of Webster Groves Camp, No. 43, Department of Missouri, United Spanish War Veterans, Webster Groves, Mo., opposing the reduction of appropriations for the Regular Army, National Guard, and Organized Reserves, and any reduction in the number of officers and enlisted men in the Regular Army; and favoring the appropriation of the full amount recommended by the Budget Bureau for the Army, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and citizens' military training camps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2558. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of New York State Nurses' Association, favoring the passage of Bankhead bill, H. R. 7525; to the Committee on Flood Control.

2559. Also, petition of H. J. Rosenbloom, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Goss bill, H. R. 4680; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2560. Also, petition of Bird Lovers' Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the establishment of the Everglades national park in Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2561. Also, petition of American Rattan & Reed Manufacturing Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Kahn bill, H. R. 6744; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2562. Also, petition of Cameron Machine Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the establishment of the Everglades national park in Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2563. Also, petition of T. J. Oakley Rhinelander, of New York City, opposing further reduction of the Budget for national defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2564. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Resolution of the congregation and Sunday school of the West Kendall Free Methodist Church, Kendall, N. Y., opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2565. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the Court St. Joseph's, No. 884, Catholic Daughters of America, of Keyport, N. J., protesting against House bills 4757 and 4739; to the Committee on Education.

2566. By Mr. CHRISTGAU: Resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Litchfield Creamery Co., Litchfield, Minn., relative to establishing unfettered trade relations between this and other nations, and reducing Federal expenditures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2567. Also, resolution adopted and submitted by the Lake Stay Local, No. 178, of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Minnesota division, Arco, Minn., favoring the passage of Senate bill 1197, introduced by Senator FRAZIER; Senate bill 2487, introduced by Senator WHEELER; and House bill 7797, introduced by Representative F. B. SWANK; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2568. Also, resolution adopted at the annual convention of the Minnesota Telephone Association in St. Paul, Minn., protesting against the placing of taxes upon telephone toll messages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2569. Also, petition signed by members of the Minnesota Bird Club, of Minneapolis, Minn., urging support of House bill 12381, providing for the establishment of the Everglades national park in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2570. Also, petition signed by citizens of Stewartville and Simpson, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 8092, providing for the observance of Sunday by barbers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2571. Also, petition signed by citizens of Dodge Center, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 8092, providing for the observance of Sunday by barbers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2572. Also, petition signed by citizens of Ellendale, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 8092, providing for the observance of Sunday by barbers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1932

The Senate met, under the unanimous-consent agreement, at 11.15 a. m.

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

Almighty God, who turnest the hearts of the children unto the fathers and hast declared that the righteous shalt be had in everlasting remembrance, be graciously pleased to sanctify to this Nation the influence of Thy servant, George Washington, as we commemorate the anniversary of his birth and pay loving tribute to his character and the genius of his leadership in the founding of our Republic.

In this our day of opportunity bestow upon us those noble qualities of manhood reflected in his life that we, too, may be valiant without ambition, confident without assumption, discreet without fear, resourceful in danger, resolute in adversity, triumphant in faith. We invoke Thine especial blessing upon the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Members of the Congress, and all others in authority, that they may so lead and direct the people of our land that when we shall have served Thee in our generation we may be gathered to our fathers, having the testimony of a good conscience, in favor with Thee our God, and in perfect charity with all mankind. All of which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Wednesday, February 17, 1932, when, on request of Mr. FESS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9203) to improve the facilities of the Federal reserve system for the service of commerce, industry, and agriculture, to provide means for meeting the needs of member banks in exceptional circumstances, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. BRAND of Georgia, Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. MCFADDEN, and Mr. STRONG of Kansas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 292) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to aid in the establishment of agricultural credit corporations, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JONES, Mr. FULMER, and Mr.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

HAUGEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following resolution:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
February 20, 1932.

Resolved, That the Senate be requested to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H. R. 8824) entitled "An act to restore certain lands to the San Carlos (White Mountain) Indian Reservation, Ariz."

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, because several Senators are expecting it, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Couzens	Jones	Schall
Austin	Dickinson	Kean	Sheppard
Bailey	Dill	Kendrick	Shipstead
Bankhead	Fess	Keyes	Smith
Black	Fletcher	King	Smoot
Bratton	Frazier	Lewis	Steiwer
Brookhart	George	Logan	Thomas, Idaho
Broussard	Glass	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Bulkley	Glenn	McKellar	Townsend
Bulow	Goldsborough	McNary	Trammell
Byrnes	Gore	Morrison	Vandenberg
Capper	Hale	Neely	Wagner
Caraway	Harrison	Nye	Walcott
Carey	Hastings	Oddie	Watson
Connally	Hayden	Pittman	Wheeler
Coolidge	Hebert	Reed	White
Copeland	Howell	Robinson, Ark.	
Costigan	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	

Mr. AUSTIN. I desire to announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to announce that my colleague the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] is detained from the Senate by illness.

Mr. GLASS. I desire to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is absent in attendance upon the disarmament conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. JOHNSON. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] is detained from the Senate on account of illness.

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

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. HOWELL, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 3403) for the relief of Ralph Edward Bertheaud, and it was referred to the Committee on Finance.

SAN CARLOS INDIAN RESERVATION, ARIZ.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the resolution from the House of Representatives requesting the return of House bill 8824.

Mr. FRAZIER. Pursuant to the resolution adopted by the House of Representatives asking the return of the bill (H. R. 8824) to restore certain lands to the San Carlos (White Mountain) Indian Reservation, Ariz., I desire to make a request. The bill is before the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs may be discharged from its further consideration and that it may be returned to the House of Representatives.

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

CEREMONIES IN COMMEMORATION OF TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF WASHINGTON'S BIRTH

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, under the arrangements which have been made for the joint session of the two Houses in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington, I understand the Senate is to leave its Chamber promptly at 11.35 a. m. Our hats and coats will be taken over and placed on a rack outside of the Hall of the House of Representatives, so that those Senators who desire, after the conclusion of the exercises in the House, to march to the front of the Capitol for the purpose of witnessing the ceremonies there and listening to the music, will have their coats and hats at hand and will not find it necessary to return to the Senate. I do not know of anything else that is to be done this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order heretofore made, the Senate will now proceed to form in line in order to march to the House of Representatives.

Mr. SMITH. At what time are we supposed to be in the Chamber of the other House?

The VICE PRESIDENT. We are supposed to leave here at 11.35 a. m.

At 11 o'clock and 30 minutes a. m. the Senate, preceded by its Sergeant at Arms and Secretary and headed by the Vice President and the Chaplain, together with the committee on arrangements on the part of the Senate, consisting of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to take part in the joint session of the two Houses held in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington.

At the expiration of the ceremonies in the House of Representatives the Senate, under the order previously entered, stood adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 23, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1932

The House was called to order by the Speaker at 11.30 o'clock a. m.

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

Blessed be the Lord and the God of our fathers, from everlasting even to everlasting. In Thy holy providence we wait this hour to render our tributes of praise and gratitude to the memory of him whose heart and mind are the propulsive forces of our national existence. We pray that the youth of our land may be inspired by the recital of his sacrificial and heroic deeds as the fundamentals of free and representative government are condensed in him. May the patriotism of our entire citizenship flame forth these days in response to his spirit—the ideal master for the student, the ideal general for the dauntless soldier, and the ideal citizen for all brave patriots. Heavenly Father, do Thou lift the mantles that make for mental drabness and soul darkness. Let the lessons of this day touch every fireside, every hamlet, and every schoolhouse, and may they feel the wonder value of that contribution he made to all humanity. While empires rise and fall, while palaces and altars go down together he will still live and travel with the future years.

Almighty God, let Thy kingdom come—Thy kingdom of righteousness and peace; not the trumpet, not the banner, not the armed host but the kingdom of brotherhood. Out of the darkness bring forth the light, out of tears bring forth gladness, and out of the world's groans bring forth the songs of deliverance. Expel from all lands the misereres and the requiems, and let the whole realm rejoice together. Unstop the ears of the nations, and may they hear the witnesses of the centuries. They tell us that righteousness and not the sword is the fruit of the vision of God, and that His order for the whole earth is fraternity and not the ravages of conquest. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

By unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal was postponed until a later hour in the day.

RECESS

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess subject to the call of the Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

Accordingly, at 11 o'clock and 32 minutes a. m., the House stood in recess at the call of the Speaker.

At 11 o'clock and 35 minutes a. m., the Speaker resumed the chair and called the House to order.

JOINT SESSION

EXERCISES IN COMMEMORATION OF THE TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

At 11 o'clock and 36 minutes a. m., the Doorkeeper, Mr. Joseph J. Sinnott, announced the Vice President of the United States and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Members of the House rose.

The Senate, headed by the Vice President and the Chaplain and preceded by its Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Chamber.

The Vice President took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The Speaker relinquished the gavel to the Vice President, who, as the Presiding Officer of the joint session of the two Houses, called the session to order.

The Doorkeeper announced the following guests, who were escorted to the seats assigned to them:

The Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The ambassadors and ministers and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The Chief of Staff of the United States Army, the Chief of Naval Operations of the United States Navy, the Major General Commandant of the United States Marine Corps and the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard.

The Governor of Virginia, the Governor of North Dakota, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The United States George Washington Bicentennial Commission and the members representing the District of Columbia Bicentennial Commission.

The representatives of the family of George Washington, and

The members of the President's Cabinet.

At 11 o'clock and 48 minutes a. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States, who was escorted by the Joint Committee on Arrangements of the Senate and House to a seat on the Speaker's rostrum.

The Interstate Male Chorus and the audience, under the direction of Commissioner Clyde B. Aitchison, sang two verses of "America."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes Representative WOODRUM, of Virginia, a member of the Joint Committee on Arrangements, to read the resolution calling for the joint session of the two Houses of the Congress.

Mr. WOODRUM. On January 20, 1932, the following concurrent resolution was adopted by the Congress:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 11.30 o'clock a. m. on Monday, February 22, 1932.

That the President of the United States, as the chairman of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of George Washington, is hereby invited to address the American people in the presence of the Congress in commemoration of the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of the first President of the United States.

That invitations to attend the ceremony be extended to the members of the Cabinet, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Diplomatic Corps (through the Secretary of State), the General of the Armies, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, and such other persons as the joint committee on arrangements shall deem proper.

The Interstate Male Chorus sang "The Recessional," by Reginald De Koven.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vice chairman of the United States George Washington Bicentennial Commission, Senator FESS, of Ohio.

Senator FESS. President Hoover, ladies, and gentlemen, for the first time in the history of mankind a nation is celebrating in an all-year program the memory of its founder. Not only all America and all Americans, wherever found, but most countries throughout the world are paying tribute to-day to the memory of George Washington. It is proper that this program begin in the Capital of his country, in the city that bears his name. It is eminently fitting and appropriate that it should be opened by the present head of the Government of which Washington is known as the father and was the first President. To those in this official assembly and to those listening in two hemispheres, I present the President of the United States. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

President HOOVER. The Senate, the House of Representatives, and my fellow citizens, just 100 years ago in this city Daniel Webster, in commemoration of the birth of George Washington, said:

A hundred years hence other disciples of Washington will celebrate his birth with no less of sincere admiration than we now commemorate it. When they shall meet, as we now meet, to do themselves and him that honor, so surely as they shall see the blue summits of his native mountains rise in the horizon, so surely as they shall behold the river on whose banks he lived, and on whose banks he rests, still flowing on toward the sea, so surely may they see, as we now see, the flag of the Union floating on top of the Capitol; and then, as now, may the sun in his course visit no land more free, more happy, more lovely than this, our own country.

[Applause.]

The time that Webster looked forward to is here. We "other disciples of Washington" whom he foresaw are gathered to-day. His prophecy is borne out, his hope fulfilled. That flag "still floats from the top of the Capitol." It has come unscathed through foreign war and the threat of internal division. Its only change is the symbol of growth. The 13 stars that Washington saw, and the 24 that Webster looked upon, now are 48. The number of those who pay loyalty to that flag has multiplied tenfold. The respect for it beyond our borders, already great when Webster spoke a hundred years ago, has increased—not only in proportion to the power it symbolizes but even more by the measure in which other peoples have embraced the ideals for which it stands. To Webster's expression of hope we may reasonably answer, Yes—"The sun in its course visits no land more free, more happy, more lovely than this, our own country." Proudly we report to our forefathers that the Republic is more secure, more constant, more powerful, more truly great than at any other time in its history.

To-day the American people begin a period of tribute and gratitude to this man whom we revere above all other Americans. Continuing until Thanksgiving Day they will commemorate his birth in every home, every school, every church, and every community under our flag.

In all this multitude of shrines and forums they will recount the life history and accomplishments of Washington. It is a time in which we will pause to recall for our own guidance, and to summarize and emphasize for the benefit of our children, the experiences, the achievements, the dangers escaped, the errors redressed—all the lessons that constitute the record of our past.

The ceremonial of commemorating the founder of our country is one of the most solemn that either an individual or a nation ever performs; carried out in high spirit it can be made one of the most fruitful and enriching. It is a thing to be done in the mood of prayer, of communing with the spiritual springs of patriotism, and of devotion to country. It is an occasion for looking back to our past, for taking stock of our present, and, in the light of both, setting the compass for our future. We look back that we may recall those qualities of Washington's character which made him great, those principles of national conduct which he laid down, and by which we have come thus far. We meet to reestablish our contact with them, renew our fidelity to them.

From this national revival of interest in the history of the American Revolution and of the independence of the United States will come a renewal of those inspirations which strengthened the patriots who brought to the world a new concept of human liberty and a new form of government.

So rich and vivid is the record of history, that Washington in our day lives again in the epic of the foundation of

the Republic. He appears in the imagination of every succeeding generation as the embodiment of the wisdom, the courage, the patience, the endurance, the statesmanship, and the absence of all mean ambition, which transformed scattered communities of the forest and the frontiers into a unity of free and independent people.

It is not necessary for me to attempt a eulogy of George Washington. That has been done by masters of art and poetry during more than a hundred years. To what they have said I attempt to make no addition.

The true eulogy of Washington is this mighty Nation. He contributed more to its origins than any other man. The influence of his character and of his accomplishments has contributed to the building of human freedom and ordered liberty, not alone upon this continent but upon all continents. The part which he played in the creation of our institutions has brought daily harvest of happiness to hundreds of millions of humanity. The inspirations from his genius have lifted the vision of succeeding generations. The definitions of those policies in government which he fathered have stood the test of 150 years of strain and stress.

From the inspiration and the ideals which gave birth to this Nation there has come the largest measure of liberty that man has yet devised. So securely were the foundations of this free Government laid that the structure has been able to adapt itself to the changing world relations, the revolutions of invention and the revelations of scientific discovery, the fabulous increase of population and of wealth, and yet to stand the kaleidoscopic complexities of life which these changes have brought upon it.

What other great, purely human institution, devised in the era of the stagecoach and the candle, has so marvelously grown and survived into this epoch of the steam engine, the airplane, the incandescent lamp, the wireless telephone, and the battleship?

If we are to get refreshment to our ideals from looking backward to Washington, we should strive to identify the qualities in him that made our Revolution a success and our Nation great. Those were the qualities that marked Washington out for immortality.

We find they were not spectacular qualities. He never charged with a victorious army up the capital streets of a conquered enemy. Excepting only Yorktown and Trenton, he won no striking victories. His great military strength was in the strategy of attrition, the patient endurance of adversity, steadfast purpose unbent by defeat. The American shrine most associated with Washington is Valley Forge, and Valley Forge was not a place of victory—except the victory of Washington's fortitude triumphant above the weakness and discouragement of lesser men. Washington had courage without excitement, determination without passion.

The descriptions of George Washington by his contemporaries give us no clear picture of the inner man, the Washington whose spiritual force so palpably dominated his whole epoch. As a mirror, his own writings do him indifferent justice, whilst the writings of others are clouded by their awe or are obscured by their venom. We must deduce mainly from other records why he stood out head and shoulders above all the crowd around him. It was an extraordinary crowd, living at white heat, comprising men as varied, as brilliant, as versatile as the extraordinary demands which the times made upon them. They were men flexible in intellect and versed in the ways of the world. Yet in every crisis, and for every rôle, they turned to Washington. They forced upon him the command of Indian fighters; they made him a general against trained British troops; they demanded that he be a constitutionalist and a national statesman; they insisted he must guide his country through the skillful ambushes of European kings; they summoned him to establish the nonexistent credit of an insolvent infant nation. Why did his brilliant fellow patriots always thus turn to him?

The answer of history is unmistakable: They brought their problems to Washington because he had more character, a finer character, a purer character, than any other man of his time. In all the shifting pressures of his generation all men acknowledged that the one irresistible force was the overwhelming impact of his moral power. Motives and men were measured by their stature when standing in his shadow. Slander fell harmless before him, sham hung its head in shame, folly did not risk to look him in the face, corruption slunk from his presence, cowardice dared not show its quaking knees.

In his integrity all our men of genius in his day found their one sure center of agreement. In his wisdom and authority they found the one sure way to practical fulfillment of their dreams.

We need no attempt at canonization of George Washington. We know he was human, subject to the discouragements and preplexities that come to us all. We know that he had moments of deepest anxiety. We know of his sufferings, and the sacrifices and anguish that came to him. We know of his resentment of injustice and misrepresentation. And yet we know that he never lost faith in our people.

Nor have I much patience with those who undertake the irrational humanizing of Washington. He had, indeed, the fine qualities of friendliness, of sociableness, of humanness, of simple hospitality; but we have no need to lower our vision from his unique qualities of greatness, or to seek to depreciate the unparalleled accomplishments of the man who dominated and gave birth to the being of a great nation.

What we have need of to-day in this celebration is to renew in our people the inspiration that comes from George Washington as a founder of human liberty, as the father of a system of government, as the builder of a system of national life.

It is of primary importance that we of to-day shall renew that spark of immortal purpose which burned within him, shall know of the resolution and the steadfastness which carried him forward to the establishment of a nation. That establishment was not a momentary flash of impulse, in a people rebellious and passionate under oppression, destined to fade into the chaos so often born of revolutions. On the contrary, it was builded upon foundations of principles and ideals which have given the power and strength that made this Nation and inspired the establishment of ordered liberty in a score of other nations.

We have need to refresh to the remembrance of the American people the great tests and trials of character of the men who founded our Republic. We have need to remember the fiber of those men who brought to successful conclusion the eight years of Revolution. We have need again to bring forth the picture of the glories and the valor of Lexington and Concord, of Bunker Hill, the suffering and fortitude of Valley Forge, the victory of Yorktown. We have need to revive the meaning and the sheer moral courage of the Declaration of Independence, the struggles of the Continental Congress, the forming of the Constitution. We have need at all times to review the early crises of the Republic, the consolidation of the Union, the establishment of national solidarity, the building of an administration of government, and the development of guaranties of freedom. No incident and no part in these great events, which have echoed and reechoed throughout the world for a century and a half, can be separated from the name and the dominant leadership of George Washington.

