

monly known as the chain-store system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3572. Also, petition of George Compton, Mrs. John D. Thorn, James M. Jewell, and 25 other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging Congress to curb the activities of the growing monopolistic organizations throughout the country commonly known as the chain-store system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3573. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of American Rattan & Reed Manufacturing Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 6744 to provide for the Government purchase of American goods; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

3574. Also, petition of International Association of Machinists, National Lodge, No. 556, Government employees, with reference to discharge of 500 men in the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3575. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the Polish National Alliance, Group No. 255, urging enactment of House Joint Resolution 144; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3576. By Mr. PARKER of Georgia: Petition of 100 retail food dealers and 40 retail dry-goods and clothing merchants of Savannah, Ga., urging the enactment of legislation 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.

3577. Also, petition of the Savannah (Ga.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting the passage of legislation providing for a Federal tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3578. By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Mary R. Munson, Florence V. Hitchcock, C. N. Campbell, and 23 other residents of Ashland, Greene County, N. Y., praying for maintenance of the prohibition law and opposing its repeal or resubmission to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3579. Also, petition of Isobel T. Hallock, C. Kenneth Taber, and 23 other residents of Milton, Ulster County, N. Y., praying for maintenance of the prohibition law and opposing its repeal or resubmission to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3580. Also, petition of 42 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Paltz, N. Y., praying for maintenance of the prohibition law and opposing its repeal or resubmission to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3581. By Mr. RAMSPECK: Petition of 32 citizens of Brookhaven, Ga., protesting against the enactment of Sunday-observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3582. Also, petition of 81 citizens of Atlanta, Ga., protesting against the enactment of Sunday-observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3583. By Mr. ROBINSON: Resolution signed by C. A. Smith, 620 Grant Avenue, and 61 other citizens of Waterloo, Iowa, urging the defeat of any legislation reducing the salaries of postal employees and other Government employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3584. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Preserved and Salt Fish Dealers Association of New York, requesting salt and preserved fish be included in the items of food that are exempt in the proposed sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3585. Also, petition of American Manufacturing Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., referring to the proposed manufacturers sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3586. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Resolution of Group No. 2238 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States, Castile, N. Y., favoring the passage of House Joint Resolution 144, directing the President of the United States 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.

3587. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of Minnehaha Lodge, No. 827, International Association of Machinists, Minneapolis,

Minn., urging enactment of anti-injunction legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3588. Also, petition of Central Cooperative Association, St. Paul, Minn., urging long-time loans to farmers through the Federal land banks to cover mortgage indebtedness at same interest rate as on money loaned foreign countries during World War; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3589. Also, petition of Jackson Post of American Legion, Jackson, Minn., urging immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3590. Also, petition of Swift County (Minn.) United Veterans, urging enactment of immediate cash payment of compensation certificates and of the widows and orphans' bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3591. Also, petition of Central Cooperative Association, urging that tariff be placed on all competitive farm commodities imported, especially from the Philippine Islands, to protect interest of American farmers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3592. By Mr. SWANSON: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Cumberland, Iowa, opposing resubmission of eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3593. Also, petition of citizens of Adair County, Iowa, favoring cash payment of the balance of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3594. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of Mrs. S. M. Williams and 26 others, principally citizens of Rock Springs, Ga., opposing Senate bill 1202; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3595. Also, petition of Porter Hoyt Griffith and a number of other ex-service men, asking the immediate payment in full of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3596. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Mary Sammons Parry, of Waynesburg, Pa., recommending economies in the appropriation for military affairs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3597. Also, memorials of Groups Nos. 1746 and 2595 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States, Canonsburg; Group No. 1743 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States, Manifold; and Group No. 2573 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States, Nemacolin, all of the State of Pennsylvania, supporting House Joint Resolution 144, directing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3598. By Mr. WATSON: Petition with 73 signatures of residents of Philadelphia, Pa., opposing the tax on automobile industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3599. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Albert W. Bruce, 243 Washington Boulevard, Oak Park; Otto H. Moses, 2172 Stave Street, Chicago; Clifton C. Bailey, 1112 Grove Street, Evanston; and other residents of Illinois, opposing legislation reducing the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the citizens' military training camps, the Regular Army, and Navy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3600. Also, petition of rural letter carriers of the sixteenth congressional district, opposing the placing of the Rural Delivery Service on a contract basis; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 1932

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 2, 1932)

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

5064) authorizing Vernon W. O'Connor, of St. Paul, Minn., his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 110) authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) relative to the printing of "Revenue Revision, 1932," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 3514. An act regulating the use of appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department; and

H. R. 307. An act to approve Act No. 256 of the session laws of 1931 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the districts of North Kona and South Kona, on the island and county of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii."

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] is still detained from the Senate by reason of continued illness. I ask that the announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GEORGE. My colleague the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] is still detained from the Senate because of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have been requested to announce that the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] is detained by illness.

I also desire to announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is necessarily out of the city.

I wish also to announce that the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is detained from the Senate by illness.

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

GOV. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT ON PUBLIC UTILITIES

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, owing to the fact that this is the 4th of March and that a year from to-day I expect to

see the present Governor of the State of New York inaugurated as President of the United States, I think it is very appropriate to insert in the RECORD a part of a message which he delivered to the State Legislature of New York on March 2 concerning public utilities. The New York World-Telegram quotes from this message to the legislature concerning the public service commission of that State and concerning the necessity of bringing about a reduction of rates by public utilities. The fact of the matter is that the cost of public utilities has become one of the costs of the necessities of life in this age of civilization. In this message Governor Roosevelt said:

It is a startling fact that in spite of the current change in the purchasing power of the dollar there seems to be no voluntary state-wide or nation-wide effort by utility companies to cut their rates proportionately. * * * The public of the State has come to realize that the degree of control and supervision which was hoped for in 1907 has become impossible because of a long line of decisions and judge-made laws which to a great extent have nullified the original purpose of the statute.

He asserted that the commission on revision of public service commission laws had spent a large amount of money, but has produced no legislative action to benefit the people.

It seems to me that there is no subject to-day which is of more vital concern to the American people than the cost of the service rendered by public utilities, especially when those public utilities have issued such large blocks of watered stock, placed them upon the stock market, and the people who have bought the stocks have found them so reduced in value that they are now practically worthless. It is highly important that those who are in charge of the Government, whether it be in State or Nation, and those who are to be in charge of it after next March shall recognize that the public utilities of the country furnish a public necessity of modern civilization and that the regulative bodies which are to regulate those rates shall keep in mind the fact that they are providing a public necessity, and keep in mind also that the rates should be based upon the actual service rendered and the value of the property, regardless of the watered stock that may have been issued.

I have quoted this brief excerpt from the message of Governor Roosevelt as renewed proof of the fact that he is on the side of the people and that he is thinking in terms of the needs of the people in these times when the people are finding it so difficult to meet the costs of the necessities of everyday life.

INVESTIGATION OF COAL-MINING CONDITIONS IN KENTUCKY

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, by way of preface to the introduction of a resolution for an investigation by the Committee on the Judiciary may I say that grave charges of violations of law and of serious interferences with the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States in certain coal-mining regions of Kentucky for some weeks have been receiving general and repeated currency in the press and magazines of the country. Indeed, personal appearances and testimony from well-known and responsible Americans, supplementing petitions for the redress of reported grievances, for some time have come to the attention of various Members of this legislative body.

Without expressing any final decision on the accuracy of these representations, it is just to conclude that probable cause has been shown for public inquiry. In that conviction a resolution on the subject has been prepared by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] and myself. I join in offering it with a definite sense of official responsibility, also with confidence that it tends to serve the public interest, because the coal fields of my own State of Colorado were subjected to a similar and searching inquiry under like circumstances in 1914 by a committee of the National House of Representatives. The Colorado investigation, in which I participated, is credited with ultimate far-reaching and beneficial results, in better industrial and human relations, both State and National. A fair investigation, moreover, may be of special value at this time, since Congress now has before it certain legislative measures designed to regulate and open the way to the efficient and prosperous manage-

ment of our tragically disorganized, too often antisocial, basic coal-mining industry.

Trusting that the investigation will be authorized and pressed, and requesting a prompt report from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I send the resolution to the desk and ask to have it read.

The resolution (S. Res. 178) was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to investigate the conditions existing in the coal fields in Harlan and Bell Counties in the Commonwealth of Kentucky with a view to determining particularly (1) whether any system of peonage has been or is being maintained in such coal fields; (2) whether the Postal Service and facilities have been or are being obstructed or interfered with therein, and if so, by whom; (3) whether citizens of the United States have been arrested, tried, or convicted in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States; (4) whether firearms, ammunitions, or explosives have been shipped into such coal fields from States other than Kentucky, and if so, by whom shipped and by whom paid for; (5) whether any unlawful conditions exist or have existed in such coal fields which interfere or have interfered with the production for interstate shipment, or otherwise with the interstate shipment, of coal from such coal fields; and (6) the causes leading up to the conditions reported to exist in such coal fields. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigations, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary remedial legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Senate in the Seventy-second Congress until the final report is submitted; to employ such clerical and other assistants; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

COMMENTS ON THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT HOOVER

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, this is a very memorable day, the day the newspapers of the morning record as being the third anniversary of the inauguration of President Hoover; and I am going to pause before I proceed, because I am hoping that some Senator on the other side will undertake the task of paying tribute to and giving an accounting of the administration during the last three years. It is natural that it should be done; it is most appropriate that it should be done in this body to-day.

I see sitting before me one of the satellites of the administration, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS]; I see another distinguished leader over on the Republican side, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], and I suppose, within hearing distance certainly, the distinguished Republican leader, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], can be found. I see also now my fine and good-looking friend, who always rises to the defense of the administration, the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], who has just come into the Chamber. Nor am I going to omit to mention my friend the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who never allows the anniversary of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln to pass without paying tribute to him. If any of these distinguished gentlemen or any other Senator on the Republican side of the Chamber—and there is now a pretty full attendance—desires to rise and exploit the administration and give an accounting of its services I shall yield the floor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. Indeed, I will, and I take my seat. It is most proper that the Senator should be heard.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate was edited by a very brilliant speech on the part of the Senator from Mississippi demanding economy and specifying many ways whereby economy could be brought about. Immediately following the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill was resumed; but before the echo of the sound of the voice of the Senator from Mississippi had died away

there were amendments offered greatly adding to the total sum appropriated by the agricultural appropriation bill as it has been reported, although that total approximated \$175,000,000. Notwithstanding the Agricultural Department is one of the youngest executive departments of the Government and has not been in existence very long, yet it is growing by leaps and bounds through the increase of its activities. On yesterday, when a roll call was demanded on an amendment proposing an increase of \$25,000 in the agricultural appropriation bill, I noticed that almost every Member upon the side of the Chamber for which the Senator from Mississippi speaks, including the Senator from Mississippi himself, voted for the increase. If the utterances of the Senator from Mississippi to-day are to be on a par with his remarks of yesterday, I think no other Senator should interfere with what he may have to say.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, that is all the Senator from Ohio has to say in defense of the administration. [Laughter.] That is his tribute; that is his analysis; that is his accounting. Instead of going on the air in a sealed room with their hot air, reading their eulogies of the President, or doing so in the cloistered rooms of the Republican National Committee, where a humble Democrat like myself can not gain admittance, why does not the Senator from Ohio and why do not other Senators on the Republican side of the Chamber rise on the floor of the Senate to sing their pæans of praise for the administration and try to "sell Hoover" to the country?