Upon these foundations of divine inspiration laid by our forefathers, and led by Washington, our Nation has builded up during this century and a half a new system of life, a system unique to the American people. It is hallowed by the sacrifice and glorious valor of men. It is assured by a glorious charter of human rights.

It comprises a political system of self-government by the majority, resting upon the duties of individual men to the community, and of the local communities to the Nation. It is a government designed in spirit to sustain a dual purpose: to protect our people among nations by great national power, and to preserve individual freedom by local self-government.

It comprises a social system free of inherited position, based upon the ideal of equality of all men before the law,

the equal privilege of men to strive and to achieve, and the responsibilities of men to their neighbors.

It embraces an economic system based upon the largest degree of freedom and stimulation to initiative and enterprise which can be permitted and still maintain the ideal of equality of opportunity among men.

Finally, it embraces a system of relationships to other nations based upon no thought of imperialism, no desire to dominate; a determined national self-reliance in defense and independence in action; freedom from all commitment to the unknown future; and an aspiration to promote peace and good will among all men. [Applause.]

Perhaps no single part of this system is different from some instance in history or in some other part of the world. But in its composite form it is distinctly unique and distinctly American, a system under which we have reached an assured position among the most powerful of the nations of the world.

This destiny of national greatness was clearly foreseen by George Washington. More fully than any man of his time was he gifted with vision of the future. He spoke habitually of the "American Empire," and predicted its expansion from ocean to ocean. He planned and wrought for the binding forces of transportation and peaceful commerce. He thought in terms of almost imperial grandeur, and he wrought in terms of republican solidity. His far-flung dreams have come true, and he lives to-day in his works, in the names of our towns or cities and our States, and in the affectionate reverence of us who so immeasurably benefit by his wisdom.

Our American system of national life is dependent upon a trust in the principles of government as established by George Washington; a trust in his example to our people; a trust in and a devotion to religious faith, which he himself so devoutly practiced; a trust in that divine inspiration which he so sedulously invoked and which is expressed in the common mind of our people; and above all a trust in the divine Providence which has always given guidance to our country.

From Washington's spirit there has grown an infusion of social ideals with the quality of magnanimity—upholding prosperity with generosity, dignity with forbearance, security without privilege, which has raised our institutions to a level of humanity and nobility nowhere else attained.

We have the faith that Webster expressed, that a hundred years hence our countrymen will again celebrate his birth, will review the memory of his services with no less sincere admiration and gratitude than we now commemorate it, and that they, too, will see, as we now see, "the flag of the Union floating on the top of the Capitol." [Applause.]

From the room where I conduct my high office I hourly see the monument which Washington's proud and grateful countrymen have raised to his memory. It stands foursquare to the world, its base rooted steadfast in the solid substance of American soil. Its peak rises toward the heavens with matchless serenity and calm. Massive in its proportions, as was the character of Washington himself, overwhelming in its symmetry, simplicity, and sincerity, it most fittingly, beautifully, and nobly proclaims the founder of our Commonwealth and our acceptance of his faith. Around that monument have grown steadily and surely the benevolent and beneficent agencies of orderly government dedicated to the spirit of Washington.

Beyond any other monument built by the hand of man out of clay and stone, this shaft is a thing of the spirit. Whether seen in darkness or in light, in brightness or in gloom, there is about it a mantle of pure radiance which gives it the aspect of eternal truth. It is a pledge in the sight of all mankind, given by Washington's countrymen, to carry forward the continuing fulfillment of his vision of America. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The assembly will rise and sing "The Star-Spangled Banner."

"The Star-Spangled Banner" was sung by the audience lead by the Interstate Male Chorus.

DISSOLUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint session of the Senate and House assembled for the purpose of commemorating the Bicentennial Anniversary of the Birth of George Washinton is dissolved.

Thereupon,

The Joint Congressional Committee on Arrangements escorted the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet from the Hall of the House.

The representatives of the family of George Washington then retired.

The Doorkeeper escorted the other invited guests from the Hall of the House in the following order:

The Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Ambassadors and the Ministers of foreign Governments.

The General of the Armies; the Chief of Staff of the United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations of the United States Navy; the Major General Commandant of the United States Marine Corps; and the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard.

The governors of the several States and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The United States George Washington Bicentennial Commission and the members representing the District of Columbia Bicentennial Commission.

Upon the retirement of the guests, the Senate returned to its Chamber, and the House of Representatives resumed its session.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 154, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2.30 o'clock this afternoon.

Accordingly (at 12.30 o'clock p. m.) the House stood in recess until 2.30 o'clock p. m.

[During the afternoon session of the House to-day Mr. RAINEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the proceedings at the exercises on the Capitol steps, which are here published in full as follows:]

ORDER OF EXERCISES AT EAST FRONT OF UNITED STATES CAPITOL, FEBRUARY 22, 1932, AT 12.45 P. M.

Assemblage called to order by Dr. George C. Havenner, executive vice chairman of the District of Columbia George Washington Bicentennial Commission.

The executive vice chairman presented Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin, chairman of the District of Columbia George Washington Bicentennial Commission, who was introduced as presiding officer.

Upon the arrival of the President of the United States, "Hail to the Chief" was played by the massed bands of the United States Army, United States Navy, and United States Marine Corps, conducted by Lieut. Commander John Philip Sousa.

At a signal given by the President the entire assemblage joined in the singing of "America." A national and international radio hook-up made possible the simultaneous singing of this hymn all over the United States and abroad. Chief among the singing units were 10,000 Washington school children and adult chorus of 2,000. Conductor, Dr. Walter Damrosch. Accompaniment by the massed bands of the United States Army, United States Navy, and United States Marine Corps.

ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY DR. LUTHER H. REICHELDERFER, PRESIDENT BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Doctor REICHELDERFER. Mr. President and fellow citizens, my task to-day, although brief, is none the less a privileged one, as we stand here at the heart of the Government to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington.

Here in enduring stone and standing foursquare to every storm, is the temple of our political liberties, the expression in objective and visible form of those principles of liberty and self-government which Washington gave to our Nation and through our Nation to all the world. No more fitting place could be found for this solemn commemoration.

My duty to-day is the more pleasant because of the intimate partnership between the Federal and District of Columbia Governments. As a representative of what Washington himself liked to call the Federal City, I welcome to these ceremonies all those who have come here to-day to honor the founder of our Capital City, not only our fellow Americans from far and near, but the sojourners within our gates from foreign shores. The lesson which Washington taught us is larger than mere local boundaries, and we desire nothing narrow or restricted in the scope and spirit of the celebration here in this city which honors Washington's memory by its very name.

Everything about him was big, broad, national, indeed, international and universal in its appeal. So we are glad to have such a diversified and cosmopolitan assemblage for these opening exercises. We ask all the world to join in this bicentennial festival and to rejoice with us to-day. In that spirit the National Capital greets you and bids you welcome.

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES M. BECK, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. BECK. Mr. President and my fellow citizens, it is a gracious impulse, inspired by sentiments of pious gratitude, which has to-day brought these thousands to the Capital of the Nation to honor the birthday of Washington. Such a ceremonial is a sacred debt to the dead, a like duty to the unborn, and the living generation can gain fresh inspiration and courage in these trying times by recalling his character and achievements. To-day, as always, his character is "as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land." It is our noblest heritage.

I am greatly honored in being asked to interpret, in a few words, the spirit of the occasion. I shall attempt no formal eulogy. The eloquent tribute to the memory of Washington which has just been made in the Halls of Congress by his lineal successor in the great office of President of the United States makes any other eulogy of Washington on this occasion an idle superfluity. Indeed, any eulogy must be inadequate, for the immortal substance of his reputation defies definition, and posterity contents itself by saying, with Abraham Lincoln: "In solemn awe pronounce his name, and in its naked, deathless splendor, leave it shining on."

The fame of Washington is as a fixed star, whose benignant rays will illuminate the ages for uncounted centuries to come. He belongs to the few among mortal men whose fame is timeless.

Ordinarily, it is presumptuous for a living generation to anticipate, as to any character in history, the judgment of posterity. Reputations come and go. Those that may seem great and lasting for a century or more too soon become as those airy streaks of cloud which, with the first breath of a new morning, "fade into the infinite azure of the past."

Walking once in Westminster Abbey, where kings and queens are mingled in the promiscuity of death, a verger told me that Dean Stanley had had a long search for the grave of a king who had been buried in some former century with pomp and circumstance. It recalls the sad comment of Edmund Burke: "What shadows we are and what shadows we pursue."

The Greeks of the classic age realized the presumption of such anticipations of posterity when they condemned Phidias to prison for sacrilege because he had sought to perpetuate his name by furtively chiseling his own image upon the shield of Minerva. And if this were true in simpler days, it is even more true in this age of crowded and fast-speeding wonders, when, as the collective power of civilization waxes, the individual wanes. "The best of this kind are but shadows." It thus becomes increasingly hazardous to assign to any man a place among the immortals.

And yet there is born each century a man of whom it can be safely said that his fame defies that never-ending stream of time which washes away the dissoluble substance of temporary reputations. Such a man is Washington. The ages have enthroned him in the great arena of history as a Homeric king of men, and before him the unending generations pass with the salutation, "Morituri, te salutamus." His preeminence can be tested by the fact that if the wise and good of all the cultural nations of our present civilization were asked to select the three noblest characters of history, the name of Washington would be on almost every list. Name another of whom this could be said.

It can be said of few men, moreover, that they were the founders of a state, for these mighty organisms rarely evolve from the predominant work of one man. There have, however, been a few such founders—Alexander, Cæsar, Charlemagne, and Napoleon. Their empires have all vanished, but the great Republic, which Washington founded, and which is his noblest monument, remains, and will remain as long as his people are faithful to his ideals of government. Never before was its power so great or its prestige so resplendent. Its star is still ascendant in the constellation of the nations, for who can ignore the momentous shifting of the world's center of gravity in the past 50 years. To those ancient seats of power on the Nile, the Tiber, the Danube, the Rhine, the Seine, and the Thames can now be added the Hudson and the Potomac. As the Republic grows in power and majesty, the fame of Washington becomes more resplendent.

To exert a beneficent influence in the councils of civilization the Republic need only follow his wise advice, as eloquently set forth in that noblest testament that the founder of a state ever gave to his people, the immortal Farewell Address. Speaking "as an old and affectionate friend," not only to his generation but to all that were to follow in the tide of time, Washington advised his people not to implicate themselves "in the ordinary vicissitudes of European politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships and enmities." His reiteration of the word "ordinary" is most significant. It implies that in extraordinary crises of civilization America should not pursue a policy of isolation but should assume its due share of the collective responsibility of nations for the maintenance of peace through justice. He would still recognize that elemental forces infinitely greater than political institutions have united the once scattered nations into a world community of purpose and action.

He believed that America should be a helpful member in the family of nations, but without sacrificing its independence in decision and action by any entangling alliance. Such would be his policy to-day, for, to quote his own words, he would have us "independent of all and under the influence of none."

He gave us the shining ideal and ultimate objective of our foreign policy in urging us always "to give mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence."

As all great and noble soldiers, he deprecated war, except as a last resort, and yet regarded it as preferable to a craven acquiescence in injustice, for in accepting the command of our Army he announced his belief that even peace could be too dearly purchased. When he delivered his second inaugural address in December, 1793, the world was, to quote his own words, "in an uproar," and the difficult task of the United States was, as he then said, to "steer safely between Scylla and Charybdis." Recognizing that perpetual peace could never come while the spirit of injustice remained, he solemnly warned his Nation "not to indulge a persuasion that, contrary to the order of human events, they will forever keep at a distance those painful appeals to arms with which the history of every other nation abounds." And he solemnly added:

> There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation for weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.

He never believed, however, that preparations for war would alone insure peace. With nations, as with individuals, peaceful relations must in the last analysis depend upon a mutual spirit of "good faith and justice." Therefore, he urged that we should at all times observe such "good faith and justice towards all nations [and] cultivate peace and harmony with all." To observe that policy in its

letter and spirit is to be true to Washington, to ourselves; and if we are thus true, we can not then be false to any nation.

He would have welcomed the present noble effort of the nations to insure peace by an equitable limitation of arms, with its resulting growth in the spirit of amity, for the last letter he ever wrote contained the declaration that it was "time to sheath the sword of war and give peace to mankind"; but he had no illusions as to its possibility until all nations had a sincere desire for justice as the only basis of peace. Let us to-day reverently thank the God of our fathers not only for the words and deeds of Washington but for the lasting inspiration of his noble character. It illuminates, as none other, the very soul of America. From his simple grave in Mount Vernon he still guides the destinies of the American people. When the seas are smooth we may little feel his presence and sometimes are unmindful of his wise admonitions; but when the ship of state plunges into a storm and is threatened by angry seas his mighty shade is again in our consciousness as the true and eternal helmsman of the Republic.

There is a painting by the great English artist, Burne-Jones, which depicts the closing incident of that Arthurian saga which embodies the chivalry of our English-speaking race. The picture reveals King Arthur upon his deathbed at Avalon. Over a couch hangs his sword with which he had defended his people, and beside the bed stands a trumpeter who, if ever England were in desperate need, would sound his trumpet, at whose call King Arthur would rise again from his couch of death in defense of his nation.

Our Arthur—bravest of the brave and knightliest of the knightly—sleeps at Mount Vernon, but whenever disaster menaces our institutions the American people again become conscious of his potent influence, for "the path of the just is as a shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

Song: "Washington, Fair Capital," Barnes. Sung by school children from divisions 1 to 9, Washington public schools and other schools. Conductor, Dr. E. N. C. Barnes. Accompaniment by the United States Army Band, Capt. William J. Stannard, leader.

Solo: "Carry Me Back to Old Virginny," Bland. By Hon. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, Member of Congress from Virginia. Accompaniment by the United States Army Band, Capt. William J. Stannard, leader.

Song: "To Thee, O Country," Eichberg. Sung by school children from divisions 10 to 13, Washington public schools and other schools. Conductor, Prof. A. H. Johnson. Accompaniment by the United States Navy Band, Lieut. Charles Benter, leader.

"George Washington Bicentennial March," Sousa. Massed bands of the United States Army, United States Navy, and United States Marine Corps, conducted by Lieut. Commander John Philip Sousa.

"The Star-Spangled Banner." The assemblage, led by Dr. E. N. C. Barnes. Accompaniment by the United States Marine Band, Capt. Taylor Branson, leader.

Thereupon the exercises were concluded.

AFTER THE RECESS

The recess having expired, at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the House was called to order by the Speaker.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

THE HUNGARIAN NATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

BUDAPEST, *February 21—10.40 a. m.*

JOHN N. GARNER,
Speaker of the House, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the Hungarian House of Representatives I am sending to you and the House our most sincere wishes on the occasion of Washington's bicentennial. The Hungarian nation never will forget the assistance your country rendered Hungary in its hardest times.

LADISLAS ALMASY,
President of the House.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this day is devoted largely to the memory of George Washington, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an article on George Washington by ex-President Coolidge.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, February 21, 1932]

GEORGE WASHINGTON

(One day during Mr. Coolidge's first term in the White House he was asked what books he had been reading.

"Books about Washington," was Mr. Coolidge's reply.

The first President, he explained, was primarily a business man. He was a practical executive. He deliberately planned for this country a great industrial and commercial future.

Mr. Coolidge had succeeded to Washington's job. Therefore he was studying Washington's plans and policies. He felt that in following them the United States had never gone wrong.

Those who have studied Mr. Coolidge's administration may see in this article how strongly his own policies were affected by his study.

We asked Mr. Coolidge to write on those phases of Washington which have meant much to him and which have been too little understood by the general public, and he has done so. On this celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of Washington's birth, coming, as it does, in a time of economic difficulties, Mr. Coolidge's picture of the business genius of the founder of the Republic takes on new interest and significance.)

By Calvin Coolidge

The careful study of the life of George Washington has an intensely practical purpose. We want to know what he thought and what he did in order that we may be the better able to determine what we ought to think and do now at this difficult time. We shall find it providential that the course of our Nation was largely directed in our formative period by a man who was so human, so devoted to establishing a government of the people, and so experienced in private business that he was able to apply sound business sense to the promotion of the public welfare.

The celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of the first American, which occurs on the 22d of February of the present year, should, of course, include a proper estimate of him as a great statesman and a great soldier. It is in that character that we have come to think of him. He was both, and as such is entitled to all the praise that can be lavished upon him by the most eloquent. But that is not enough. It does not tell us of the real man nor give us any insight into how he became great. We shall fail in the most desirable comprehension of him unless we turn to the more practical examination of his growth and development and try to learn how to do things by finding out how he did them.

There are two kinds of biography which fall short of giving their readers the help which should be secured from an acquaintance with great men. Some of them endow their subjects with all virtue and all wisdom. Such characters appear removed from the reach of common people. They may admire and worship, but they do not feel any kinship. They gain only the impression of a superior being dwelling apart from his fellow men. It would seem almost sacrilege to attempt to imitate him or hope to be like him. Others, proceeding in an opposite direction, represent great men as devoid of most good qualities who have reached the positions they held by being crafty and successful impostors. They are made to appear unworthy of credit or admiration and left to the inference that all greatness is a sham and a pretense. The logical conclusion is meant to be that there are no heroes and nothing is holy. Neither one of such portrayals is in accord with human nature or the truth.

George Washington was well born. His father was a mature man nearing the forties and his mother was a young woman in the twenties. Neither of his parents had any place by reason of artificial rank or title, but they belonged to that great and strong aristocracy which ennobles itself by the power of its own achievements. They were both people of the world. Tradition has it that they first met in London, where the father was accustomed to go on his business of a successful Virginia planter.

It was a serious household into which this boy came. The young mother read the Bible and Matthew Hale's Contemplations and Meditations. At a very early age her son appears to have been provided with a book of sermons. Of course, membership in the church and regular religious worship were the practice of the family. Faith was a reality in the Washington home. The Bible, the church, the sermons of pious men were all a source of inspiration for the practical affairs of everyday life.

While we do not know much of the details of the early education of Washington, we know enough to inform us on the development of his mind and character. In common with the times, his spelling was indifferent and his grammar insufficient. But he was proficient in writing and in figures. Form and numbers came naturally to him. In every sense he was a normal and fun-loving boy, but the loss of his father when he was but 11 perhaps increased his seriousness of mind. It was the practical application

of what he was learning even in his early youth that stamped him as remarkable. The forms of business transactions, the precepts of correct deportment, as well as his arithmetic, which he pored over at school, were all instructions to him for the conduct of his daily life. In all things he became methodical and was always making plans for future action, whether it was the cultivation of his plantations or the freedom and government of his country. He educated himself to know how to plan and how to do—to be an executive.