The Senator from Ohio heretofore on the anniversary of the inauguration of the President has not thought that it was in the interest of expediency to keep silent. I recall that the first year after the President was inaugurated the Senator from Ohio spoke in praise of the administration for about two hours. It was a very feeble attempt, not characteristic of the distinguished Senator, because he is eloquent in all his addresses and generally enthusiastic in what he has to say; but that day he had a hard job. He realized it. He did it just as well as he could under the circumstances, and he spoke for a long time, giving an accounting of the administration. He gave as his excuse for speaking that day the first anniversary of the Hoover administration.

Then came the second anniversary of the Hoover administration, which seems a long time ago. When I read this morning that this was the third anniversary of the inauguration of President Hoover I just could not realize it. It seems to me it has been an age since Hoover became President of the United States [laughter], and no doubt that is the way it has impressed the country. However, on the second anniversary of the inauguration of the President the Senator from Ohio did not speak upon the floor of the Senate about the achievements of the administration. The praise of the administration was designed to be left to a man named Doubleday, who, as it will be recalled, was the publisher of *World's Work*, and who had sent out broadcast to all of the beneficiaries of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill a written letter to be signed by them, and also an appeal to them to make contributions to the cause then represented by Mr. Doubleday, so that sufficient money might be raised to carry in the press all over the country paid advertisements in the form of a letter to be addressed to Mr. Hoover telling him of the fine work he had performed and his high standing among the people of the country. That was the inspiration which caused my friend the Senator from Ohio later to endeavor to "sell Hoover." He took the suggestion from Mr. Doubleday, and so when the Republican National Committee met last year he again tried to "sell Mr. Hoover" to the committee, and neglected to make his usual laudatory speech in this Chamber on the anniversary of Hoover's inauguration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the Senator sure the name is Doubleday or Doublecross?

Mr. HARRISON. Probably the latter is the more fitting. When we exploited Mr. Doubleday's efforts here upon the floor of the Senate he backslided and refrained from further participation in the scheme; but that was what furnished the Senator from Ohio the inspiration to try again to "sell Mr. Hoover" to the country.

Now, is it not fair when on this anniversary day we can enter into a real discussion upon this floor of the alleged achievements of the administration that there should be remarks made here rather than that Senators should go into the sealed room of some broadcasting station and send out stuff over the air which ought not to be contaminated by such utterances? For that reason I asked Senators on the other side if they would not take advantage of the opportunity to discuss the achievements of the administration, and I offered to yield to my friend from Ohio, who is still chairman of the Republican National Committee. I think he is still chairman of the committee; there has been so much talk about him retiring from the committee that I do not know whether he is still chairman or not; but, any way, he is, as I believe, the titular chairman of the Republican National Committee. I do not know whether Mr. Burke or some one else is running it; but I thought I was very courteous in offering time to the Senator this morning.

Now, if no Republican Senator will dare to do it, I am going to call the attention of the country to what has been done during the past three years. I want to be fair about it, and if I make any misstatements I want Senators on the other side to rise and correct me, and when I shall have finished I want them to have courage enough to rise here upon the floor and discuss the greatness and the achievements of the present administration. Do not wait to broadcast when no one can answer you.

It will be remembered that the last campaign was known as a whispering campaign; it has now been transformed into a whimpering campaign, and before November next it is going to be a weeping campaign.

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

Mr. HARRISON. I always yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. Is the Senator sure it will not be a "gnashing of teeth" campaign among the Democrats?

Mr. HARRISON. You Republicans look too hungry and too disconsolate for a Democrat now to "gnash his teeth" when he glances at you. No; there will be no "gnashing of teeth" amongst the Democrats. We are in too high hopes and too harmonious in principle to permit the "gnashing of teeth" among ourselves.

I have been amused, Mr. President, at the character of speeches that have been made over the radio by some of the Republican leaders. How their utterances have changed with regard to this remarkable man! I have before me a picture of Mr. Hoover painted by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, a picture I shall never forget. He does not talk that way now, but he did talk that way in 1920. I read from the New York Times of April 1, 1920:

Representative Fess, of Ohio, chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee—

He has always been a leader of the Republican Party; he has always been a spokesman for the Republican Party. Of course, there have come times in his remarkable political career when he talked a little bit too much; there have been times when coming from conferences with the President he has talked too much and has received from the President a little slap on the wrist; but it has had little effect upon the distinguished leader of the Republican National Committee—his apparent enthusiasm and loyalty to Republican administrative policies or to any Republican President has always impelled him to rush to their defense. So at this time he said:

The Republican Party can not accept an internationalist as its standard bearer. Hoover must be greatly embarrassed in seeking the nomination at the hands of a party he conspired against with the party's opponents to defeat in 1918. It will demand a leader whose Americanism is not in question and whose political views are not a matter of speculation.

But the Senator from Ohio does not talk that way now. Here is my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. Watson],

the leader of the Republican Party on the majority side of the Senate—

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FESS. On October 10, 1918, President Wilson issued his famous letter asking for the election of a Democratic Congress.

Mr. HARRISON. And Mr. Hoover joined in it, and that aroused the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Hoover joined with members of the Cabinet. One member of the Cabinet was Mr. McAdoo, who had stated that the President had done nothing more than Lincoln once did, which, of course, was not a statement of fact. Mr. Hoover made a statement, given out in New York, in which in a way he affirmed the letter of the President; at least I so interpreted it. I was at the time chairman of the committee in charge of the election of a Congress, and I wanted a Republican Congress elected. I thought that Mr. Hoover, a Republican, was going out of his way to join what appeared to me a Democratic propaganda headed by the then President. I thought it was very unfair to the Republicans. Consequently I made a statement at the time condemning what the Food Administrator at that time had said.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; and that aroused the Senator.

Mr. FESS. It did.

Mr. HARRISON. That was one time when Mr. Hoover had a lucid interval, when he wanted a Democratic Congress elected; but, fortunately for the country, we elected a Democratic Congress last year without the help of Mr. Hoover or the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. And the country probably will realize the very evil effects of it before we get through.