Although the Virginia of the first half of the eighteenth century had many of the aspects of a frontier, constant contact with Europe made it a home of many cultured people. The father of Washington when a boy spent 12 years in England. He sent the two elder brothers of George to Oxford. He might have followed had his father lived. As it was, he had the instruction of an English schoolmaster, and later of a Huguenot clergyman, who taught him the graces of polite society. His youthful copybooks show that he was trained and trained in these things until he became proficient. There was no accident and no miracle, but just hard work.

The death of his father left him with the slender portion that customarily went to a younger son. All about him lay an uncharted wilderness. To bring land under order and law and advance his own fortunes he became a surveyor. His expeditions into distant woodlands in charge of a squad of men, where they must shelter and feed themselves for weeks at a time, the necessity for methodical accuracy involved in the undertaking, were the finest kind of preparation for his future campaigns. He learned how to estimate distance and location and see the military possibilities of wide reaches of country.

Likewise, Washington became a soldier by personal contact and painstaking study. After about the age of 17 he lived much at Mount Vernon with his elder brother, Lawrence, who had been a captain of militia under Admiral Vernon in the Cartagena campaign and later a major and adjutant general of his district. He placed the young man under the instruction of old army officers, who taught him fencing and the manual of arms. So proficient did the pupil become that before he was 20 he was appointed a major.

The same kind of a progress accounts for his political training. His father was a member of the Virginia House of Burgesses. His brother Lawrence held the same office. On the great estate below Mount Vernon lived Sir William Fairfax, collector of customs for the district, and president of the King's council, so that in office he ranked next to the governor of the colony. A little below, George Mason had a large plantation. This neighbor was a statesman of great ability and an earnest and consistent advocate of popular rights and local self-government. While these men were somewhat older than Washington, they were his constant companions. When he was but 26 he was himself elected to the house of burgesses. He had to make a campaign to win his seat. His political career began at the bottom. For a number of years he was reelected, and had the opportunity at Williamsburg to take a prominent part in all the political action of the stirring period before the Revolution. No doubt he heard Patrick Henry make that speech which was interrupted with cries of "treason." During this time he was serving on committees, helping prepare documents and organize associations for the protection of the rights of the Colonies. In very early life Washington came to be a practical politician.

The same background appears in his business training. His father was an important business man, widely engaged in agriculture, mining iron ore, and at times took command of a sailing vessel. In those days there was little division of labor, and each estate was practically self-sustaining. Nearly everything that was necessary for food, clothing, and shelter was produced where used. Disposal of surplus made the planter his own merchant, exchanging his produce in England for what he could not raise at home. Successful operation on a broad scale of such enterprises required a man of affairs. That was the atmosphere of his early home. All through life his decisions were influenced by his great business experience.

When he was only 20 he found himself one of the executors and the residuary legatee of the will of his brother Lawrence. From that time on he had charge of all his father had left him, helped his mother care for her property, and had the management of the Mount Vernon estate of his deceased brother and ultimate ownership of it, besides his duties as major of militia and adjutant general of a district extending over a number of counties. The production of the soil, of the fisheries, of the mill, as well as the supplies for a great many servants and for a considerable force of militia, all passed through his hands.

In general culture Washington must have learned much from Thomas, Baron Fairfax, who came here in 1746 to have oversight of his vast estates which were managed by Sir William Fairfax. He was the holder of an ancient title of nobility, literary, an associate of Addison, a mature man of the world who lived and died a loyalist. He often employed the young surveyor and had him much in his company at his manor house and at his forest retreat. Washington had that rare faculty of being able to absorb what was best in the persons and things with which he came in contact and to disregard the rest. He applied himself to learning and applied his learning to living. He was a disciple of application.

Such was the preparation of George Washington, when, at the age of 21, on the last day of October, 1753, he set out to carry a letter from the Governor of Virginia to the French commander, warning him not to trespass on the country around the present city of Pittsburgh. The rest of his life belongs to history.

From this time on Washington was a leader in the great plan for the making of America. While New England wanted to be safe from attack from Canada, Virginia and her neighbors wanted to expand into the Ohio Valley. They saw it as a business venture. It was for that reason that Washington was sent to dislodge the French. That expedition started the Seven Years' War, which finally brought all of North America, except the old Spanish possessions on the south and west, under British rule. The route to the western waterways was opened to the enterprise of settlement.

Following the end of the war, in 1763, there was a dozen years of agitation concerning the taxation and commerce of the Colonies. As a man of business, responsible for much property, engaged in exports and imports, Washington grasped the full significance of events, and with a deliberation that made his decisions the final word of the people took the patriots' side. While it is impossible to say that he thus early had a plan for his country that he finally put into operation, it is a fact that all the plans of consequence thereafter adopted by the country to the end of his life were the result of his approval and support.

When he went to the Congress at Philadelphia he wore his uniform. He knew that the issues meant war and he knew that war meant independence or annihilation. It was his plan for independence, which was for long periods solely dependent on his resolution and military skill, that finally prevailed.

When peace came, turning his attention to agriculture and commerce, he saw that the regions beyond the Alleghanies could only be held by economic ties dependent on transportation. He thought a canal up the Potomac was necessary. That meant the cooperation of several States. When a convention was called for this purpose it was found to be inadequate, and was dissolved, to be replaced by a national convention, called for the purpose of establishing a Federal Government. When it met, not only because he was the leading citizen but the leading nationalist, Washington was chosen to preside over it. The result was a proposal for the Constitution and the Union. As the war could not have been won without him, so the Constitution could not have been adopted without him. The Nation has since been governed in accordance with his plan.

It is one thing for a people to go through the form of adopting a constitution, but it is quite another to put it into successful and permanent operation. Our form of government was new to human experience. All the rest of the world thought it could not last. It was inevitable and absolutely necessary for Washington to be made the first President. Without his ability, his prestige, and his character, it is probable our Government might have broken up before it had a fair start. He made it a success because of his firm belief in the principle of government. He had had enough experience so that he knew the necessity of exercising all of the sovereign authority which the new Constitution provided. But his plan was for the exercise of the authority which the people themselves had created. His constant desire was to administer their Government.

Too little emphasis has been placed on his faith in a government of the people. When, in the confusion and bankruptcy of the closing months of the Revolution, the Army started a movement to make him king, he promptly denounced it. He wanted a government of the people, but he wanted it to be a real government capable of governing. Law and order were his gospel. He sympathized with his soldiers and the people in their distress and sought to relieve them by legal means, but he would fight usurpation of a mob as readily as usurpation of a monarch.

When he took office, the most pressing requirements of the new Government and the people were financial. It was here that the sound business experience and judgment of Washington were of supreme importance. He knew how to deal with questions of taxation, commerce, and credit. For working out the details he had Hamilton as his Secretary of the Treasury, but his were the final decisions.

To provide funds, import duties, and internal-revenue taxes were levied. When some people in Pennsylvania resisted payment with force the Army was sent to execute the law. The debts of the States, contracted for national defense, were assumed. To facilitate the operations of the Treasury in collecting and disbursing funds and maintaining credit operations a national bank was established. His policy was to strengthen the National Union sufficiently to make it a complete reality without encroaching on the States. He had seen enough of the futility of a government without authority when he commanded the Army.

His foreign policy was independence, peace, justice, and neutrality. Public clamor could not induce him to become involved in the French Revolution. He signed the treaty with England that was at first so unpopular and made a treaty with Spain, opening the Mississippi, because he knew both were beneficial to our commerce.

Finally he summed up his political creed in his Farewell Address. He believed in liberty and the Union unhampered by national jealousies. He urged respect for authority and obedience to law. Education, religion, and morality he considered necessary supports of free institutions. Careful maintenance of the public credit by a sparing use of it, impartial justice to all nations, permanent alliance with none, and adequate national defense were some of the important points in the wise plan for future action which he presented to his countrymen.

Washington had a deep understanding of human nature and a profound loyalty to the truth. He had the best political judgment and was the best soldier of his time. His permanent success as a statesman was due to his ability to apply business principles to political needs. Our country has never made a mistake when following his counsel.

DEATH OF HON. SANFORD KIRKPATRICK

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the death of Hon. Sanford Kirkpatrick at his home in Greensboro, N. C., on the 15th day of this month. I did not learn of this until Saturday when I saw an account thereof in one of my home papers. He was born in Ohio, February 11, 1842, and moved with his parents to Wapello County, Iowa, in 1849. When the Civil War broke out he was 19 years of age. He entered the Union Army and served four years and four months. He entered the war as a private, and before the war was over he was promoted to first lieutenant. He was a brave and courageous soldier and had the admiration, respect, and affection of his comrades.

From 1887 to 1913 he was in the service of the Internal Revenue Bureau of the Treasury Department where he made a remarkable record. His duties kept him in the South most of the time. He established a home in Greensboro, N. C., but always claimed his legal residence in Wapello County, Iowa.

In the spring of 1912 he came to Iowa and announced his candidacy for the Democratic nomination for Congress from the sixth congressional district of Iowa. He was nominated and that fall was elected. He ably represented the people of this district in the Sixty-third Congress. During the World War and since, up until two years ago, he spent his winters in Washington. Many of you will remember his attendance at the daily sessions of this House during the several months of each winter that he was in Washington and the intelligence and interest with which he followed all pending legislation. His span of life was over 90 years. Mr. Kirkpatrick was a man of strong convictions, an outstanding patriot, and a devoted, tried, and true public servant. He has many friends in the district which I now have the honor to represent, who have learned with profound sorrow of his passing.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, 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 further 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.

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.

The CHAIRMAN. For the information of the House, the Chair will state that this bill has been read up to page 121, up to the employment service, with the exception of certain portions of it which were passed over, to be taken up afterwards, one on page 36, embodying the Bureau of Prohibition, which goes over until to-morrow by unanimous consent, and others, on page 49, line 19; page 51, commencing with line 23, and ending on page 52 with line 18; and on page 101, line 14, and ending with line 25 on page 113. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States Southwestern Reformatory—Maintenance: For the United States Southwestern Reformatory, including not to exceed $139,857 for salaries and wages of all officers and employees and not to exceed $2,000 for the construction of buildings in accordance with the provisions of "An act for the establishment of a United States Industrial Reformatory," approved January 7, 1925 (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 832), to be expended under the direction and upon the written order of the Attorney General, or his authorized representative, by contract or purchase of material and hire of labor and services and utilization of labor of United States prisoners, as the Attorney General may direct, $700,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the total sum to be expended for such purposes shall not exceed $3,000,000: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury, if in his discretion it would be impracticable to cause the plans, drawings, designs, specifications, and estimates for the remodeling and construction of the necessary buildings to be prepared in the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, and the work of remodeling and constructing the said buildings to be supervised by the field force of said office, may contract for all or any portion of such work to be performed by such suitable person or firm as he may select.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UNDERWOOD: Page 50, line 9, after "$700,000," insert "no part of said sum to be used or expended for the payment of prison labor."

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I know that the offering of this amendment is perhaps futile, but it is my wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee a few questions pertaining to the appropriation here for the industrial reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio. It so happens that this reformatory is located in my congressional district. I know the gentleman has made a careful study and survey of conditions in that section of the country. I am wondering whether he could tell me how much of these appropriations has been expended for the employment of free labor.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. More than $400,000.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Also, whether or not the gentleman thinks it would be the part of wisdom during these abnormal times, with the unemployment existing in our country, to finish the construction work at Chillicothe by contract instead of using prison labor as extensively as we have in the past?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee held extensive hearings on that. It was the opinion of the subcommittee that prison labor should be continued at this site because it was required by the substantive law which authorized the prison to be built. This was authorized back in 1929, and the original act authorizing the building of the prison provides:

For the purpose of construction of such buildings the Attorney General shall employ the labor of such United States prisoners confined in the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga., the United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kans., the United States Penitentiary, McNeil Island, Wash., and State or Territorial prisons, penitentiaries, or reformatories who are eligible for confinement in said United States industrial reformatory under the provisions of this act and who can be used, under proper guard, in the work necessary to construct the buildings.

This is the bill that was before the Judiciary Committee for consideration in 1928. Mr. Foster, of Ohio, who was then at the head of the prison service, was asked and answered questions as follows:

And your idea was to get $100,000 or $150,000 per year over a 10-year period and to have it built by prison labor?

Yes.

So it would perhaps work up to over $900,000 for a 10-year period?

Yes; with first offenders, excluding the crimes of murder, arson, rape, etc.

It is interesting to note how the appropriations were made, carrying out the original purpose Congress had in mind. They first appropriated $100,000 to build a brick kiln, so that the boys confined there could make their own brick. The gentleman will remember there was opposition to it on the part of the Representatives from Ohio, but Congress voted down their protests and permitted the $100,000 to be appropriated for that purpose.

Then following that there was first carried in the deficiency act of May 29, 1928, $400,000, and that is in line with what Mr. Connor stated was his purpose, to use prison labor to construct the buildings. He said it would go on slowly. Later on, in keeping with that policy, the next appropriation, which was on January 25, 1929, carried only $150,000, and the gentleman will find again that Mr. Connor, who was then at the head of the service, made the further statement that it was the purpose to use prison labor in constructing this in line with the original authorization.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that the provisions of the organic act provided that the Attorney General, whenever practicable, should use prison labor in the construction of this institution.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No; that language was not used at all. On the other hand, the original act required that he should take prisoners from the four prisons I read and use those prisoners for the purpose of constructing these buildings. I invite your attention to the statement that was made before the Committee on Appropriations at the time the $150,000 was asked for. In speaking of the history of the institution Mr. Connor, who was then at the head of the prison service, made the statement, along with others—

that when the permanent building was constructed with the necessary safeguards erected it would be possible to receive prisoners direct from the courts, and that conditions at the reformatory were such that there was ample opportunity for the employment of all prisoners who had been sent to the institution, and that when the construction begins there would undoubtedly be ample facilities for the employment of all prisoners sent to the institution in the future.

In that connection the gentleman will note that this prison is established at an old Army base or camp, and the prisoners were placed in temporary buildings, provided with a hospital and dormitories, and while housed in these buildings they were to construct new permanent quarters.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Right at that point may I interrupt the gentleman to say that I note on page 386 of the hearings, in the testimony of Mr. Bates, director of prisons, a statement in which he calls attention to the dangerous condition of the buildings in which the prison inmates are now being housed. He further directs attention to the severe criticism in the Wickersham report because of keeping prisoners at Chillicothe in fire traps. The excuse offered was that we were building permanent buildings just as quickly as we could.

The question in which I am interested is this: Does not the gentleman think it would be better to proceed at this time and finish the construction work at this institution by contract and thereby give employment to free labor that is now unemployed, and in so doing expedite the work in order to remove these conditions?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman will find another statement that Mr. Bates made, where he emphasizes the importance of providing work for prisoners, where he says nothing is so demoralizing or hurtful to prisoners as idleness. At this prison there are 1,600 boys. They are first offenders. They are trying to rehabilitate them. They are there under a board of advisers, and on the board of advisers is the president of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Green. Labor agreed to the terms of this bill and as to the wisdom of the declared policy for the rehabilitation of these first offenders.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I hope the gentleman will not misunderstand me. I am not criticizing the chairman of the committee or the Attorney General of the United States or the director of prisons, but I have had several complaints relative to the institution in Chillicothe using prisoners as brick masons, as carpenters, as plumbers, in competition with the skilled labor of our section of the country.

I have before me a letter from a constituent, and in part this is what he says:

Being an employee of the Government under civil service as a brick mason at the United States Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio, I wish to call to your attention a grievance that the convicts are constantly employed as bricklayers, causing us an unusual amount of unemployment, which seems to be quite unjust, especially during this depression period, coming as it does directly from the Department of Justice of our Government.

Now, the objection I want to make is: I think it is unfair and un-American for the Department of Justice or any other department of the Government during these abnormal times to place prisoners in direct competition with free labor, especially in the skilled occupations, such as brick masons, plumbers, steamfitters, carpenters, and other skilled mechanics.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If the gentleman will read the hearings of the Hawes-Cooper bill and the statements that have been published within the last 30 days, explanatory of the purpose and spirit of that legislation, the gentleman will see that the American Federation of Labor acquiesces in the wisdom of the policy announced in that bill as well as other bills of this character.

In other words, they recognize that these prisoners are maintained at the expense of the people of the Nation, and that whatever the expense is, it must come out of the Federal Treasury, and that prisoners should be provided with reasonable employment. Such a policy is essential to health and to the morale of prison populations.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thank the gentleman and agree with him in part. There is just one further proposition to which I desire to call attention.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Bates states in the hearings on page 382 that they are using prison labor for the rough work, the fetch-and-carry work. Mr. Bennett states on page 383 that in constructing the buildings as far as possible the labor of inmates has been used. In that connection, the gentleman will notice in the hearings, page 384 and I may say that Mr. Bates and Mr. Bennett in the testimony given before the gentleman's subcommittee have stated that they were using prisoners only in the rough work and not in the skilled work—but on page 384, the future policy of the Director of Prisons is stated in answer to a question by the gentleman from Alabama. I quote from the hearings:

Mr. OLIVER. How much do you contemplate paying out of the $1,671,000 which represents the balance which you say will be expended to complete the buildings?

Mr. BATES. I can answer that in this way: There is quite a little history connected with this institution. I have come to this conclusion: That it is expensive to try to combine prison labor and paid labor, so we have not thought to employ them there on one job. In this program we have turned two of these dormitory buildings over entirely to the inmates as a training project. We have picked out three of the other remaining buildings, the mess hall and kitchen, school building, and assembly hall, and we are having specifications drawn on these to let those entirely at contract.

What I want to know is if they intend to permit the prisoners to do all of the work, skilled and unskilled, on the remaining buildings that are to be constructed?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If the gentleman will read further in the hearings he will find that I called the attention of the Attorney General and Mr. Bates to the provision of the law as to the use of prison labor and stated that while I recognized very strong pressure was brought to bear on the Attorney General to employ free labor, yet at the same time the original act did not contemplate that free labor should be used to any great extent. May I read section 5 of the original act?

That the discipline observed in said United States Industrial Reformatory shall be correctional and designed to prevent young offenders from becoming habitual criminals. It shall be the duty of the Attorney General to provide for the instruction of the inmates in the common branches of an English education and for their training in such trade, industry, or skilled vocation as will enable said inmates, upon release, to obtain self-supporting employment and to become self-reliant members of society.

For this purpose the Attorney General shall establish and maintain a common school and trade schools in said industrial reformatory, and shall have authority to promulgate all such rules and regulations for the government of the officers of said industrial reformatory and the inmates thereof as he may deem proper and necessary.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Just one more question. Here is another paragraph in the communication from which I read a moment ago. This gentleman says in part (I quote further):

Also, these convicts are not doing mechanical work as we do. When it comes to the real technical part, they build forms for them to place their brick in, which makes us feel that the Government is going a long way to keep us unemployed, when they

take our work from us who have passed the civil-service test in every respect, even in character, then turn our work over to the criminal element of our country; what do you think?

Mr. Chairman, this practice is unfair to the free labor of our country. Millions of our people are unemployed; anxious and willing to work, but unable to secure employment. I am more interested in these people than the convicts within our prison walls. I know our prisoners must be employed, but these are fearful and abnormal times. The honest man, with a wife and children to support, should have our first consideration.

He has committed no intentional crime. It is we who are committing a wrong against our honest citizens by practices such as these.

If the prisoners must have exercise, perhaps we can employ a few additional physical educational instructors to take care of them. But by all means let us spend these appropriations for as much free labor as possible at this time. I am making this protest to-day hoping that as much of this appropriation as possible will be used by our distinguished Attorney General and able director of prisons for the employment of free labor. I trust that these distinguished gentlemen, according to their testimony, will "continue to resolve doubts in favor of free labor."

For this attitude I heartily commend them and urge its continuance.

I am opposed to convict labor, competing with free labor, at any and all times.

That is the part I am objecting to, if the gentleman pleases. I think it is unfair to build forms for these prisoners in order that they may compete as brick masons with free labor in our section of the country. I desire to condemn that practice as not being consistent with the provisions of the organic law for the use of prison labor on this construction work.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. I was interested in what the gentleman from Alabama had to say about the views of the Attorney General. About two years ago another Congressman and I went to see the Attorney General about this proposition. At that time we were successful in getting the Attorney General and Mr. Bates to rule that because there was a lot of technical work to be performed there that they would be free, under the law and under the organic act, to permit the employment of a lot of brick masons and a lot of carpenters. They did that for one season, but last year they again proceeded to put on the prisoners. Can the gentleman tell me why they changed their policy?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes in order that I may explain this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this was the first bill that was passed for the purpose of seeking to rehabilitate prisoners in accordance with modern methods and lending real encouragement to those who had been so unfortunate as to commit first offenses. Congress was urged to establish a reformatory, and in the organic act it was provided that that reformatory should be under the control of a board of supervisors, so as to take away from it as far as possible the idea of prison life; that there should be no walls; that its population should be given vocational and practical training along many lines. The ages were fixed at between 17 and 30. Following the authorization, a fund of $100,000 was first provided for a modern brick kiln to provide brick for the construction of the buildings by the population of the reformatory. It was also provided in the organic act that the Attorney General should provide training so as to equip these boys to return to their homes fully prepared to engage in some useful trade.

When we were considering this appropriation we found that the Attorney General, naturally very sympathetic of existing conditions, may have, in response to the entreaties of the very capable Representatives from Ohio, permitted, in a larger way than the original act contemplated, the use of free labor. That matter is discussed in the hearings, and you will note that the committee thoroughly understood and sympathized with the position of the Attorney General. We knew how difficult it was to resist the persuasive appeals of the able Senators and Representatives from the State of Ohio, so the committee felt it would permit language to be carried in this bill which, while not strictly in line with the authorization act, does vest some discretion in the Attorney General as to the employment of free labor within reasonable limits if, in his judgment, it is found wise to do so.

I appreciate the attitude of the gentlemen from Ohio, and the nature of the protests filed with our good friend, who so ably represents this district; but if the House yielded to this protest it would have to yield to similar protests as to every Federal prison.

Let me say this: There is one class of hard workers who have never filed a protest against reasonable work by prisoners, even though it is in competition with their labors. It is a large class, yet the class upon which the welfare of our country basically rests—our farmers. All prisons raise vegetables and foodstuffs and operate dairies, but you have yet to hear from a single farmer a protest as to this form of prison labor. [Applause.]

I say, again, it is significant that on the board of advisers for this reformatory is the president of the American Federation of Labor, who gave approval to the legislation and who is now serving in a helpful way to rehabilitate these young men charged there with their first offense. The whole country is interested in seeing that the hand of sympathy and encouragement is extended to these lads, so that they may be well equipped when they return to their homes to take up some lawful trade.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have often wished that when such questions are debated, as the one now raised by our friend from Ohio, and are before the House, that the wives and little helpless children of men in our penitentiaries and prison institutions could be in the gallery. I wish they could just fill the entire gallery and let us look at them while we are voting on such questions.

What are we going to do with them? Are they to be cast off into eternal darkness? Are they to be eternally damned and deemed beyond the pale of help from our Government? When their husbands and fathers are sentenced to terms of hard labor are we to keep them idle in penal institutions, well fed and well cared for, with nothing to do and no means of making a little pittance to send to their starving wives and children? Is this to be the policy of this Government?

I want to show you what some of our prisoners are doing in our Federal penitentiaries; you may not know about it. Do you know that down here at Atlanta they are making duck cloth for your mail sacks, such as the samples I now exhibit before you, but there is an agreement with the Federation of Labor that the Government can not make and furnish but 20 per cent of the mail sacks. The balance has to be made in commercial shops where union workers are employed. We could make them all, all the mail sacks our Government needs, and they are good mail sacks—the best in the world for the Government—but the American Federation of Labor will not let us. We could make them all at about one-tenth of what they cost the Government in outside mills and in outside factories, but we pay this extra cost to satisfy just such union labor contentions as my friend from Ohio is making.

Let me show you something else. Do you know that the wives and children of the men who work there get a regular remittance every month? Do you know that the husbands send their wives and little children a regular remittance so earned by them every month? Is not this worth while?

I want to show you what else they are doing. Here is a splendid shoe [indicating], a good shoe that they are making for the Army and the Navy. They can make this shoe and pay all costs and pay the prisoner who helps to make it

something to send to his wife and children every month, and yet sell that shoe to the Army and Navy for $2.85. It would cost the Government $8 or $10 elsewhere. Here is a dress shoe that they make for the officers of the Army and the Navy for $3.75. This would cost you or me $12 at a store, and the man who makes this shoe sends a regular remittance home to his wife and children, and the Government saves by letting the Army and Navy buy this shoe. Look at it. It is a good shoe.

Here is a dress calf shoe.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment I will yield to my distinguished friend from Ohio, who is a most valuable man in this Congress. I want to show these things that are made by these prisoners who are behind bars. They can not sell these shoes to any other source except the Army and the Navy and our Indian Service, because organized labor has so circumscribed them that they can only make and sell certain things for Government use, and it keeps prisoners occupied, in good health, and permits them to make and send a small sum to their families each month.

They can make this shoe I now show you and pay all costs and pay the man something to send to his wife and children and sell it to the Army or the Navy at $2.60 a pair.

You know hunters pay $12 in commercial stores for this shoe to hunt in [indicating]. It is a good, stout, waterproof shoe. They make and sell this for $2.19 to the Army and Navy and the Indian Service. Why should they not do it? I say they should, and I am possibly the only Member of Congress who can preach this doctrine because the American Federation of Labor would get after you boys if you make this kind of a speech.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. SWING. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield to us for questions if he gets this time?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. That is what I want it for, to answer questions. I shall yield first to my friend from Ohio [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I hope the gentleman has not misunderstood the nature of my protest. I agree with the gentleman that these prisoners ought to be employed, but I object to the Government using them in skilled occupations, such as brick masons, and training them to become bricklayers and to go out and compete in an already overcrowded market for skilled laborers.

Mr. BLANTON. They should be used to build these new prison buildings.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But the Government went there and constructed a brick, plant. In so doing, prison-made brick came in competition with the brick industry of my State and district. I did not approve of this step. I knew what it would do to private industry. I am now protesting against prison labor coming in further competition with free labor.

Mr. BLANTON. I quite agree with my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that prison labor should not be permitted to come in competition with free labor. And we do not permit prison labor to compete against free labor. We permit prison labor to make only such things as the Government must use itself.

The chairman of our committee has already pointed out that at every prison the inmates raise gardens and truck produce that they daily eat, and not a farmer has ever protested.

Does my friend know that there are many wives who stay loyal to prisoners while they are serving terms, and they are there when the man is turned out. Does anyone want them to go back to stealing again, breaking open houses again? Do you want them to commit new crimes, or do you want them to be prepared when they come out to make an honest-to-God living?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I agree with the gentleman from Texas, in part. He is a student, a scholar, and an able statesman. But has the gentleman given any consideration to the hundreds of honest men who are unemployed, and to their women and children who are facing destitution and want?

Mr. BLANTON. This Congress should do something for the unemployed. We have done entirely too much for big interests. Congress has given $2,000,000,000 to the railroads, $125,000,000 to the land banks that are still robbing the farmers in the country, and whenever I vote here in the future it is going to be for the people, the actual starving people of this country. I am going to vote for no other kind of bill for any other purpose that comes here. [Applause.] Now I will yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SWING. The gentleman has made a very touching appeal in behalf of the wives and children of men who have been convicted of a willful violation of law. Would you have Congress establish a precedent of dealing more kindly with those than it would with the wives and children of law-abiding citizens, thousands of whom are now out of work and their families suffering because of this very competition from convict-made goods?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I am for the honest ones first, but I am also in favor of trying to redeem the dishonest ones.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. I gladly yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I heard the gentleman say something about the joint land banks and the foreclosures.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; to-day at Albany, Tex., they put a poor farmer out in the cold and took possession of his farm, worth $10,000, several times what he owed them, because he could not pay the interest on $1,500. There was the joint-stock land bank at Dallas, Tex., created to help the farmers rather than to absolutely ruin them——

Mr. ABERNETHY. Let me say this, that I have a letter from a friend. He has had his land sold by one of these joint-stock land banks.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, I can not yield further, as we will discuss the land banks later.

I want to answer the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER], who is so anxious to interrupt me that he can not sit still. Here is what we are going to do for honest citizens outside of penitentiaries. We are going to take over and run this Government in behalf of all the people. I have just received a telegram which is the most encouraging news I ever had in a long time.

It comes from a big convention at San Antonio, where the Battle of the Alamo was fought, and it is as follows:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *February 22, 1932.*

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives:

Demonstration here to-day in favor of GARNER for President. Greatest ever held in Texas. Every section of Texas and many other Southern States represented. Texas to-day gives its solid support to the GARNER-for-President movement. GARNER must be drafted by the Democracy of the country. All political leaders and the South's leading business men join me in asking this be read before your body if the time is opportune.

T. N. PICNOT.

That is the most encouraging news I have heard, because if we Democrats do draft our Speaker and he is nominated, he will be elected, and then there will be a people's rule of this Government, and it will once again be a government of the people, for the people, and by the people, and we will not have any more trouble about finding work for honest men seeking jobs or for men in penitentiaries, because there will not be so many of them in the penitentiaries; there will be a way of earning an honest living outside of them.

Mr. SCHAFER. Why will the gentleman not find so many in the penitentiaries? Does he believe that his candidate will repeal the prohibition law? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, there he goes again. There is no power here in Washington that can repeal the prohibition law. You know, my friends, the gentleman from Wisconsin would be a very valuable Member if he could get prohibition off his mind. I want to ask him a question, and I want the gentleman to tell us the God's truth. Is the gentleman a wet or a dry? [Laughter.]

Mr. SCHAFER. I am not both, like the gentleman's candidate. I am a wet.

Mr. BLANTON. All right; he is a wet. Now, let me ask the gentleman another question. Did the gentleman vote in the election in 1928 for so-called dry Mr. Hoover or wet Mr. Smith?

Mr. SCHAFER. I voted for the most favorable candidate from the wet standpoint, because the gentleman's candidate, Mr. Smith——

Mr. BLANTON. Whom did the gentleman vote for?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Hoover.

Mr. BLANTON. That is it, you see.

Mr. SCHAFER. Let the gentleman yield until I answer the question. The gentleman's candidate for President in 1928, in his Milwaukee speech, correctly indicated that the President had no jurisdiction in repealing or amending the eighteenth amendment, and that before the repeal or modification of the Volstead Act could be acted upon by him, it would have to be passed by the Congress. He did not show any wet leadership at the Houston Democratic convention, but in his Milwaukee speech indicated he would do so if elected President.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have ever found the gentleman from Wisconsin willing to agree with me. He is a fundamental wet. He can not sit still when anybody is talking dry. However, he, a wet, voted for Hoover, and I have contended all the time that Hoover is as wet as Smith or wetter. The gentleman now agrees with me and says that Hoover is wetter than Smith.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MAAS. I take it the candidate of the gentleman from Texas is a dry.

Mr. BLANTON. I will let my candidate declare himself in his own way.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, we have been very liberal in this debate.

Mr. BLANTON. I was through, but I wanted to answer the gentleman.

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

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that we are all tempted this evening to have a field day in no man's land, but we are now considering a very important bill, and it is the hope of the House that we may finish the bill not later than to-morrow evening. I have consulted Members on both sides, and find a strong sentiment that all discussion be confined to the bill. I hope Members will try to observe that admonition in the further consideration of the bill this evening.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I think the RECORD should show at this point that joint-stock land banks are not Government institutions.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Could not I have 10 minutes in which to answer the gentleman's question on the merits of the bill, on the matter of prison labor?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama that debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out "10 minutes" and inserting "20 minutes."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin to make it 20 minutes instead of 10 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHAFER) there were—ayes 61, noes 63.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. SCHAFER and Mr. OLIVER of Alabama.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 69, noes 79.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion for the time being.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] may proceed for five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. Chairman, I want to briefly discuss the merits of the motion offered by my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], because in the fine city of Milwaukee, which I have the honor to represent in part, we have a great many shoe factories, as well as practically every other kind of industry. I was certainly surprised to find the gentleman from Texas acting in the capacity of salesman for prison-made shoes, when throughout the United States there are thousands, hundreds of thousands, yea millions of law-abiding American citizens walking the streets to-day unable to find employment. [Applause.]

Oh, the gentleman spoke in glowing terms about how wonderful it was for the wives and children of a convict to receive a check for the wages of that convict, perhaps a felon, who in these days of depression is working behind the walls of a penitentiary. But the gentleman failed to indicate that by reason of the work performed by those convicts which result in those checks going to their families there were just that many more wives and children of law-abiding American citizens, many of whom offered their all in time of war in the military and naval services, who do not receive a pay check because the bread-winner of the family is unable to find a position.

In these dark days of depression and unemployment we should be bending our efforts toward reducing the amount of shoes and other articles manufactured by convicts who are confined in the prisons instead of increasing it. If jobs are to be furnished through the manufacture of shoes and other products, let those law-abiding citizens have the work in preference to the convicts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended one minute.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have one additional minute. I want to ask him a question.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to make a short statement.

I know everyone is anxious to get back to the bill. We have enjoyed the speeches which have just been made, and I am sure the gallery enjoyed them, but it is important that we get down to a business consideration of the items in this very important bill.

I desire to say, so that no wrong impression can possibly be had from what has been said, that this reformatory was established with the full approval of the American Federation of Labor. As stated before, the president of the Ameri-

can Federation of Labor is a member of the board of advisors.

This act requires that the board of advisers, before any young man is returned to his home, must make every possible effort to find lawful employment for him. The public is willing to forget the past of every young offender who leaves this institution with a good record. Those in control strive to educate and to rehabilitate these unfortunates, so that they may take their places in the honorable walks of life along with their fellows. That is the purpose of this legislation.

I want to emphasize this so that no one may gather from anything which may have been said that there has been opposition at any time on the part of organized labor to the establishment of this reformatory. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the completion of the United States hospital for defective delinquents, including the cost of purchasing a site, remodeling, constructing, and equipping the necessary buildings thereon, purchase of mechanical equipment, and all other expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the act entitled "An act to establish a hospital for defective delinquents," approved May 13, 1930 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 18, secs. 871, 872, 880), to be expended under the direction and upon the written order of the Attorney General, by contract or purchase of material and hire of labor and services and utilization of labor of United States prisoners, as the Attorney General may direct, $775,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri: That the numbers "$775,000," in line 16, at page 52, be stricken out and the numbers "$1,250,000" inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in the beginning I want to say that I commend the able members of this committee for their contribution in an effort to balance the Budget of the Government. However, I feel that in cases where there is an imminent need for an increased appropriation, or where the Government is legally or morally obligated to appropriate an increased amount, there should be such increased appropriation. I have offered an amendment which seeks to increase the appropriation carried in this item from $775,000 to $1,250,000. The amendment seeks to increase the appropriation to the amount recommended by the Budget.

The item carries an appropriation for the completion of a hospital for defective delinquents located at Springfield, Mo.

In the very brief time allotted to me I can not in detail discuss this case. Summarizing, however, may I say, that in 1930 the United States Government found it had in its various penal institutions many persons who were either insane or bordering upon insanity; it also found that in such penal institutions there were large numbers of persons who were afflicted with tuberculosis and that as a matter of justice to those inmates and as a matter of economy it was expedient and necessary that they be grouped and segregated from the other prisoners. Consequently in 1930 a congressional committee was appointed. This committee made a recommendation that a hospital for defective delinquents be constructed at a cost of not to exceed $2,500,000. This hospital was to be constructed under the supervision of the Attorney General.

Under this authorization Mr. Sanford Bates, whom we heard justly lauded on the floor of this House last Saturday, prepared and circulated data in the various communities interested soliciting the donation of a site for this great improvement. I should like to call to the attention of the Congress certain statements made in the data furnished by Mr. Bates. Among such statements and representations are found the following:

Character of institution: The proposed hospital for defective delinquents, to be located in Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, or Missouri, will be used for the care and treatment of offenders against the United States who are mentally abnormal, who suffer from chronic diseases, such as tuberculosis, cancer, senility, and the like. The institution will be built by private contractors at an estimated cost of $2,500,000.

Relying upon these representations made by the United States Government, the good people of the city of Springfield, Mo., which is located in my district, combined together and raised $133,500, purchased a site for this hospital and gave it free of charge to the United States Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. A contract has been let for this great improvement and the work thereon is now in progress.

Mr. Bates, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, in the Budget, realizing the imminent and emergent need of this great improvement and fully realizing the representations made by the Government to the people of Springfield, recommended that the appropriation carry $1,250,000 to complete the improvement. The committee has reduced this appropriation to $775,000. I understand they claim they have done this because they think it is not longer necessary to include within the improvement the tubercular unit of the hospital.