Mr. HARRISON. I must apologize to the Senator. Some one remarks that we elected a Democratic Congress with the help of the President and the Senator from Ohio.

The distinguished leader on the Republican side, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson], about the same time, back in 1928, in speaking of Mr. Hoover, said:

We have come upon strange times. We used to nominate men because of what they stood for. Now we are asked to name voiceless candidates to lead us.

And yet the other night, over the radio, as the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally] called to the attention of the country the other day, on Lincoln's Birthday, the Senator from Indiana just pushed the memory of Lincoln aside and exploited Mr. Hoover as the superman of all the ages of the world. How do you expect people to have any confidence in what you say when you turn about face so quickly?

I could cite here what the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson] said during the Republican convention in Kansas City; but I am too anxious to see harmony within the ranks of the leaders of the Republican Party to do that. I do not want to arouse the old feelings that were engendered at Kansas City. Then, too, I doubt if the rules of the Senate would permit me to quote such language. Indeed, if the Vice President were in the chair—he is not—I could bring back to memory the many nice things that he said at Kansas City about President Hoover. You have changed your tune now. It is altogether different. You have organized different kinds of bands and gangs. You have your gumdrop battalion that is out at work. That is one thing the administration has done. They have made gumdrops famous. They have the petticoat brigade out at work. Of course, it is not headed, in these days, by Mabel Willebrandt. She is too busy, and has been for some time; she is tired from her efforts before the Farm Board up here in getting these large loans and advancements to the President's friends out in California to make this concoction out of grape juice—I do not know exactly what it is called—Vine-Glo, or some such name as that. So she is not now beating the tom-tom. She may come into the picture later. Her place has been

usurped by Mrs. Dolly Gann. She is out on the hustings, on a nation-wide tour.

I noticed the other day that Mrs. Gann spoke or gave out an interview in Chicago, and she said, "The Democrats will try to talk about depression, but there is no depression. It is over. They can not make that an issue."

She said:

As a result of constructive measures the President has taken, the great masses of the people have never discovered that they were in hard times and have gone about their mirths and their employments without ever having found it necessary to limit in any degree their standard of living.

That is the kind of political evangelists the Republican Party is sending out to the country to tell them there have been no hard times. There has been mirth in all the homes of the country, perfect contentment, and 100 per cent employment—two chickens in every pot, two cars in every garage, and the people are building more garages. That is the kind of brigade that is working; and, oh, this medicine-ball gang! They are out. Why, one of them helped my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. Fess] before the Republican National Committee. I refer to Secretary of War Hurley. He showed fire. He had pep. He was tired of the way that other so-called leaders of the Republican Party had acted. They had not defended the President aggressively, as they should have done; so he took the matter in hand, and he pepped up the disconsolate and drooping spirits of the Republican leaders assembled here in Washington on that auspicious occasion and sent them home about one one-thousandth of 1 per cent more enthusiastic than when they came here.

Then they have another one who goes over the country, a remarkable character—I have known him for a long time—Mr. Jahncke; he is the political contortionist of the little cabinet. He can talk as well on one subject as another. Of course, that does not mean much, but he is ever ready to answer every call or demand of his chief. So he goes from Maine to California reading his speeches and praising the work of his chief. He read a speech to some crowd up here in Ohio, and I notice the papers carried the line that Mr. Hoover had shown such wonderful and remarkable qualities of leadership and had thrown so many constructive measures at us that the Democrats had become "dizzy."

Mr. President, some Democrats may have been driven to drink over Mr. Hoover's "leadership" and "constructive administration," and some of them may have been thrown into the very pits of economic despair; but I can not conceive of any Democrat getting dizzy from any quality of leadership displayed by the gentleman in the White House. He has taken us in merry-go-rounds, it is true; he has taken us down the slides, so to speak, and we may have become a little bit dizzy from that, but not from any qualities of leadership that he has shown. We may have become dizzy from trying to find out when he was going to act, and what side he was going to take when he did act; but that is the only time any Democrat has become dizzy about Mr. Hoover.

These are remarkable gentlemen that you are sending out over the country to engage in this campaign.

Now, Mr. President, let us look back and see what is the record. Let us stop for a minute blowing bubbles, as these members of the petticoat brigade and the gumdrop battalion, and the medicine-ball gang are doing.

I recall those glowing words in a very beautiful song, penned many years ago, and I am reminded of it when I listen to my friend from Ohio over the radio—not in the Senate any more. He has not the nerve to defend the President, and his remarkable work, here. When I hear his remarks over the radio, and all these other broadcast speeches in regard to the high quality of the work of Mr. Hoover as President, I am reminded of these words in this song:

We're forever blowing bubbles,
Pretty bubbles in the air.
They fly so high, nearly reach the sky,
Then, like a dream, they fade and die.
Fortune's always hiding,
We've looked everywhere.
We're forever blowing bubbles,
Pretty bubbles in the air.

That is what the American people know they are doing; that is what for the most part Mr. Hoover as President has done. Why, Mr. President, you recall that in that remarkable campaign of prejudice and intolerance, when they prophesied continued prosperity and fooled the people and people fell for it, a promise was exacted of Mr. Hoover; and he, frightened over the outcome of the election, promised that he would call an extra session of Congress should he become President of the United States. So he did call that extraordinary session of Congress; and it is well to-day, three years from that time, for us to refresh our memories as to the character of campaign that was waged and the prophecies that fell not only from the lips of my friends from Ohio and Indiana and Utah but from the lips of every Republican orator who went on the stump, exploiting the prosperity of the country. "It is always with us," they said, "when the Republicans control the country. Panics never come. Despair is never in the wake of the people. Industrial skies are always black with smoke from prosperous plants. People are ever employed. Profits are high; banks are intact, and there can not be an economic depression while the Republicans are in power."

One of the most remarkable documents that has been printed in a long time is this little red book that tells the story and the record of Mr. Hoover. It is entitled "Oh, yeah?" Even children laugh at it. The country everywhere knows of this remarkable record, and so it has been dramatized in this book—"Oh, yeah?" This chart shows the way that stock values for two and a half years have declined from the high peaks down into the low valleys. Then it puts together some remarkable utterances, including those of the distinguished Senator who now has opposition in Pennsylvania [Mr. Davis], who was then one of the spokesmen of the administration, and who said on October 24, 1928:

The single issue in the presidential campaign is, How can we best maintain and increase prosperity in America, and who is the man to do it?

The Vice President, speaking in 1928 as a vice presidential candidate, said:

The only issue in this campaign is the continued prosperity of the American people.

Then, again, at Gary, Ind., the Vice President said:

Stick to the full dinner pail.

Ah! That pail has turned out to be nothing but an old empty can.

You have been enjoying Republican prosperity. If you want to continue the prosperity of the administrations of Calvin Coolidge, vote for Hoover.

That is what Candidate Curtis said.

Then the President himself, at Palo Alto, away out in the home of his distinguished friend and colleague from California [Mr. JOHNSON], spoke eloquently of the great work in the past of the Republican Party; and to those good people out there, many of whom were friends of my friend from California who now presides over this body, he said:

Unemployment in the sense of distress is widely disappearing. * * * We in America to-day are nearer to the final triumph over poverty than ever before in the history of any land. The poorhouse is vanishing from among us. We have not yet reached the goal, but, given a chance to go forward with the policies of the last eight years, and we shall soon, with the help of God, be in sight of the day when poverty will be banished from this Nation. There is no guaranty against poverty equal to a job for every man. That is the primary purpose of the economic policies we advocate.

I shall not burden the Record with more of these expressions. Here they are. That was the campaign.

I have before me advertisements, paid for by the Republican National Campaign Committee. One of them reads:

Vote for Hoover.

They appeared in all the magazines and periodicals of the country.

Wages, dividends, progress, and prosperity. The Republican Party isn't a "poor man's party." Republican prosperity has erased that degrading phrase from our political vocabulary.

Under high tariff and lower taxation, America has stabilized output, employment, and dividend rates.

I have an advertisement here which says that this man is ten men in one, and that the American people can not take the chance of not electing him President of the United States.

What a man!

Could any Republican who voted for Mr. Hoover at the last election have doubted, in view of these remarkable statements over the radio, statements before them in advertisements, statements carried upon the wings of a whispering campaign, that if he should be elected prosperity would continue and we would never have any cause for legislative enactment to cure the economic situation?

What has happened? This man, who is a great leader, called Congress together in April for the purpose of enacting farm relief and for tariff revision, limited tariff revision. Let us see what happened.

We tried to give to the farmers of the country real relief. A fight ensued here for weeks and for weeks, and over the strenuous opposition and objections and protestations of the Senator from Ohio, the leader of the Republican Party and the spokesman of this administration upon this floor, we won out, and then we were defeated by the President. He had his way. He got his Farm Board. I shall not say more about that.

If you think you can make the farmers believe that they have been materially helped by the farm relief legislation you put over, you are indeed an optimist. It has created confusion. It has cost several hundred million dollars, and certainly they can not complain that the Democratic Party did not assist in making appropriations, because we laid in their laps \$500,000,000. That is the farm relief the Republican Party of this administration gave to the farmers.

You will not talk about it much in the coming campaign, will you? You will not even attempt to defend that "farm relief." You will just ignore that part of the campaign. You will not have the courage to go before the farmers of this country and defend such an act as that.

Oh, I suppose my friend from Ohio might do it, because somehow or other he does not mind getting into hot water. [Laughter.]

Then he said that we must revise the tariff, must have a limited revision. We went to work on that. Of course, there was no demand for a revision of the tariff upward. In the Fordney-McCumber law you had put on the statute books tariff rates higher than had ever been enacted up to that time. There were certainly no demands at the time the extra session was called in 1929 for an increase in tariff rates in this country. Yet, when you got together here and allotted the chairmanship of this subcommittee to this apostle of special interests, and that one over to another, giving to Mr. REED, of course, the steel schedule, giving to Mr. BINGHAM the schedule which carried the articles and things in which his State was interested, and over to Mr. SMOOT the sugar schedule, about which he has talked more than any other subject in the world, then you went to work and increased the rates over the House rates in 872 instances, giving to the American people a tariff bill which has wrecked this country.

I say "wrecked this country," and I offer no apologies for saying that. Let Mr. Jahnce and Mr. Hurley and the other members of the medicine-ball gang go forth and say that one Democrat in the Senate said that that tariff law had wrecked this country, because I will admit it, and when we take up a tariff bill shortly we are going to show you. We will not convince you, because you will not be convinced. You know in your hearts it is true, but you want at least to protest that you still believe, with the old reactionary element of the Republican Party, in these excessive rates of protection which amount to embargoes.

The most pitiful picture that has ever been offered by any President of the United States in all the history of this Republic was portrayed to the Congress and to the country during the consideration of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill. Here we were for months almost in a death grapple, the progressives and the Democratic Party fighting against the

reactionary leadership of the Republican Party with reference to a tariff policy. We cried out in our weak voices on this floor to the President of the United States to take a hand against this conspiracy which had been concocted in the closed rooms of these representatives of special interests and to employ the power of his office and his influence on the side of the people against these high and excessive rates attempted to be foisted upon the people.

Protests came from foreign countries in greater number than ever before, in stronger language than they had ever employed, stating to us as a country that "If you dare do this, we will be forced to retaliate, to organize cartels, to boycott, to raise our rates against the importations of your goods into our countries."

Ah, they laughed about it. In derision did the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Utah speak. How eloquently did the distinguished leader on the other side say, "Oh, it is the usual, old custom of foreign countries to protest on the consideration of any tariff bill."