This institution is destined to be the most significant penal institution in the United States, because it is intended to house all of the medical penal problems of the Government. It represents the humanitarianism of our great United States in its treatment of those unfortunates who, because of mental, physical, or other causes over which they had no control, transgressed the laws of the land. Such unfortunate victims of these disturbing influences must have the humane treatment this great improvement contemplates.

Mr. Bates, before the committee, stated that there were now from 15 to 25 prisoners who were insane or bordering upon insanity in each of our Federal prisons.

He further stated, ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, that to-day there was a large number of tubercular inmates in the various prisons, and that at the Atlanta Prison they now had from 40 to 50 tubercular prisoners in tents in the yard; that in the winter those tents are all buttoned up, with an oil stove inside, and that these tubercular prisoners have to live in these tents with these oil stoves burning, and that they need better treatment. He recommended that this hospital be completed so that this humane treatment might be accorded to these defective delinquent prisoners.

Springfield is one of the leading cities, commercially and industrially, of the Middle West, located at the foothills of the Ozark Mountains, and surrounded by a great agricultural region.

This hospital is located in the greatest scenic and healthful region in the entire United States. I would like to say for the benefit of some of you Members of Congress who have not had the pleasure of sojourning for a time in this region that in the Ozark Mountain region one can always find invigorating and health-giving climate and atmosphere, and because of that condition this hospital is singularly well located for the treatment of tubercular prisoners.

I appeal to you to increase this appropriation for three reasons. First, as a matter of simple, plain economy. It will cost the Government of the United States less to equip and build a hospital with the facilities to care for tubercular patients than it will to continue the treatment of such patients in the hospitals as they are now existing.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Does the gentleman feel that the Government is morally obligated to the people of his district to go through with the promise they made when the people of his district gathered up the money to purchase the site where this hospital is to be built?

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. I certainly think the Government is morally obligated to fulfill that agreement and I intended to mention that in just a moment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I assume the purpose of the gentleman's amendment is to provide funds for the building of a separate tuberculosis hospital.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Yes; as included in the program.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. In other words, it is a hospital the design of which the gentleman has seen, which is separate and apart from the hospital now being constructed under contract.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. That is the purpose of the amendment, for the reason that the original plans and data contemplated that.

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. HOPKINS. I would like at this point to get the gentleman's opinion, and particularly the opinion of the chairman of the subcommittee, as to the effect of the word "completion," where it reads "for the completion of the United States hospital," inasmuch, as the gentleman has pointed out in such a fine way, the Government did promise to build a two and a half million dollar institution and gave an implied promise and an implied contract to do that, if the citizens of that district would raise $135,000, which they did.

If the bill is passed as it is, without amendment, although I hope they will adopt the gentleman's amendment, yet is it the intention of the Committee on Appropriations to limit the cost of this hospital to the $2,025,000 which this bill will provide as the total cost?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will state to the gentleman that I shall ask permission of the committee to make a statement about this matter. There is no authority of law for the building of a separate tuberculosis hospital, and I think this will be made clear. If later it is the desire of the Congress to build a tuberculosis hospital, that will have to be taken up with the legislative committee. Of course, they would have the right to use wards in this hospital for the purpose of placing tubercular patients there, if the Attorney General desires to do so. I do not want to take more of the gentleman's time.

Mr. HOPKINS. I was wondering whether that language meant that this was for the entire completion of the hospital.

Much has been said about the need to cut appropriations, and I, for one, am highly in favor of reducing many Government expenditures, but in this case a different issue is at stake. I want to summarize the case as presented by me and my colleagues from Missouri:

First. Congress in May, 1930, authorized a two and a half million dollar hospital for defective delinquents, mentally or physically.

Second. The Department of Justice broadcast a "statement of facts" on which many cities submitted bids. Springfield, Mo., submitted what was considered the best bid and gave $133,500 to purchase a site for this two and a half million dollar hospital. This, in my opinion, constituted an implied contract on the part of the Government to build a two and a half million dollar hospital. Not to do so at this time smacks of bad faith on the part of our Government.

Third. The testimony indicates that this two and a half million dollar hospital is needed. As a matter of fact, the Department of Justice requested $3,000,000 originally. Furthermore, the testimony shows clearly that unless this hospital is completed as requested by the Department of Justice many tubercular patients must be left at their respective prisons without regard for the danger to the lives of those hospitalized with them.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] warns against the Federal Government building too fine and complete hospitals for criminals. This argument comes too late. Congress has already decided its policy, and it is not the function of the Appropriations Committee to make any changes in substantive law.

The people of Springfield accepted the promise of the Government in good faith, and I urge my colleagues at this time to vote for the amendment and carry out this agreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. I think this increased appropriation should be made from a humanitarian standpoint. The original plan certainly contemplated, as the data of the Director of Prisons clearly show, that the tuberculosis unit would be built in this hospital.

The evidence to-day is that in the Atlanta prison there are from 40 to 50 tubercular prisoners living in tents and under insanitary arrangements, and we ought to be prompted from the humanitarian standpoint to properly build this hospital so they can have humane treatment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will ask the gentleman if it is his understanding that at the time this site was selected, the Government represented to these people that this tuberculosis hospital would be constructed, and that this $133,500 was pledged with the understanding that a tuberculosis hospital would be built in connection with the institution for defectives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. To the gentleman from Missouri I may say that certainly that was the understanding, because in the data furnished by Mr. Bates is found the following language:

> That this hospital shall be for offenders against the United States who are mentally abnormal, who suffer from chronic diseases, such as tuberculosis, cancer, senility, and the like. The institution will be built by private contractors at an estimated cost of $2,500,000.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask this question in view of the statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee to the effect there is no authorization by Congress for the construction of a tuberculosis hospital in connection with this institution.

Mr. DYER. If the gentleman will yield, I do not think the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] means to say that Congress has not authority to go ahead and provide funds for the full appropriation. Legislation was enacted authorizing that.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I shall be pleased to discuss that in a few moments, and I shall answer the gentleman's question at that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. If I may proceed now, there is to me a most impelling reason why this increased appropriation should be included in this legislation.

As has been shown, the Government of the United States in an effort to secure sites represented and promised the good people of Springfield, Mo., that if they would appropriate $133,500, the Government would construct a hospital to cost $2,500,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

Mr. DYER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be given five minutes more, because this is a matter that the membership should know about, because a great injustice has apparently been done to Springfield, Mo.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I had in mind to ask the gentleman who made the promise on the part of the United States, and how it was made and where?

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. I thought that was clear, that it was made by Mr. Bates, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, certainly acting within the scope of his authority and under the direction of the Attorney General, in whom was lodged authority by this law to supervise the construction of this hospital. Mr. Bates prepared and circulated a paper in this community in which he stated that a tubercular unit would be built in this hospital at a cost of two and a half million dollars.

Mr. HOPKINS. And in addition Congress had made an authorization of two and a half million dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. That is true, Congress authorized the expenditure of two and a half million dollars.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. It was my good fortune this summer to be on the site where this hospital is to be constructed. It is a wonderful site, and I may say that in conversation with persons who had a considerable part in the negotiations between Springfield and Mr. Bates, there was clear understanding that the tubercular hospital was to be erected. Certainly, they are to be congratulated on the fine site that they have for the location of a hospital. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. The good people of Springfield, Mo., relying on the representations and promises made by the Federal Government, by diligent effort and sacrifice, combined and raised $133,500 to purchase this beautiful site and turned it over to the Government free of charge.

I received a telegram to-day from the Chamber of Commerce at Springfield, Mo., in which it urges that the United States Government keep faith with the people at Springfield. [Applause.] I submit to you that the Federal Government is morally bound to increase this appropriation and construct this tubercular unit.

The good people of Springfield, Mo., are composed of as fine citizens as can be found anywhere in the world. They have kept faith, they have done their part, and I say to you that it would be a gross violation of its pledge on the part of the Federal Government to decrease this appropriation and not construct the hospital as it promised and agreed.

Mr. GARBER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GARBER. I am not in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, but I am in opposition to the gentleman's charge that the Federal Government is under a moral obligation to carry out any implied or direct promise made by anyone, when it must have been assumed all through the negotiations that it must first have the approval of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. The original act provided for a hospital to be constructed under the superintendence of the Attorney General.

Mr. DYER. If the gentleman will permit, if he will examine, he will find that the legislation placed this matter in the hands of the Attorney General.

Mr. GARBER. Let me inquire, Did the legislation place in the hands of the Attorney General the authority to appropriate this money to pay for these buildings? Certainly not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Fair play and justice demand that the Government keep its faith and not decrease this appropriation.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the point of order disposed of.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I was anxious that the very able gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JOHNSON] should have full opportunity to present his views relative to the recommendations of the committee. He has done so in a very lucid way, and I note the presence of the other influential Members from Missouri and among them I see a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee who was on the committee at the time the authorization act was passed. Sometimes, you know, even Homer nods. And the learned gentleman from Missouri could not be expected to remember the provisions of the many bills reported by the Judiciary Committee nor the hearings had thereon.

You will remember I asked the gentleman who offered the amendment if it was his purpose by this amendment to provide funds for the building of a separate tubercular hospital, separate from the hospital now under construction. He said it was. I asked him also whether such tubercular hospital was some little distance from the hospital now building, and he answered it was. For that reason I reserved the point of order, because he has correctly stated the facts. I have the picture here of the hospital now under construction, and I wanted to get the gentleman's interpretation of his own amendment, because it is only when we understand what one intends that we can be sure of doing no injustice in the application of the law to the facts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Did they not state that the purpose was to build a tubercular unit in this hospital?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman's purpose is to build a separate tubercular unit, and he stated it was some little distance to the left of the hospital now building. At one time it was thought of locating it to the right of this building, but later it was determined to put it on the left.

Here is the picture of the hospital that the Judiciary Committee authorized to be built, and the act only authorizes one hospital. The contracts for that hospital were let last month, and it is to cost $1,710,000. When the original act authorizing the hospital now being built was before the Committee on the Judiciary, it was stated by those favoring the bill that they wanted to build a hospital with a capacity of about 550.

This hospital now under construction will have a much larger capacity than 550, and it is so well arranged that it will care not only for the insane but for the afflicted from any cause. They can well care for tubercular patients if found desirable. In other words, there are many open, well-ventilated dormitories in this hospital now building. You will have rooms for acute cases of insanity, for milder cases of insanity, for the aged, the infirm, the feeble, and the blind. You may also place in this unit of the hospital now building all of the tubercular patients, if desired.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. What part was to have taken care of the tubercular unit?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Here is the original act that was before the Committee on the Judiciary, and I call attention to it because the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER], who has been the capable acting chairman of this important committee so often, was no doubt present when the authorization bill was passed. The hospital was being urged for the purpose of caring for the insane, and they undertook to give to the committee the number of insane then in Federal prisons, and you will find that the wording of the bill itself relates to the insane, the feeble-minded. Nothing appears in the hearings nor in the bill as to tubercular prisoners. It referred to the insane, to the mental defectives.

The act provides that the Attorney General is authorized and directed to select a site in connection with some existing institution or elsewhere for a hospital for the treatment of all persons charged with offenses against the United States who are in the actual custody of its officers and who at the time of their conviction, or during the time of their detention or confinement, were or shall have since become insane or so afflicted with an incurable degenerative disease as to require medical attention. Then section 6 provides that there shall be a board to pass on the mental condition of these patients in the different hospitals, so that the Attorney General may transfer those that are found mentally defective or insane to this authorized hospital for treatment, and the following language may be quoted:

The Attorney General upon receiving such report of the medical board may direct a warden or superintendent, or other official having custody of the prisoner, to cause such prisoner to be removed to the United States hospital for defective delinquents, or to any other such institution as is now authorized by law to receive in-

sane persons charged with or convicted of offenses against the United States, there to be kept until in the judgment of the superintendent of such hospital the prisoner shall be restored to sanity or health, or until the maximum sentence without deduction for good time or commutation of sentence shall have been served.

Then, there is provision that the proper State authority must be notified at the expiration of the sentence if the prisoner is insane, so that the State may provide for him to prevent him from becoming a menace to the public.

When Mr. Bates was before the committee in support of the bill, on page 29 of the hearings, he made this statement:

That is a very real question in the discipline of prisoners, and so we have presented that bill asking for the construction of a general hospital for the insane and the feeble-minded.

That was the reason given for building the hospital. This hospital now under construction will care for 200 more than the Judiciary Committee understood it was providing for at the time it made the authorization. Congress was spending money rather freely about that time. It made an appropriation of $1,250,000 to start the construction, and since there were some tubercular patients in Atlanta, Ga., then being kept out in the yard in tents, Mr. Bates very properly called the attention of the Committee on Appropriations to the fact that they would be moved from Atlanta to this hospital when completed. I know he was perfectly sincere, and no one questions the honesty or sincerity of Mr. Bates as to any statement he may have made about the hospital. He no doubt concluded it would be better to construct a separate building for the tubercular patients, and undertook to draw plans for a separate building, first locating it on one side and later on the other side, yet some distance removed from the hospital that had been authorized and is now under contract.

This hospital, as originally authorized and for which plans have been drawn and the contract for construction let, can care for all Federal tubercular patients if it is desired to transfer them there. The question might have arisen as to the original act if it had appeared that it was to provide for tubercular prisoners whether the site selected was the best. I have no doubt it is a beautiful location, but we all know that where one is suffering from tubercular trouble they usually prefer going to a high, dry climate, such as is found in Arizona, Texas, or Colorado; even the rich go there. The Government has built hospitals to care for Army and Navy tubercular patients in those sections. The question might properly arise, if it becomes necessary to provide a separate hospital for tubercular prisoners, whether they might not best be located at a place in high, dry sections.

I am calling attention to the fact that this authorization act and the hearings had thereon show that this hospital was built to care for the insane, and that the number they provided for was in excess of the insane they were required to care for at that time. They said 550 would probably be the bed capacity. That was 200 more than the number of insane prisoners. This hospital, for which a contract has been let, will care for about 750. It is ample for present needs as to insane and tubercular.

Permit me to warn you against building too many Federal hospitals to care for the blind, the infirm, the insane, the tubercular. Why? Because when you do, it will be found that in many States, if not all, when it becomes known that the Federal Government is provided with excellent facilities for caring for these unfortunates, a way will be found to send the blind, the feeble, the lame, the insane, and so forth, to Federal hospitals, where they will be kept free from expense to the State, to the county, or the city.

We can easily go too far and—just as the Attorney General has tried to limit Federal offenses, where the acts are also offenses against State laws, so as to require the States to carry out their duties in providing punishment for such crimes, and not place this heavy load upon the Federal Government—so I warn you not to build expensive hospitals to care for State offenders.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. My distinguished friend from Missouri, a prominent member of the Committee on the Judiciary, in a very recent speech, speaking of the act which he sponsored, and which has brought many old and many young violators into Federal prisons, said:

If the States are to surrender their right to try these cases and to look alone to the Federal Government to punish and care for them at great expense, I would favor the repeal of that statute.

The gentleman was right. Carrying out just what I have tried to say to you, be cautious when you undertake to provide these hospitals to care for the afflicted who commit crimes against State laws, recently made crimes also by Federal laws. The States, the counties, and the cities are primarily charged with that duty.

It will be found that we have provided a very liberal probation system, where judges will be more lenient, I hope, in the cases of those afflicted with mental troubles, with lung troubles, with blindness, and other like ills, and we may be relieved of this load by leaving to States the care and punishment of such cases.

May I call your attention to one very interesting case? An insane man in a Federal prison, his mind slightly defective, I am informed, when he came there, becoming perhaps a little more acute—when his sentence expired, the Federal Government, at its expense, sent him back to his home, the home from which he came, to those who should care for him. What happened? The United States marshal was arrested because the State had passed a law against bringing into the State anyone who was insane. That case is still pending, so I am informed. It all shows that we must be careful in loading up the Federal Government with State, county, and city offenders where they commit offenses against State laws. That is why I wanted to call attention to this matter.

This is a beautiful hospital, wonderful location, no doubt; much larger than my friend from Missouri, when he voted out this bill, contemplated it would be. We are carrying every dollar necessary to complete one hospital, as authorized by law and now contracted for.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the hospital would have facilities to care for the tubercular prisoners?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Facilities far better than in almost any State; far better than in the gentleman's State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Would the gentleman contend it would be proper to house tubercular patients with patients who were not tubercular, or should they not be isolated?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. When this hospital was originally designed it was designed in sections. There are large open rooms, rooms smaller, rooms for acute and semiacute cases, rooms for the infirm. Tubercular patients would come under that designation. There are no insane patients for these units. The hospital has capacity greater than is required for the number of tubercular and insane prisoners we now have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Director Bates, of the Bureau of Prisons, did testify, did he not, that it was necessary to have enlarged space there for the tubercular prisoners?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think Mr. Bates unquestionably feels we should have that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. It is a fact, is it not, that the Federal Government, through Director Bates, represented to the various communities that this hospital would care for the tubercular prisoners, and upon those representations the people of Springfield, Mo., donated $133,500 for the site?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I have tried many cases; you have heard many cases tried in court, and you have often-

times heard of the rivalry between different localities for Government buildings. It so happens that in this case the record discloses that many States were bidding for this hospital, offering free sites. I wonder if when the wide-awake city of Springfield read the hearings and found that Indiana and other States were offering free sites if that was not a large factor prompting Springfield's offer of a free site. And what happened? The request was made by the department, when Congress came to make the appropriation, "Give us authority to accept a free site." Why? Because there are many free sites offered, not alone in Missouri but in other States.

Yet we now find this splendid community of Springfield complaining because, forsooth, we do not propose to spend quite as much as they understood the Government would. Two million and twenty-five thousand is appropriated. They demand $2,500,000. They say they donated a site costing $135,000, but overlook the fact that they will have a most wonderful building thereon, costing over $2,000,000, a building capable of housing many kinds of afflicted prisoners. We find the people of that community saying, "We do not want the Federal Government to save any money in building this institution to care for the infirm, the blind, the tubercular, and the insane." They insist, "You must spend more money and build a costly separate tubercular hospital," although the act authorized only one hospital. There is no mention made of tubercular prisoners in the original act. Why then do they protest? Because, forsooth, Mr. Bates in his enthusiasm said that this institution would cost $2,500,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Regardless of any mental influence that might have been exerted upon the people of Springfield which induced them to donate this site, yet if the Government, through Mr. Bates, represented and promised that it would expend $2,500,000 for the erection of buildings which would house defective delinquents, including those needing psychopathic treatment as well as treatment for tuberculosis, can anything justify the Government of the United States in now going back on its pledge and on its promise?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman is a lawyer, and he knows that every Federal official is nothing but an agent with limited authority. The people in this community were supposed to know what the law was under which Mr. Bates was acting. As I have said, no Federal official has the right to go out and bind this Congress for the expenditure of money in large amounts simply because he may sincerely believe he has authority to do so.

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. LOZIER. The gentleman has stated the legal aspect of the case very clearly, but does the gentleman think it is ethical for the United States Government to hold out to the public that they intend to build a $2,500,000 hospital, and solicit sites from cities, giving the people of those communities a bill of particulars, leading them to believe that it will be a $2,500,000 project, thereby stimulating them to more liberal donations, and then abandon a very considerable part of the proposed program—does the gentleman think that is ethical? Although no representative of the Government has the right to bind the Government, does the gentleman think it is ethical and morally right for the Government to stimulate people to make a donation of that kind on the belief that they are going to get a $2,500,000 proposition, and then when they have made that contribution the Government says, "We will cut it down to $2,000,000 or $1,500,000 without refunding in whole or in part the contribution made by a city that relied on the representations of the Government officials that they would get a $2,500,000 project—does the gentleman think that is ethical?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is a fair question, and I am very glad to answer it. Sometimes it is well to answer a question by asking a question. Is it the gentleman's opinion that it would be the ethical thing for Congress, representing 120,000,000 people, with a deficit of $2,000,000,000 now facing us, simply because the agent of the Government, with limited authority, and who, of course, had to follow the express will of Congress—everybody dealing with the agent being charged with the legal limitations on his authority—yet because in his enthusiasm the agent may have said that the buildings would cost $2,500,000—can it be that Springfield, in the spirit of a Shylock, can say to Congress it is unethical not to spend $2,500,000 on the hospital, although Congress finds that the hospital now contracted for will adequately provide for its prison needs and is in strict accord with the act of authorization?

Mr. LOZIER. Now I shall be pleased to answer the question propounded by my friend the gentleman from Alabama, whom I always delight to follow because of his uniform fairness and great ability. Of course, if the Government does not need a $2,500,000 hospital at Springfield, it should not build one to cost that sum. But if it is needed to properly care for the tubercular patients, it should be constructed. If the Government, having made these representations and having stimulated an excessive liberality on the part of the people of Springfield, finds on further investigation that in the interest of economy and public service it is not necessary to expend $2,500,000 on this project, does not equity and good conscience require the Government to do what an individual would do in dealing with another individual, namely, go to the people of Springfield and say, "We have changed our mind about this matter; we find a $2,000,000 structure will serve all our needs, and as we are not giving you as much as you were led to believe you would get, we are now willing to refund to the people of Springfield all or a part of the fund which they were induced to donate on the representation that the Government was going to locate a $2,500,000 institution in the community"?

Does the gentleman think that after having obtained this donation on such representations, if the Government changes its plans, as it has the right to do, that in equity and good conscience it can retain the donations, there having been a failure or a partial failure of consideration?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I would answer the gentleman by saying that Missouri is ably represented on the floor of the House. There are many splendid lawyers in its delegation, and if these gentlemen feel that an injustice has been done Springfield because of the facts detailed by the gentleman, why not file a bill asking for the refund of $135,000 and let Congress pass on it. That course is fair and open to the gentleman. If Congress should conclude that the gentleman's contention is sound, the Government will save money by refunding the $135,000 rather than approve the amendment which the gentleman from Missouri now offers carrying $500,000 additional.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In this implied guaranty or warranty that is held here as having been made by Mr. Bates, was any time limit fixed within which the Congress should appropriate two and a half million dollars?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it therefore a breach of faith if we do not in this immediate bill appropriate the full amount?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I was going to call attention to the fact that we are cutting quite a good many appropriations. We cut one over at Chillicothe a few moments ago. We cut one last Saturday $1,100,000 in Oklahoma. We did not have this kind of plea then. It was said that building would cost two and a half million dollars, and we are providing less than $1,200,000 for it. You will find all through this bill we have cut appropriations; and if you do

not approve these cuts, how do you propose to meet the deficit? Can it be possible that when we can save money and provide facilities for our needs that then we are to listen to the plea of some locality that we must increase the amount because they feel we owe it to them because some official said a certain building should cost so much?

I want to now read you something that is of real interest.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman appears to be a very excellent lawyer and has stated here that the gentleman who made these representations was an unauthorized agent of the Government.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Well, every agent of the Government is unauthorized if he acts beyond the authority set out in the organic act, which in this case authorized one hospital, not two. There was no authority for a separate tubercular hospital.

Mr. MAY. I would like to ask the gentleman to explain to the committee if it is not an equitable principle, recognized throughout the law of this land, that the acceptance of a donation and the retention of it constitutes a ratification of the agency, if it was without authority, and if they keep the $130,000, that is a ratification.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If the gentleman is correct, and he feels he can impress the House with that fact, the Government should refund the $135,000, your remedy is adequate.

I now want to speak to you about another matter.

Mr. DYER. Before the gentleman does that will he yield to me?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. DYER. With respect to the statement that the Government or the representatives of the Government or of the Department of Justice did not have authority to proceed upon the theory they would get the full amount, I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the second deficiency bill of last year authorized $2,500,000 for this institution?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. There was appropriated $1,250,000——

Mr. DYER. Is not that the fact?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The Committee on Appropriations can not legislate. That was only an authorization, and no contract has been let thereunder for more than $1,710,000. So the contractor can not complain. There has been no contract let beyond $1,710,000, and we are carrying in this bill $775,000 in order to pay the balance due on the contract and to provide for necessary utility construction in connection with this institution.

Mr. DYER. Is the gentleman acquainted with that provision in the second deficiency appropriation act which authorized $2,500,000?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It dies with the year, the gentleman understands.

Mr. DYER. But there was authority in that bill for it.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If so, the authority was not exercised.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Will the gentleman now yield to me on a matter to which he has referred?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. The gentleman said that if the citizens of Springfield were dissatisfied or felt they had been defrauded, they could present a bill to the Congress. I want to state to the gentleman that the citizens of Springfield are not pleading for charity. They do not want to be placed in the position of asking reimbursement where they have been defrauded, if that is proper——

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yielded to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. They simply feel that they have been promised a building costing two and a half million dollars and that there is need for the building.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Gentlemen, I would not for a moment have taken up your time in referring to that part of the gentleman's argument if he had not confined his argument largely to that one fact, since to my mind, from a legal standpoint, it is untenable.

They say, because of the promise of Mr. Bates to give them two and a half million dollars, nothing else will satisfy. Then I say, if they are right, let them introduce a bill for a refund. Why spend $500,000 when we can discharge the obligation with $135,000?

Now, gentlemen, here is what I wish to call attention to. The committee found there had been very expensive estimates submitted for medical care at existing institutions. We found that at Atlanta, at Leavenworth, McNeil Island, Chillicothe, and Alderson, five prisons in all, that for many years preceding the recent legislation authorizing the Public Health Service to take over the medical service that we had been appropriating far less than was estimated by the Public Health Service. We spent for that purpose $84,980 at all of the institutions named. What do you suppose the Public Health Service requested for those same institutions? Two hundred and sixty-nine thousand dollars for personal services, which before had cost about $84,000. The committee said, "This was too much." Yet the committee was reasonable and only cut it to $200,000.

Take the hospital at Springfield. What do you suppose they estimate you should appropriate for medical services there after it is completed? The modest sum of $134,000; this to care for a hospital population of not exceeding 800 prisoners, whereas we have been caring for 11,000 prison population in six widely separated institutions for $84,000; that is to say, for medical personnel services. Here is the set-up for the Springfield hospital as it appears in the hearings on pages 434 and 435:

A supplemental list of medical personnel to be required for the Springfield institution includes the following:

Number	Position	1933
	Medical and dental personnel:	
1	Superintendent (medical officer in charge)	$7,200
1	Assistant superintendent	6,028
3	Resident physician	9,474
1	Dental officer (assistant surgeon)	4,039
	Nursing personnel:	
1	Chief nurse	2,600
1	Assistant chief nurse	2,300
11	Head nurse (4 female, 7 male), at $2,100	23,100
18	Nurse (10 female, 8 male), at $1,920	34,560
	Visiting consultants:	
1	Consultant in surgery	2,000
1	Consultant in eye, ear, nose, and throat	1,200
1	Consultant in internal medicine	600
1	Consultant in Röntgenology	600
1	Consultant in urology	600
	Other technical personnel.	
1	Pathologist	4,039
1	Chief occupational therapy aide	2,600
1	Chief physiotherapy aide	2,600
1	Head occupational therapy aide	2,000
1	Head physiotherapy aide	2,000
2	Physiotherapy aide, at $1,920	3,840
6	Occupational therapy aide, at $1,920	11,520
1	Oral hygienist	1,800
1	Druggist	1,620
2	Laboratory technician (1 X-ray and 1 clinical laboratory)	3,240
2	Medical interne	3,120
1	Dental interne	1,560
62	Net total personnel services	134,240

If Congress did not come in and sometimes save the Public Treasury from the demands of public officials in executive departments, instead of a deficit of $2,000,000,000 you would have a deficit of $3,000,000,000. [Applause.]

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I am not finding fault with the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill, the gentleman from Alaboma [Mr. OLIVER], for whom I have

the greatest regard. I know that he is a most efficient public servant and is trying to do the thing that ought to be done, but I do dislike to have the gentleman from Alabama leave the thought with the Members that the State of Missouri or the people of Springfield, Mo., are trying to get something to which they are not entitled. I do not want this hospital, personally, enlarged as outlined in previous appropriation bills unless it is necessary for the benefit of those whom it is to serve, but the gentleman will recall that last year in the second deficiency appropriation bill we did provide for this institution at a limit of cost of two and a half million dollars. If we do not need the tubercular end of it, very well, but in the hearings on that bill there was testimony to the effect that it was to be used in part for the care of tubercular patients. That is true. I am not complaining or fussing with the gentleman from Alabama. I want him to conserve the resources of the country; and, if we do not need the money, all right. But I do not like the impression to go forth that I am, or anyone from Missouri is, and of course I speak only for myself, trying to get through an appropriation larger than the project deserves. I do not care so much about what the Springfield people get, that is a secondary matter. It is only as to what is needed for the people that this institution is intended to serve. If the facts are different now from what they were, and we do not need it, then I do not want to support it; but I do not want the impression to go out that the Department of Justice, acting in pursuance of legislation which Congress enacted and in pursuance of the act of appropriation that it passed authorizing two and a half million dollars, or its officials, or any one of them, have done anything but that which they had a right to do and should do; and I know that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], who is in close touch with the Department of Justice in these matters and with the superintendent of prisons, agrees with me that what I am saying is correct.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think that Mr. Bates is an excellent official and that he would not intentionally make any misstatement. He was encouraged, no doubt, to make the statement by what the gentleman has said. As a separate institution it was never discussed at all, because there are rooms and dormitories in this hospital being built where you can well care for tubercular patients, and much better than our States now care for these unfortunate sufferers.

Mr. DYER. I have no doubt of the correctness of the statement of the gentleman from Alabama, but there was testimony in the hearings to which I have made reference that it was to be used in part for tubercular patients.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Not before the gentleman's committee.

Mr. DYER. In the Committee on Appropriations itself, in the second deficiency appropriation bill. If we do not need this money, all right; but let us say so in a fair and square manner without reflecting on any official or any department of the Government that has proceeded under the authority of Congress in two instances, one the act itself and one the appropriation bill to which I have made reference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If this building, as Mr. Bates states, is necessary, does not the gentleman think, in view of the fact that there has been talk from the beginning of this Congress that there should be a great building program put out for the unemployed, that it would be worth while continuing it for that reason?

Mr. DYER. I would rather take the judgment of the gentleman from Alabama on a matter of that kind than of anyone else, but I want him to be fair.

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

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. HOPKINS. Provided it can take care of tubercular patients in this smaller unit, they will be taken care of in lieu of other patients who should be brought there, will they not?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think they have ample bed room for all patients that should be sent there.

Mr. HOPKINS. If tubercular patients are sent there, they will be sent there in place of people who are partially insane or invalid paralytics.

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

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto be closed in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

I regret that I must differ with the committee in this matter. I do so not because this institution happens to be located in my State but for reasons of economy, the very reasons that have been urged in opposition.

There is no question about the authorization. Let me read it to you. The authorization provides for patients—

> Afflicted with an incurable or chronic degenerative disease or so defective * * * physically as to require special medical care and treatment not available in an existing Federal institution.

Under this authorization the department planned an institution with facilities for the treatment of all such diseases, and, of course, they included quarters for the isolation and treatment of tuberculosis. No modern prison would be complete, no modern penal institution would comply with even the elementary requirements, which did not afford accommodations for the treatment of this dread scourge. The department, after consulting the most eminent medical authorities available, drafted plans providing for wards in which victims of the white plague could be humanely nursed back to health and usefulness. They went before the Bureau of the Budget with a request for an appropriation of $2,500,000 to carry out these plans. The Budget officials, after examining the proposition exhaustively, cut this estimate to $1,250,000. That was considered to be a minimum. But the subcommittee, taking into consideration the reduction in the cost of materials and labor since the plans were first drawn, reduced the amount to $1,050,000. That is the amount which it was intended this bill should carry.

And now we come to the real issue in the matter. In this debate we have not yet touched on the real consideration which brings this question before you. Up to the time the bill was taken up in the committee en banc no one had thought of omitting the tuberculosis wards. It had not been suggested either in the hearings before the Budget Bureau or the subcommittee of the House. And the appropriation of $1,250,000 was considered to be the irreducible minimum.

Why, then, this sudden proposal to reduce the estimate a further $225,000? It was not made for purposes of economy. It was not made in order to retrench expenditures. It was not made to balance the Budget. It was made because there were some who raised the question of location—some who believed that the site selected was the wrong place for a tubercular hospital. They insisted that it ought to be located in New Mexico or Arizona or some neighboring State where the climate was supposed to be better adapted to the treatment of pulmonary troubles. And they wanted to defer the erection of the plant until they could take up the question of location and go into the merits of the claim that ultra-dry climates are better adapted to the treatment of respiratory maladies.

Such position is not supported by modern scientific knowledge. That theory, once so generally accepted, has now been abandoned. And happily so. Specialists in the treatment of tuberculosis are now agreed that climate is not an essential consideration. The Government itself issued a bulletin emphasizing that fact just last month. If you will call up the department and ask for their publication under the title of "Tuberculosis," you will receive the Government's treatise on the subject, in which the emphatic statement is made that it is no longer considered necessary to leave home and go to some distant State to be cured. With proper care and nourishment this disease may be cured to-day in any State in the Union.

And, so far as climate is concerned, there is no more healthful place in the world than up here at Springfield in the foothills of the Ozarks. This section has become in recent years the playground and health resort of the Middle West. If any of you wish "to be shown," I invite you to come to Missouri this summer and drive along our modern highways and enjoy the beauty and salubrious climate of this far-famed "Land of a Thousand Smiles." You will then understand the selection of this site for this great institution. The department had bids from half a dozen different States. They considered more than a score of possible locations, and they did not decide the question solely on the basis of the contribution made by Springfield. They had offers of sites from many cities. They selected Springfield because they were convinced after long study and investigation that it offered the most healthful location that could be found for the purpose.

And now we come to the question of economy. Some may have the impression that a reduction of this item means economy—that it will save the Government money. Nothing could be further from the facts. This hospital must be built somewhere; if not at Springfield, then somewhere else. And it is vastly cheaper to build it here. This vast plant which is to be constructed at Springfield at an expense of more than a million dollars is equipped with a central heating plant, a general laundry, a common dairy, storehouses, administration buildings, farm and garden with all needed farm buildings. If the hospital is built here, all these items will be saved. If erected elsewhere these will all have to be supplied at heavy cost. At Springfield there will be no such construction costs to be charged exclusively to the hospital, and the additional cost of maintenance will be infinitesimal. To build the hospital here as originally planned will result in a very material saving to the Government both in original capital outlay and in maintenance for all the years to come.

And there was still another reason for the location at Springfield. This site was selected after full consideration because it is conveniently located, geographically, in the approximate center of the area which is supposed to be served. If it is taken over toward the Pacific coast and located on the outer rim of this area, the Government will be put to that much additional expense every time it is necessary to reach it or leave it.

In brief, for every reason which can be advanced—for reasons of geographical location, for reasons of health and climate, for reasons of economy, both in construction and maintenance—this hospital should be provided for as originally planned and intended and the amendment should be approved.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If the question was before Congress now as to whether they would build a separate hospital to care for tubercular cases, in view of the facts now known, this Congress would not, in my judgment, vote any amount. I will say to the gentleman that I have no desire to change the site unless later it becomes necessary to build a hospital for tubercular patients, and then Congress should consider the best place for such a hospital. That was not in my mind, nor did the full committee discuss it at all, but they struck this out and fixed the amount of the appropriation, because it was thought that would amply provide for the Government's present needs.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on this paragraph.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JOHNSON] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri: In line 5, on page 52, strike out the words "completion of" and insert in lieu thereof "continuation of the work upon."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 114, the item providing for commissioners of conciliation. I want to offer an amendment to that paragraph and also to the paragraph appearing on page 116, in reference to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. I do not care to retard the committee, but I would like to offer these amendments.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object. I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

Investigating mine accidents: For investigations as to the causes of mine explosions, causes of falls of roof and coal, methods of mining, especially in relation to the safety of miners, the appliances best adapted to prevent accidents, the possible improvement of conditions under which mining operations are carried on, the use of explosives and electricity, the prevention of accidents, statistical studies and reports relating to mine accidents, and other inquiries and technologic investigations pertinent to the mining industry, including all equipment, supplies, and expenses of travel and subsistence, purchase not exceeding $2,400, exchange as part payment for, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work, purchase of laboratory gloves, goggles, rubber boots, and aprons, $440,325, of which amount not to exceed $77,310 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, in my absence from the Chamber temporarily I have requested the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. DOUGLAS], a member of the committee, to offer some committee amendments.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: On page 102, in line 15, strike out the amount "$440,325" and insert in lieu thereof "$435,325."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Testing fuel: To conduct inquiries and scientific and technologic investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and use of mineral fuels, and for investigation of mineral fuels belonging to or for the use of the United States, with a view to their most efficient utilization; to recommend to various departments such changes in selection and use of fuel as may result in greater economy, and, upon request of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to investigate the fuel-burning equipment in use by or proposed for any of the departments, establishments, or institutions of the United States in the District of Columbia, $170,000, of which amount not to exceed $30,700 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: On page 104, at the beginning of line 15, strike out the figures "$170,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$136,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mineral-mining investigations: For inquiries and scientific and technologic investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and mineral substances, other than fuels, with a view to improving health conditions and increasing safety, efficiency, economic development, and conserving resources through the prevention of waste in the mining, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral industries; to inquire into the economic conditions affecting these industries; and including all equipment, supplies, expenses of travel and subsistence, and the purchase, not to exceed $2,500, including exchange, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work, including not to exceed $17,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $157,185: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for an investigation in behalf of any private party.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: On page 105, in line 7, strike out the amount "$157,185" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$125,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of inquiring of the gentleman from Alabama whether he has furnished to Members of the House a table showing the prices of automobiles, as was suggested in the debate on Saturday and, if not, when he proposes to do so?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I did not understand that I was to furnish such a table. I understood the gentleman was to prepare some amendments and submit them to me for consideration. That amendment will come up to-morrow and not this afternoon.