Yet we have lived to see that very prophecy they made come true, that very threat they uttered carried out. I remember that day when, in dramatic fashion, 1,089 of the greatest economists of this country, from every part of the land, signed a letter to the President, or to the Congress, I have forgotten which.

In this protest of the economists they laid down with remarkable accuracy just what would happen if this scheme written in the pages of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill were carried out. They told us how it would increase unemployment in the United States. They told us how increased rates would be levied by foreign countries in retaliation on account of our action. They told us how factories which had built up an American trade throughout the world, and had increased our exports to a higher figure than they had ever reached before, would fall; that we would lose those markets; and how those owning those factories would be compelled to go to Canada and to Europe and elsewhere and build new factories, giving employment to foreign labor, making products to be sold in competition with our own.

The figures show that their prophecy has come true, and we have seen the exports of this country fall off from the last year under the old law, even—from more than \$5,000,000,000—to this last year, when they amounted to a little more than \$2,000,000,000. We have hardly a balance of trade now in our favor.

Of course, these factories have closed down, because those who ran them have built factories elsewhere. Of course, unemployment has increased in industrial centers, because the labor of foreign countries is being employed.

Mr. Morrow, whose memory we all respect, and whose striking personality we liked, said this in a speech at Newark when he was a candidate for the Senate:

All parties in the past, including the Republican Party, have been wont to credit themselves with whatever good times happened during their term of power, without looking for the deeper reasons that underlie the ebb and flow of prosperity. Any party that takes credit for the rain must not be surprised if its opponents blame it for the drought.

So the Republican Party takes credit for the prosperity, and it must take whatever discredit attaches for the economic drought now hovering over this country. What these economists said has come true. You have wrecked the economic and industrial life of this country; and Mr. Hoover, as he sat as the commanding figure of the Republican Party, certainly in the most influential position of anyone in this country, kept his lips sealed; he refused to take into his confidence any leader of the Republican Party and tell him how he felt on any question touching the tariff proposal.

That is the kind of leadership you have had. That is the character of leadership that has been displayed by the superman who now sits in the White House. I lay it down in all sincerity, Mr. President, that he showed during the tariff fight less qualities of leadership, more indecision, less courage than any President has ever shown in all the history of the country.

Oh, yes, there are some romantic incidents connected with all that history, though. We made a fight for the flexible

tariff provision. The sentiment of the country was with us. We were in conference. Senators will remember the ride of the four horsemen from the Rapidan one night about 2 o'clock in the morning. I think it was at a time before they had paved the road that led to the Rapidan. I think it was at a time when it took quite a while to get there over those rocky, bumpy places. It was before the marines got to work down there smoothing out the rough places. On this night, as the papers heralded the next day, those four distinguished Senators came—not as Paul Revere, because they did not ride horseback; they could not. Perhaps they rode in a White House automobile. But they came up here to straighten it all out and bring the news from the President so the Republican leadership would not give up to the progressive Republicans and the Democrats in the flexible-tariff fight. Thus one of the achievements of the administration was the midnight ride of the "four horsemen of the Rapidan."

There will be much said about the tariff in this campaign. It can not be claimed that it brought all the prosperity about which the Republicans talked. They will not admit, either, but will try to fool the people that it did not bring about this panic, this stock crash, this value depreciation, this increased unemployment, and all the heavy hearts and wrecked ambitions that we have witnessed in this country. They will keep pretty quiet, too, on that proposition.

Then what happened? We had the stock crash in September or October, 1929. Values to the extent of more than \$5,000,000,000 were wiped out. What did the superman do? What did his great Secretary of the Treasury do? Mr. Hoover gave out a statement and said:

Prosperity will soon return. This is just a seasonal matter. Prosperity is just around the corner.

Mr. Mellon chipped in and made similar observations.

Oh, no; Mr. Hoover did something else. After a little while, when prosperity did not come according to the time he said, Mr. Hoover sent for all of the great business men of the country, the captains of industry everywhere, and said to them, "Gentlemen, steam up. Let us not have a depression under a Republican rule. It will not do. It is contrary to everything we have preached in the past. Buckle on your armor and help me out in this crisis. Do not reduce wages. Put more money into more improvements. Go back to your homes and help out." They went back to their homes and in a few days, of course, they began to reduce wages. They did not begin to enlarge their operations but they began to reduce their operations. Mr. Ford, who came out the other day for Mr. Hoover as a great man to be reelected, was one of the first to close down and the balance of them followed suit.

Then Mr. Hoover said:

I am going to ask that the Federal Government appropriate money for public improvements and public works.

He started on that line for a while, but again he shifted. He then came out and at the end of his third year as President he announces an economy program. In everything he has done, except the tariff and farm relief—and he can have all the credit he wants for them—he has been driven to his position. He is certainly the procrastinator of all ages. Tell me in the situation that has continued now for over two years and a half that the man who has directed the affairs of the Government, that let it exist and continue for more than two years and then acted, shows a remarkable degree of leadership?

He let the Congress last year in March adjourn over the protest of many congressional leaders. He sent us home and gave the impression to the country that if the Congress was in Washington in session it would terrify business and that things would get worse. He said, "Give business a time to rest. If Congress gets away, things will come back all right." He was just going to wave that magic wand, and magician that he was, turn the trick, and things would be all right. But it has not brought about any relief to the country.

The situation went on and on and got worse and worse. Appeals came for him to call the Congress in session in

order that we might do something. He may have been moved a little bit about it. Perhaps he called in some of his reactionary friends, like my friend from Ohio (Mr. Fess), but they said to him, "No; do not get that crowd together down here. They will scare business again. They will frighten it, and the whole economic situation will get worse." So he refused to call Congress together. He telephoned a lot of us or telegraphed a lot of us; he asked a lot of us to come to Washington and to confer about it, and legislated through a correspondence-school course, but still he would not call Congress into session.