Mr. GOSS. Has the gentleman any definite information as to the prices of these cars in the various sections of the country?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. As far as I know, there is no reason why we should change the amount as set out in the amendment. I think the gentleman will find that cars of that class will be much cheaper a month from now than they are to-day.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I dislike to take issue with my distinguished colleague from Alabama. In these days of unemployment I do not see any reason why a request to return to certain items should be objected to when other Members have been permitted to go back to items and consider them. I asked unanimous consent to return to the item in reference to the commissioners of conciliation as well as to the item with reference to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, but the gentleman from Alabama objected.

These activities are vital to-day, because they are engaged in the work of finding jobs for people and furnishing statistics which are of vital importance. I do not understand how the chairman of this subcommittee could object to such a proposition.

I have never objected when any Member asked unanimous consent to return to items in a bill which had been passed over, items which might have had relation to mining, to the farmers, or anything else. I believe every part of the United States should have its say, at least, have an opportunity to offer amendments.

The understanding I had was that after the conclusion of the Washington exercises we would begin the reading of this bill. That was the understanding I had, and I would like an opportunity to offer these amendments. I do not want to take any time in debate on them at all, but I would like the opportunity of offering the amendments; one being an amendment raising the amount for the commissioners of conciliation by $20,000, which would allow them to have these conciliators go into these disputes in labor.

The Secretary of Labor says he is in absolute need of this additional money. The other amendment has reference to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and it provides for increasing the amount by $47,000, so that that bureau may continue the work of collecting data throughout the United States which is vital to the Congress and to the people of the United States.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return——

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Do I understand the gentleman is willing to submit his amendments without debate?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; I shall offer my amendments without any debate at all.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Then, may I make this statement, and I shall not discuss the matter further than to say that the committee was unanimous, both the full committee and the subcommittee, in the belief that the amounts carried are sufficient.

With the understanding, then, there will be no debate on the amendments, but that the gentleman from Massachusetts may have the opportunity of offering the two amendments referred to, I ask unanimous consent that the committee return to the sections referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. On page 114, line 13, after the word "service," strike out "$205,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$225,000."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONNERY: Page 114, in line 13, strike out "$205,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$225,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONNERY) there were—ayes 9, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. On page 116, in line 18, after the word "bureau," strike out "$533,337" and insert in lieu thereof "$580,048."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CONNERY: On page 116, in line 18, strike out "$533,337" and insert in lieu thereof "$580,048."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONNERY) there were—ayes 9, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Oil and gas investigations: For inquiries and investigations and dissemination of information concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of petroleum and natural gas, including economic conditions affecting the industry, with a view to economic development and conserving resources through the prevention of waste; for the purchase of newspapers relating to the oil, gas, and allied industries: *Provided*, That section 192 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 102) shall not apply to such purchase of newspapers from this appropriation; and for every other expense incident thereto, including supplies, equipment, expenses of travel and subsistence, purchase, not to exceed $7,000, exchange as part payment for, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work, purchase of laboratory gloves, goggles, rubber boots and aprons, $221,215, of which amount not to exceed $24,940 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: On page 106, in line 1, strike out "$221,215" and insert in lieu thereof "$146,215."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the committee what these reductions are. We are voting on all these reductions and know nothing about them. There is no explanation made of them, not even a simple explanation is made to the committee, and I think we should have some explanation. Is this general throughout the department?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. With respect to the first amendments, having to do with investigating mine accidents, there was a reduction of $5,000. Five thousand dollars was for the purpose of sending an American representative to England to cooperate with England in the matter of safety and safety appliances in coal mines. It was considered by the committee that this item was not now necessary. It might be a very nice thing to do if we could afford to do it, but in view of the critical condition of the country it is one of those things which we could well afford to do without temporarily.

I will say to the gentleman that the item of investigating mine accidents is a very interesting one. Under it the Gov-

ernment operates a coal mine in which it conducts investigations with respect to the explosive power of gases and powdered coal dust disseminated through the air. It conducts certain mechanical investigations. It conducts investigations with respect to the falling of roofs in coal mines.

It is my opinion that at this time we can reduce that item, but inasmuch as the item, with the exception of $5,000, has to do with the safety of human lives, because of the limited period of time to investigate the item—approximately six hours—it was considered wise not to ask for a further reduction. I trust that answers the gentleman.

Now, as to the reduction of the testing fuel item from $170,000 to $136,000, I think it is proper for gentlemen of the House to know that that is somewhat of an arbitrary act, a cut back to the appropriation in 1923.

The purpose of the money appropriated under that item is to permit the testing of fuel by the United States not only for governmental purposes but for operations conducted by States and private enterprise.

It was the feeling of the committee, although it was a very nice thing to have—experiments conducted for certain purposes—it was an item we could very well do away with under the present conditions, so the committee agreed that it should be reduced to the 1923 level.

Moreover, let me say this: That whenever there is created an agency to conduct experiments it is inevitable that the number of experiments which that agency is called upon to perform increases, not necessarily because there is an actual necessity for the conduct of these investigations but simply because here is an agency that is created to perform them.

Mr. GOSS. I think the noble experiment of prohibition should be considered by the committee and have a cut made there, as that is in the same line for experimentation purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. My particular function is to deal with the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. GOSS. I trust the gentleman will bear that in mind when we come to the prohibition item.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Mr. Chairman, I want to state to our friend that just now every family in the United States, rich and poor, who are spending money are asking themselves this question: Is it necessary; can we do without this expenditure?

It behooves the Government of the United States, as well, to ask itself that question; and that was the question that the subcommittee that framed the bill under the splendid tutelage of the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Pennsylvania continually asked itself.

Just now many States in this Union have reduced the pay of their school-teachers, underpaid anyway, and they are paid in some States by vouchers or warrants which they have to discount, and many of them are going to have only 4 or 5 months of school instead of 9 months.

Mr. GOSS. I agree with the gentleman that some of these items should be reduced, but I hope that when we come to the prohibition item it will have its share of reduction.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not going to get off on that controversial question, because we have two hours in which to discuss that question when it arises to-morrow.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. FOSS. I think the gentleman wants to be fair?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. FOSS. The school-teachers in Massachusetts are being paid with real money.

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad to know that; but, unfortunately, in some States they are not so well fixed as they are in the big manufacturing State of Massachusetts, which has received so much from the Federal Government in the thousand-million-dollar subsidy that is handed to them under the tariff act, and it is because of their lion's share of that thousand-million-dollar tariff subsidy they get in Massachusetts through the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act that they are able to do that, and it is the only State that I know of in the United States that now pays its teachers full 100 per cent. Out in Washington, are they doing so well, may I ask my friend?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, we are holding up the school-teachers in the State of Washington, although we need money. However, we do not want to see it from the Federal Treasury yet.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is going to do everything in his power to support the $700,000,000 bill which the Committee on Labor, of which a Massachusetts man is chairman, has reported, which will take care of not only the school-teachers of Texas and Minnesota and other States but of the poor people in the United States generally?

Mr. BLANTON. I have always been for the poor people. It is the poor people that I have in mind all the time. It is the poor people in my State that are now clamoring for something to do that I have in mind, and it is their private budgets that I want to help balance, and to do that it is necessary that the Members of Congress balance the Government Budget. That is what the committee is trying to do by decreasing these appropriations.

The Clerk read as follows:

Economics of mineral industries: For inquiries and investigations, and the dissemination of information concerning the economic problems of the mining, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral industries, with a view to assuring ample supplies and efficient distribution of the mineral products of the mines and quarries, including studies and reports relating to uses, reserves, production, distribution, stocks, consumption, prices, and marketing of mineral commodities and primary products thereof; preparation of the reports of the mineral resources of the United States, including special statistical inquiries; and including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase of furniture and equipment; stationery and supplies; typewriting, adding, and computing machines, accessories, and repairs; newspapers; traveling expenses; purchase, not exceeding $1,200, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work; and for all other necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, $273,430, of which amount not to exceed $221,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: Page 112, line 5, strike out "$273,430" and insert in lieu thereof "$225,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think we are entitled to some explanation of this.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I shall be glad to give an explanation of the reduction effected by the amendment. The item of $273,430 originally included in the bill, carried under the head "Economics of Mineral Industries," was for the purpose of collating and tabulating all of the statistics with reference to the production and uses, and so forth, of minerals produced in the United States. It was considered by the subcommittee that inasmuch as all of the mineral industries are now in a very depressed condition and the production of almost every one of the minerals has fallen off substantially, and because the American Bureau of Metal Statistics is collating and tabulating and printing exactly the same information, it was justifiable to set the appropriation back to the level of 1928, when the mineral industry was not in the depressed condition in which it is now.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. If I heard the amendment correctly, it means that the proposed reduction of almost $50,000 is all cut out of the field service and that still $221,000, or practically the entire appropriation, may be expended in the District of Columbia. Is this the intention of the gentleman?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. That was the intention.

Mr. TILSON. So that it will practically all be spent in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. No. If the gentleman will read the language carefully he will find that it permits the $221,000, but does not make mandatory the expenditure of $221,000.

Mr. TILSON. Is it not intended to spend as much of it as possible in the District of Columbia, and thereby neglecting the field service?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. It is entirely up to the Director of the Bureau of Mines to distribute these amounts as he may see fit. Most of the collating work and tabulating work is conducted within the District.

Mr. TILSON. But as the bill now stands, there must be at least $50,000 that can not be expended within the District.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. The gentleman is quite right.

Mr. TILSON. This provision has been practically stricken from the appropriation, has it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Yes. But if the gentleman will take notice, the $221,000 need not, under the language of the bill, be expended. The language reads that "not more than that amount can be expended." Inasmuch as a cut of some $50,000 had been made, it was considered wise not to limit the director as to where that amount of money might be most effectively expended, in order that the purpose may be attained.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. KVALE. The gentleman, in the subcommittee, has probably broken down this item so that the gentleman from Alabama will be able to tell us how many people will lose employment as a result of this cut.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I will have to state frankly to the gentleman that I do not know how many will lose employment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Bureau of Mines, $2,052,950.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if this is in the nature of new legislation on the bill?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No. That is not new legislation.

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) 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 had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SUMMERS of Washington (at the request of Mr. HADLEY), for one week, on account of death in family.

PENSIONS TO WIDOWS, MINOR CHILDREN, AND DEPENDENTS OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, although 13 years have elapsed since the termination of the World War, the Congress has failed to pass a bill granting pensions to the widows and orphans and certain other dependents of men who served their country during that trying period. The payment of pensions to widows and orphans of deceased veterans of the various wars that we have been engaged in—with the exception of the World War—is a fixed policy of our Government. It is not only a proper but a commendable policy. However, if it is proper for this policy to apply to other conflicts that we have waged, it is equally proper that it should be applied to those who served during the recent war. It is about time that the Federal Government should grant to widows and minor children and dependents of deceased veterans of the World War the same considerations that are extended to the survivors of deceased veterans of other wars.

At the present time death compensation is payable to the widow and minor children of deceased veterans of the World War whose death was either caused by service or hastened by something that occurred while in the service. In other words, death must be what is termed "service connected," before death compensation, as distinguished from a pension, will be paid to a surviving widow, children, or dependent parents. To connect up the death of a veteran with service is difficult, and at this late date is practically impossible. This situation presents a serious and troublesome problem, difficult to explain, and impossible to do so satisfactorily. It is an inequity which should be corrected this session. It is an unfortunate fact that practically all of the veterans who have died have left no estate to which their dependents can look for subsistence. This is particularly so with reference to those veterans of the World War who have taken the journey into "the great beyond." The condition that they found themselves in after the termination of the World War, physically or economically, was such that they were unable to earn sufficient to enable them to leave anything after them when they died. In most cases where they left a widow and children their dependents have had to look to the local government, city or town, for some assistance. In Massachusetts, for example, our local governments are compelled, as they should be, by law to provide something for their relief. The State contributes a certain portion thereof. There is absolutely no reason why this duty should not devolve upon the Federal Government. There is no reason why the taxpayers of State, city, and town should directly bear this burden. The duty rightfully rests with the Federal Government. The passage of such legislation would repose this duty where it belongs and remove from the shoulders of the taxpayers of the State governments and their subdivisions this burden and this cost. There is no justifiable reason why local government should be compelled to continue to carry this burden.

Such legislation should become law during this session of the Congress.

LINCOLN AND TO-DAY

Mr. MAJOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including an address delivered by Governor Pinchot at Springfield, Ill., on February 11 on the occasion of the one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAJOR. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

"NOT TO FIRST BASE"

How many of our national leaders can declare with Lincoln, "I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence"?

Can Mellon?

Can Hoover?

Suppose Abraham Lincoln were a candidate for President this year on his platform of human rights.

Where would he get with the controlling powers of the Republican convention in Chicago?

He wouldn't get to first base!

This Nation needs the spirit of Lincoln as it has not needed it since the Civil War. It needs his honest strength, his homely wisdom, his devotion to the plain people, and the sound and simple principles by which he lived and died. Never since he led it through the greatest crisis of its history has our country needed the Lincoln kind of leadership so desperately as now, when millions are in the deepest distress and tens of millions in great trouble.

But if we can not bring Lincoln back to life, nor turn to a living Lincoln for leadership again, we can still learn from his life,

we can still follow the trails he blazed. We can still turn, in our hour of need, to the things he stood for, to the ideals he held high, to the undying principles he loved and left behind him.

From coast to coast the Nation to-day does honor to Lincoln's name. But it is an empty tribute, a useless gesture, if we lose sight of all he worked for and fought for and gave his life to.

Many an orator will praise Lincoln to-day who would have hated and opposed him had he been alive. When Theodore Roosevelt died, the men who had fought him most bitterly, the men who contested to the last ditch everything he stood for, at once began to sing their hymns of adulation. To them Roosevelt was no longer dangerous. His enormous power no longer drove toward equality of opportunity and the square deal. They praised him because he was no longer in their way.

Is it not so to-day with Lincoln?

These men are doubtless glad enough that Lincoln can not be here to see how far our National Government has fallen away from the example he set—how little our leaders follow the ideals of the man they pretend to honor.

Lincoln was essentially a man of the people. Not because he was born in a log cabin. Not because as a youth he split rails and worked with his hands. Rather because his thoughts were the thoughts of the people, his desires their desires, and his whole purpose and action were aimed to protect and further their welfare.

He hated slavery because he believed in popular liberty. He believed that no man, black or white, should ever bow in personal or economic submission to the will of any other man. In that spirit he held that the first duty of our Government is to guard the people against every group and every interest that might try to take their liberty from them.

From this same root sprang his deep concern for the Nation as a nation. America, to him, was the stronghold of the rights of the people against political or economic domination by any selfish power from without or within. "As a nation of free men," he once said, "we must live through all time, or die by suicide."

In the 70 years since Lincoln died, what has happened to this Nation of ours, to which he gave the last full measure of devotion? What would he think of it could he see it to-day? What would he think of a government given over to fostering a concentration of wealth unheard of before, and blind to the simple rights of common men?

As Lincoln understood liberty, this Nation is not free to-day. How can men be free and equal when multimillionaires grow fat and multiply while millions go hungry and cold? How can the Nation be free when the policies of its Government are dictated by a handful of the overrich? How can its people be free when its God-given wealth is taken from the many and so concentrated in few hands that the 1930 incomes of 504 men could have bought the entire wheat crop of this country and the entire cotton crop besides? How can its business be free when 200 out of 300,000 corporations control half of its corporate wealth?

How can the Nation be free when its leaders put business ahead of human welfare—when they rank money higher than men?

I heard Senator NORRIS say the other day that Mellon, with his millions of income each year, is the only United States Treasurer in our history who ever had three Presidents serve under him. Is Mellon, whose only power is money, the right kind of ruler for a free people? Has Mellon anything in common with Lincoln? Has the administration, out of which he has just been promoted? Has Hoover?

We have more to fight against to-day than depression. We have more to regain than prosperity. Our greatest task is to rid our people of the shackles of concentrated wealth and power—to make ourselves once more a nation of free men.

How many of our national leaders can declare with Lincoln, "I have never had a feeling, politically, that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence"? Can Mellon? Can Hoover?

Suppose Abraham Lincoln were a candidate for President this year on his platform of human rights.

Where would he get with the controlling power of the Republican convention in Chicago?

He wouldn't get to first base.

How many politicians now in power have ever had a feeling, politicially, that did not spring from the interests of rich contributors to campaign funds, from politics for profit, or from their belief that big business ought to run this country?

Lincoln well knew that the principles of the Declaration would be threatened in times to come. He knew how future prosperity might dull the edges of the Nation's political perception, and how eagerly that chance would be seized on by those who wanted only to use the people's government to further their own private gain. It was prophecy when he said:

"The assertion that 'all men are created equal' was of no practical use in effecting our separation from Great Britain; and it was placed in the Declaration, not for that, but for future use. Its authors meant it to be a stumbling block to all those who in after times might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism. They knew the proneness of prosperity to breed tyrants, and they meant, when such should reappear in this fair land and commence their vocation, that they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack."

Prosperity-bred "tyrants"—the word is Lincoln's—are over us to-day. And they have brought upon the people the suffering that goes with tyranny, which is another name for government by autocrats, or plutocrats, or international bankers, or public utilities, or any other control without the consent of the governed.

Consider for a moment the depression and what is its main cause. Its main cause, all will agree, is that production has outstripped purchasing power. Why? Because too little of our national income goes to those who spend their income in buying—the farmer, the wage earner—and too much to those who, having more than they can spend, invest their income in more production.

So purchasing power falls behind producing power instead of balancing it, and the depression strikes us mainly because of the enormous, unhealthy, and unreasonable concentration of wealth in a few hands—a concentration which our Government has the power to stop, but which instead of stopping, it has promoted by every means in its power.

And now the same men whose greed brought the depression upon us have opposed and blocked every attempt to have the Nation help supply the necessities of life to those whom the concentration of wealth has stripped bare and stripped of their right to work as well.

Would Lincoln have refused to tax the wealthy to give food to the unemployed? Would he have allowed workingmen and their families to suffer through three winters without bringing the Government to their assistance? Would he have opposed a great national public-works program to give men jobs?