That is another remarkable achievement of this remarkable superman that has pushed Lincoln off the boards on Lincoln's Birthday, and Washington on February 22. In December Congress convened. Will anyone else on the other side rise and tell me a thing he did in the meanwhile? I pause for a reply.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COUZENS in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I think I ought to challenge the Senator from Mississippi on that point. He has been speaking of the orations that were delivered about Mr. Hoover on Washington's Birthday and Lincoln's Birthday, but I want to call his attention to the fact that there is still another birthday coming which is much greater than either Lincoln's or Washington's. It is true that the Hoover spellbinders on Lincoln's Birthday compared Mr. Hoover to Lincoln, and Mr. Lincoln came out at the little end of the horn, naturally. When Washington's Birthday came he was compared with Washington, and of course Washington got the worst of it.

But the Senator from Mississippi must not claim those two instances as the only possible victories for Mr. Hoover. There is still another birthday coming, and I think the country will wait with almost breathless interest the coming of that other birthday when another comparison will be made and greater laurels will be laid upon Mr. Hoover's brow. Wait until the 25th of December, Christmas Day, and listen to the comparisons then! [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON. I have no doubt that will be quite true. Then I would suggest, too, that on the 1st day of April they ought to make some speeches to the American people praising Mr. Hoover. [Laughter.]

Well, Congress convened in December by law, not by the call of the President. Let us see as to these remarkable measures that will be claimed as some of the great achievements of this great administration. First was the moratorium granting a year's suspension on interallied governmental debts. I voted for that legislation. Many Democrats voted for it. We did not permit it to become a partisan matter. It could not have been passed except with the cooperation of the Democrats in both the House and the Senate. We stood for that measure because we did not want it to be said of the Democratic Party that we were trying to hamstring the President even in one thing that he was suggesting that might tend to restore economic conditions in the country. So we went through with that provision. We were hopeful it would help. We wanted to be of assistance to the country.

But we must remember, Mr. President, that when Mr. Hoover came to Congress and asked us to pass that moratorium legislation, although he disclaimed that he had changed his views with reference to the cancellation of the foreign debt, yet at the same time in that message he asked us to re-create the World War Foreign Debt Funding Commission so that they might study the present conditions of these foreign debtors and their ability to pay. But even though he appealed for that legislation evidently for the purpose of bringing in some report to modify the debt-funding agreement, the Democratic House of Representatives turned it down and the Senate turned it down.

So far as I know—and if I am mistaken I want some one now to correct me—I do not recall a single satellite of the administration who suggested, by bill or otherwise, that the

Debt Funding Commission should be re-created or resurrected. On the other hand, when the bill passed the House granting the 1-year moratorium, there was written into the measure a provision that the policy of the Congress was that it should not be construed in any way as favoring cancellation of foreign debts in any particular. I think even though we enacted that legislation, and with whatever harm there might be in it as thought by some, the provision we wrote into it over the objection of the administration and against the suggestion of the President, that the policy of the Government was that foreign nations should pay their debts and that the legislation should not be construed as any part of a debt-cancellation program, was worth the passing of the legislation. So it was that the Democrats and the progressive Republicans wrote into the law that provision announcing our debt-cancellation policy.

What else? The administration came in with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation proposal. First they were going to have a national credit association by means of which the banks were going to pool a lot of resources and make some loans. That probably helped some; at least we hope it did. But if it was good in January or December, two or three months ago, why was not the plan good two and a half years ago when conditions warranted such action? Why was it not good six months or a year ago? We passed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act. In that case the Democrats cooperated with the administration, and when Senators on the other side go out and claim as an achievement of the Republican administration the passage of that act—and it was a nonpartisan measure and stated so to be by the President—let them not forget that the only relief that was given to the farmers of this country was written into the pages of that particular legislation, and it was done over the objection of the administration; it was done notwithstanding the opposition of the reactionary Republican leadership in this body and in the House of Representatives. There was written into that measure a provision that \$50,000,000 should be appropriated to be loaned to the farmers of the country. That amount was increased by the Democratic House of Representatives so that the farmers might be able to borrow \$200,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. So that is an achievement not of the administration but of the Democratic Party and of the progressive element of the Republican Party in the American Congress.

Likewise to claim as an achievement of the present administration the passage of the bill known as the Glass-Steagall bill is preposterous. It embodies provisions which have been advocated by Democrats for a long time. No one ever heard the President whispering to anyone that he advocated it. It was introduced and championed in the House of Representatives by a Democrat, Mr. STEAGALL; it was championed in this body and engineered to success by a Democratic ex-Secretary of the Treasury, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. How can Republican leadership lay claim to any undue credit for that particular act?

In the Federal land bank legislation, it was the Democrats and progressive Republicans, over the objection of the administration, who embodied the provision of allocating \$25,000,000 of \$125,000,000 in permitting delinquent borrowers to obtain extensions to meet their installment payments.

And so, Mr. President, is the empty record of the Hoover administration. It has turned prosperity away. Its achievements have been the highest tariff, the highest number of unemployed, the highest Treasury deficit, the highest number of bank failures—there were 491 banks to close in 1928—but in 1929, there were 642; in 1930, 1,345; and last year there were 2,298. In the last three years there have been nine times as many bank failures as there were during the whole eight years of the Wilson administration. Indeed, during the month of January this year there were as many bank failures as during the whole eight years of the Wilson administration. The highest number of business failures, the highest cost of government, the highest loss in the Government revenues, the highest wage loss to

labor. That is the record of achievements of the Republican Party. Their prolific promises and promises of prosperity have produced only a pitiful economic paralysis.

Mr. President, we have heard a good deal about the reorganization of the departments of the Government; Mr. Hoover has talked about it; Mr. Harding talked about it; other Republicans have talked about it; but instead of re-trenching and reorganizing they have spent more money than former administrations and have reorganized the least. The House of Representatives in five appropriation bills, which they have already passed, have cut the estimate of the Budget Bureau and the recommendations of the President of the United States more than \$100,000,000. Yet the President talks about his economy.