Above all, would Lincoln have given his first thought to big business in the face of human distress? Would he have turned his attention only to capital? Would he have mustered the Nation's resources only to the aid of railroads and banking?

Lincoln, who said, "Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration"—would he, while helping capital, have refused help to men, women, and children in want?

"We all declare for liberty," he once said, "but in using the same word we do not all mean the same thing. With some the word 'liberty' may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself and the product of his labor; while, with others, the same word may mean for some men to do as they please with other men and the product of other men's labor."

Lincoln had a name for that sort of liberty which opposes government planning for industry, government security for workers, government limitations on the terms of work that employers may force from employees. That sort of liberty which permits "some men to do as they please with other men and the product of other men's labor" Lincoln called tyranny. It is still tyranny to-day.

Again, Lincoln spoke of "the two principles that have stood face to face from the beginning of time, and will ever continue to struggle. The one is the common right of humanity, and the other the divine right of kings. It is the same principle in whatever shape it develops itself. It is the same spirit that says, 'You toil and work and earn bread and I'll eat it.'"

No better definition could be given of the spirit of concentrated wealth that infests our Nation now. The ruthless exploiting of the wage earner and the farmer, the unequal division of profits that dried up purchasing power and was the main cause of the depression, taxation that releases the overrich at the expense of the average man, the system which allows stock-market gamblers to amass huge fortunes without doing a stroke of work, all these are shameful examples of the twentieth century version of what Lincoln meant by the divine right of kings.

"This country," Lincoln said, "with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it." Certainly he would have used those institutions to save the country and its natural resources for the people to whom they belong and to keep this Nation free from the dictation of financial and industrial autocrats. To-day the United States is in the hands of big business and the great international bankers.

And that is precisely what Abraham Lincoln warned us against.

Lincoln said of the common people, "Let them beware of surrendering a political power which they already possess, and which, if surrendered will surely be used to close the door of advancement against such as they, and to fix new disabilities and burdens upon them, till all of liberty shall be lost." But liberty, though lost, can be regained. The people, through the power of the ballot, can still rise in their own defense. They can still cast off the chains of concentrated wealth and power that have deprived them of their liberty. And if they have the power they also have the right.

Listen to the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it."

It is not the form of our government that the people need to change; it is the substance. Under the ancient form a usurpation has grown up that is far more dangerous than any foreign invasion—a usurpation based on cunning, not on force, but all the harder to overcome on that account.

What our Government is being used for to-day is not the greatest good of the greatest number but the greatest wealth of the smallest number. The magnates who control it are seeking, through that control, the utmost concentration of wealth and power in the hands of the smallest possible number. Their gain is the people's loss. God knows they are succeeding in their evil purposes.

Let the people use the power that is theirs by every right, and return this Government to the rule of the people. Let them ask for nothing that was not demanded in the Declaration and established in the Constitution. Let them ask for nothing that is not American to the core. But let them free themselves and their children from the chains of special privilege and concentrated wealth. Let us have majority rule once more in the United States.

I call on the men and women who honor Lincoln for the living principles he embodied and not merely because he is dead. I call upon them to put in force once more the principles upon which this Nation was founded. I call upon them to use their strength, the strength the Constitution gives them, the strength that is in their votes once in four years. This Nation can never be free while its President is a servant of concentrated wealth.

Oh, I can hear the overrich exclaim in horror at what I say. I can see the lifted hands of those who have waxed fat. I can catch the denunciations launched against the man, any man, who dares to tell the truth about them and the Government they have acquired. But what about the rest of us?

What about the rest of us who believe in America as something more than a source of riches? What about the millions from whom the magnates have drained their substance? What about the millions who are hungry and cold? What about the plain people, whom Lincoln loved?

Is there any good reason why the people should not rule in America? They can if they choose.

They can if they will listen to Lincoln, who said:

"When the people rise in mass in behalf of the Union and the liberties of their country, truly may it be said, 'The gates of hell can not prevail against them.' * * * I wish you to remember, now and forever, that it is your business and not mine; that if * * * the liberties of these people shall be lost, it is but little to any one man but a great deal to the millions of people who inhabit these United States and to their posterity in all coming time. It is your business to rise up and preserve the Union and liberty for yourselves, and not for me."

GOVERNMENT WASTE

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a radio address delivered by myself over the National Broadcasting facilities on January 31.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address sponsored by the Sentinels of the Republic, Washington, D. C., January 31, 1932:

It is my purpose this afternoon to call your attention to how rapidly and inexorably you are drifting away from government under the Constitution as exemplified by the writings of Jefferson, substituting therefor government by bureaus, which attempt by advice and direction to order the very life of the individual. I am going to quote here some figures to show you the rapid growth of the Government departments:

The appropriation for the Department of Agriculture in the year 1910 was $17,136,736. The number of employees was 12,480. The appropriation in 1932 is $247,000,000. The number of employees is 28,000.

I want to call your attention to one bureau in this Department of Agriculture, namely, the Extension Bureau. The bureau opened up for business in 1904 with an appropriation of $27,316.04. The appropriation for the coming year, which has just been passed by the House, for this extension service is $10,428,066. This does not include some overhead here in Washington in the Secretary's office.

This Extension Service since its inauguration has cost the Federal taxpayers $140,390,000. When matched by the States and counties this will cost the Nation over $280,000,000. Add to this the $500,000,000 appropriated for the Federal Farm Board and appropriations for other agencies in the Department of Agriculture and the total will run over a billion dollars. When you take into consideration the condition in which the farmer is now, can anyone believe this money has been wisely spent?

There are scores of bureaus here in Washington duplicating services furnished by the States, whose figures are just as appalling as the ones I have quoted to you, but time will not permit my discussion of them.

I will only have time to discuss one department of government and one independent bureau—the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Farm Board. They are so closely allied that you can not discuss one without the other. The Department of Agriculture, through its extension service, employs somewhere between six and seven thousand county agents, whose supposed business it is to teach the farmer how to produce more per man, per machine, per cow, per horse, per hen, and per acre.

On the other hand, we find the Farm Board, which is allied with this department and its activities, preaching the opposite doctrine, namely, to reduce farm crops to a domestic basis.

The alibi of the Department of Agriculture for this paternalistic work among the farmers is that they are endeavoring to lower the farmers' costs by increasing their production, and as the farmers' costs go down through increased production their prices go down in inverse ratio to the rise in his production.

The futility of further continuing these two agencies, one for increasing production and the other for decreasing production, both at a terrific expense to the taxpayer, should be patent to everyone.

The Department of Agriculture through its various bureaus is asking for about $20,000,000 for advice and direction to the farmer. Since when have these bureaus become more intelligent than the average farmer? Most of the members of these bureaus would starve if placed upon the farms of those they are now attempting to instruct.

These bureaus are supported by so-called farm leaders, who represent a small minority of the farmers. They use the same methods and psychology that were so successful in the patent-medicine business of an age just passed. You no doubt have seen pictures in magazines and newspapers of the patient bent over and his face showing signs of racking pain, with the statement below that after taking three bottles of the quack doctor's remedy he became a real man again.

These farm leaders point out the ills of the farmer and magnify them, and then, like the quack doctor, offer a quack remedy. These remedies have been disastrous to the farmer and expensive to the taxpayer. The greatest quack in the country to-day is the Farm Board. In the President's Budget for the coming year the Farm Board is asking for $1,880,000 for expenses for its officers. Let me give you a few of these salaries: 9 employees receive an average salary of $12,880 each per year; 8 employees receive $12,000 per annum each; 1, the general counsel, receives $20,000 per annum; 1 receives $8,500 per annum; and 78 employees receive salaries running from $4,000 to $6,500 per annum. The remainder of these salaries run from $3,350 down to as low as $1,200. The total for this personnel is $1,167,000. This is simply for the administrative work at Washington. In the light of results produced, I think we could well dispose of this entire fungus growth upon government.

Through cooperation with the Department of Agriculture they have more or less the direction of the six or seven thousand county agents scattered throughout the United States. With these huge appropriations maintaining this vast aggregation of field agents, they spread their tentacles into every section of the country. All these agents are schooled in propaganda; and unless the growth of this socialistic body is checked, they will destroy the sound business institutions of the country and, like the cancerous growth upon government which they are, they will eat out with their enormous salaries and inefficiencies the very vitals of agriculture and all business.

The Farm Board now is engaged principally in organizing cooperatives financed with Government money. Practically all handlers of farm produce to-day are losing money. The men managing the Farm Board are well aware of this and are feverishly organizing cooperatives and loaning them money with which to destroy independent business. This will leave the field clear for them to exploit the farmers. Will they do it? They are doing it now.

Witness the salaries paid to managers of cooperatives with the acquiescence of the Farm Board that furnishes the money. In addition to the salaries which I have mentioned earlier, we have Mr. Creekmore, head of the cotton cooperative, who has been receiving through salary and commissions $75,000 a year.

Mr. Milnor, head of the National Grain Corporation, a corporation organized by the Federal Farm Board, receives $50,000 per year. Could you not, my farmer friends, too, shed a few crocodile tears over our plight if in three short years you, like Mr. Milnor and Mr. Creekmore, could build a fortune of from $150,000 to $200,000. This money comes either from the United States Treasury or from the farmers. Ponder on these facts as measures of farm relief. Mr. Milnor not only heads the National Grain Corporation but also is the head of the Stabilization Corporation. He has issued a statement showing that the National Grain Corporation has made a very handsome profit. What is the connection between the National Grain Corporation, which Mr. Milnor heads, and the Stabilization Corporation, with its reservoir of Government funds, which Mr. Milnor also heads? How much interchange of business has taken place between these two institutions and how much money has been transferred from the Stabilization Corporation to the Farmers National Grain Corporation in the way of profits or commissions? Keep in mind that Mr. Milnor is the head of both institutions.

The Stabilization Corporation, obtaining its money from the Farm Board, is the banking institution which furnishes the money for the purchasing of large quantities of grain, most speculative in character.

The National Grain Corporation is the dealer in the grain business.

Just imagine a banking institution whose president was the head of a huge speculative grain corporation directing the destinies of both the bank and the grain corporation, and the latter speculating heavily in the market. How long would the directors of the bank permit this affiliation?

The taxpayers of the United States are furnishing the money for the Farm Board's operations. The Farm Board, through its various institutions, is acting as banker and speculator. To say the least, this is an intolerable situation.

I want the farmer to understand that I am not opposed to cooperative marketing. It undoubtedly has its place in the scheme of marketing. But I am opposed to the Government taking the taxpayers' money and, with bureaucrats who know nothing about marketing, organizing uneconomic schemes, bringing about demoralization of agricultural markets. Let us examine for a

moment a set-up which the Farm Board is endeavoring to sell the public as a measure of farm relief. It does not matter whether the institution is a grain concern, a creamery, or a canning factory. The average investment of the farmer does not exceed $100. This institution must duplicate the plant, the capital, and the management of the independent concern. The third factor, or the management, is the weakest link. Let us concede that they are able to obtain sound management. It is a good concern in any line of business—in fact, a very unusual concern—that can meet competition in any line of trade or endeavor and pay 7 per cent on the money invested. If this given corporation paid 7 per cent return upon the investment, this would yield the average farmer $7. He can buy a municipal bond to yield him 4 per cent, with nine-tenths of the hazard eliminated.

Therefore, this would leave him an added return, if successful, of $3 a year. I want to ask my farmer friends throughout the country—and I am one of them—if this $3 spells farm relief for them? I answer "no." This cooperative marketing scheme is but "a red herring across the trail" to divert farmers' minds from the fact that a high protective tariff is being maintained for the benefit of the manufacturer, who can control his production, thereby increasing his profits and increasing the cost of the things the farmer buys. At the same time the destruction of the trade of the farmers' customers in Europe is brought about. This leaves the farmers' European customers unable to buy our farm surpluses and these surpluses in turn weigh down our domestic market.

There is no solution of the farm problem other than the broadening of our markets and the reduction of taxes. All the remedies of the quack doctors will fail. We have drifted far from Jefferson's principles, who said that "Government that governs least governs best."

Before closing my remarks I wish to quote from the autobiography of Thomas Jefferson, that great liberal who laid down as no man before him the principles of self-government: "It is not by the consolidation or concentration of powers, but by their distribution, that good government is effected. Were not this country already divided into States, that distribution must be made that each might do for itself what concerns itself directly, and what it can so much better do than a distant authority. Every State is again divided into counties, each to take care of what lies within its local bounds; each county again into townships or wards, to manage minuter details; and every ward into farms, to be governed each by its individual proprietor. Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread."

I submit to my radio audience that the truth of this Jeffersonian statement has been demonstrated. With scores of duplicating bureaus in Washington directing the farmer not only "when to sow and when to reap," but directing every activity of life, including the preparation of the food for our tables and the manufacture of our clothes for children, and with our granaries bursting with food, yet our population is crying for bread.

EXEMPTION FROM QUOTA OF AGED FATHERS AND MOTHERS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file minority views on the bill (H. R. 8174) to exempt from the quota fathers and mothers over 60 years of age of United States citizens.

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

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 475. An act to provide for the establishment of the Everglades National Park in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 23, 1932, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. RAINEY submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Tuesday, February 23, 1932, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE, RADIO, AND FISHERIES

(10 a. m.)

General inquiry into the American merchant marine, the United States Shipping Board, and Merchant Fleet Corporation affairs.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10 a. m.)

Railroad holding companies. H. R. 9059.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS AND COPYRIGHTS

(9.30 a. m.)

Mechanical devices; Authors' Club.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(10.30 a. m.)

Bills dealing with general suspension, restriction, further restriction, and prohibition of immigration into the United States. Bills to be considered are: H. R. 465, 1967, 4514, 4544, 4548, 4579, 4688, 6045, 6493, 7791, 8541, 9548; H. J. Res. 75, 216, 277, 300, 301, 306.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

451. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the secretary of United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting herewith a schedule in duplicate of useless papers in the office of the United States Civil Service Commission in Washington and in the offices of managers of certain civil-service districts was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 9629) to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN: Resolution (H. Res. 158) providing for the consideration of H. R. 8578, a bill to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, by providing allowances for widows and children and dependent parents of veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 310) authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for the relief of people in distress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 311) authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for the relief of people in distress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 312) authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for the relief of people in distress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANATA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 313) directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODRUM: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 24) thanking the Governor of the State of Virginia for the statues of George Washington and Robert E. Lee; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 9630) granting a pension to Fred Russell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9631) granting a pension to Allie Graves; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 9632) granting an increase of pension to Maggie E. Sowle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 9633) granting an increase of pension to Marion O. Fulcher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PERSON: A bill (H. R. 9634) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 9635) granting an increase of pension to Antionette E. Lupher; 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:

2573. By Mr. BRUNNER: Resolution of the Sons and Daughters of Liberty, Ozone Park, urging Congress to pass immediately bill 1967, to provide for exclusion and expulsion of alien communists; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2574. Also, resolution of the Polish National Alliance, memorializing Congress of the United States to enact House Joint Resolution 144, directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2575. By Mr. EATON of Colorado: Resolution of 37 members of the Jubilee Union, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Denver, Colo., opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2576. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of citizens of Standish, Calif., protesting against Sunday closing law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2577. By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Petition of Montana Branch of National Woman's Party, urging the Congress to submit immediately to the States for ratification the equal-rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2578. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Fleet Reserve Association, Branch 26, New York City, urging the prompt passage of the Vinson bill providing for the prompt authorization for the construction of all vessels necessary to provide the United States Navy with full strength permitted under existing treaties; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2579. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Hearne Chamber of Commerce, Hearne, Tex., favoring House bill 6305; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2580. By Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: Petition of Corinth (Va.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2581. Also, petition of Fannie M. Pretlow and 16 other citizens of Franklin, Va., opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2582. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the District of Columbia Congress of Parents and Teachers, favoring the passage of House bill 9142; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2583. Also, petition of the American Legion national legislative committee, Washington, D. C., recommending an increased appropriation of $50,000 for the promotion of rifle practice; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2584. Also, petition of the Merchants Association of New York opposing the passage of the Linthicum bill, H. R. 9393, to increase the passport fee and renewal fee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2585. By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition urging Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 144; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2586. By Mr. PARKER of Georgia: Petition of Eugene George and 47 other citizens of the first congressional district of Georgia, urging the enactment of Senate bill 2793, providing for the regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of busses and trucks carrying passengers and freight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2587. Also, petition of the Theodore Roosevelt Auxiliary, No. 2, United Spanish War Veterans, urging the use of Georgia marble or granite in the post-office building at Atlanta, Ga., which is now in the process of construction; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

2588. By Mr. PERSON: Petition of 1,277 citizens of Detroit, Mich., and vicinity, favoring the enactment of legislation to curb the activities of the chain-store system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2589. By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Josephine Unverzagt, Elsie Misner, John Unverzagt, and 36 other residents of Ellenville, Ulster County, N. Y., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2590. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the American Legion National Legislative Committee, Washington, D. C., favoring an increased appropriation of $50,000 for the promotion of rifle practice; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2591. Also, petition of the District of Columbia Congress of Parents and Teachers, favoring the passage of House bill 9142; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2592. By Mr. SABATH: Joint resolution of the State of Wisconsin, requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to eliminate the present abuses in the Federal land bank system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2593. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 3 of the State of Illinois providing for the immediate cash payment to veterans of the World War of the cash surrender value of their adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2594. Also, resolution of the State of Rhode Island, recommending to the Congress of the United States an amendment to the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2595. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 23 of the State of Illinois, requesting the enactment of necessary laws to establish a national military park at Laclede, Mo., in honor of General Pershing; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2596. By Mr. SCHNEIDER: Petition of residents of Ephraim and Sister Bay, Wis., protesting against any measure looking toward the modification or repeal of the prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2597. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of World War veterans of Armstrong County, Pa., favoring the immediate full payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2598. Also, petition of Nanty Glo Post, No. 619, American Legion, Nanty Glo, Pa., favoring the immediate passage of House bill No. 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2599. By Mr. SWANSON: Petition of L. Bungor and others, of Guthrie and Adair Counties, Iowa, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2600. By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of Dishow Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Englewood, Colo., protesting against submission of eighteenth amendment to the States for a referendum vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2601. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Western Governors' Conference, recommending that Congress continue the appropriation of funds as authorized by the Clarke-McNary law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1932

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

O Thou in whose presence there is fullness of joy and life forevermore; grant to us Thy children that we may breathe the immortal air of this our world, and through the supreme influence of honest thought acquire our souls in confidence and peace, knowing that thoughts are a substantial world in which, with tendrils strong as flesh and blood, our pastime and our happiness will grow.

Make us ever mindful of the needs of others overborne by the stressing strain of life, baffled by its uncertainty,