So, Mr. President, this administration has been a weak, dismal failure. The American people know it; they can not be fooled about it. All this talk about a "superman" who has waited two years and a half even to suggest something—and whatever has been suggested along this line has been of a nonpartisan character—to allay the ills from which the country is suffering can not fool anybody. Every expression of the people since Mr. Hoover became President and made a failure has been against him. From one end of the country to the other the people have expressed their choice for Democrats who were running for office. They gave to the country a Democratic House of Representatives. That body has performed well; it has not played peanut politics, and its Members are not going about uttering encomiums as to its accomplishments, as some of the satellites of the administration have done concerning the Republican administration. We must keep the record straight.

The people in the State of my friend the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] were so disgusted with the Hoover policies—and their action was not due to the liquor question or to the desire to obtain beer—with Mr. Hoover and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] and the other Republican leaders, because of the way they had acted here in Washington, that they turned a strong Republican district into a strong Democratic district, indeed, into a district which may become a Democratic Gibraltar.

So a Democrat was elected to Congress a few weeks ago in the State of my friend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], who once was chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee. Up there amid the snows of New Hampshire, although he stumped the State, talking in behalf of his friend, former Governor Bartlett—and former Governor Bartlett is a good fellow, as good as Republicans grow; but, of course, that is not much, though it is something [laughter]—a Democrat was elected. The Senator from New Hampshire went up there; he spoke and exploited himself and made an appeal for the people to stand by Mr. Hoover; that they needed another Republican in Congress, because the vote there was so close that if the New Hampshire district was lost the Democrats would elect a Speaker of the House of Representatives. The people of New Hampshire did not believe the Senator from that State; they did not accept this fine character, Mr. Bartlett, and even in that old snow-bound, rock-ribbed State, which had not gone Democratic for a long time, they said to the Republicans, "Shoo, get out of here," and they did. [Laughter.]

Then in Michigan, in the State of my friend [Mr. COUZENS], who now presides over this body, a Democrat was elected to the House in a Republican district. I do not know when that district ever went Democratic before. I have been here a good while and I do not recall that it ever went Democratic. I am told it has never been Democratic since the War between the States. So Michigan has done one good thing besides sending the senior Senator from that State to the Senate. The people there would not listen to the Hoover appeal. They were disgusted. They knew that at Flint, at Detroit, and at many other industrial centers there were more people unemployed than ever before in the history of those cities; that plants had been moved over across the border into Canada, giving employment to

foreign people; and so they said, "You can not fool us; you have been fooling us a long time; you have been getting into office on shams and Wickershams [laughter] for a long time, but we are not going to let you do so any more." So they drove the Republican Party out of power in that district.

So it goes throughout the country. The voters are on fire against the Republican Party. I look almost with humility on what the vote is going to be in November. It is going to be so tremendously Democratic that many of the fine men on the other side whose benign countenances have graced this body for so long and who have voted so often so badly will be here no more.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator may not know of it, but an effort is being made to stem the tide. My spies inform me that many Republican song writers have been called into conference to write a song for the marching Republican clubs during the next campaign. They were instructed to write a song that would be accurate and would cause the people to turn to them. So, to the tune "Will you love me in December as you did in May," they proposed the following song:

Will you vote in this November
As you did on one fine day?
Will you vote in the good old-fashioned way
When your assets are all gone
And the soup line's very long?
Will you vote in this November
As you did on yesterday?

[Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON. I thank my friend from Maryland for his contribution.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a little memento of former days. Many of my Republican brethren saw it; a good many of them gave such mementos away in the campaign. I suppose my friend the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] gave a good many of them away. I do not know that my friend from Utah [Mr. SMOOR] gave any of them away, because the memento is represented to be gold. Of course, it is not gold—when a Republican uses gold he expects something real—so this is one of those spurious coins so representative of the Republican Party. It was used in the campaign three years ago. I do not know who originated the idea; perhaps it was my friend from Ohio. However, it is supposed to represent a quarter, and on it appears a representation of a big elephant with the motto, "Hoover lucky pocket piece. Good for four years of prosperity." I have retained one as a wonderful specimen of Republican hypocrisy, as a fine evidence of Republican sham and deceit three years ago. Whatever kind of memento the Republican managers may get out for the next campaign I am sure they will not say, "Good for four years of prosperity."

Mr. President, in conclusion, when I think of the achievements of the administration I am reminded of a letter that I received the other day from a doctor, who is a friend of mine. He said there was an old darky who came around and worked on his lawn on occasions. One morning Bill came and was looking disconsolate and disgusted with the world. The doctor said, "What is the matter, Bill? Are you not feeling well?" Bill replied, "No, sir, boss; I'm feeling pretty bad; sho' feels bad. I eats one job before I gets another. I guess we ought not be downhearted, though, 'cause we's got such a good President. Yas, sir; he's the best President what we's ever had." The doctor said, "Well, Bill, why do you think that Mr. Hoover is such a great man?" Bill answered, "'Cause he done give us so much rest." [Laughter.] And so he has, Mr. President.

GEORGE WASHINGTON AS A JUDGE

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I do not intend to take any time of my friend from Mississippi or any other Senator who desires to make the type of speech the Senator from Mississippi has made to-day. From the standpoint of Republican success, I sincerely hope that he will make another

such speech to-morrow and continue to make them right along. He made one yesterday, and then subsequently, by his vote on an amendment which was presented, showed his sincerity. Now he has made another speech. I know of nothing that will be of more benefit to the Republican Party than just that sort of a speech, and I hope he will read the leading editorial in the New York Times of to-day on that very thing. I do not intend to enter into any discussion. I rose for a different purpose.

In the American Bar Association Journal for March there appears one of the most notable articles on one phase of the life of Washington that has come to light. This article deals with Washington the judge, a subject that has never been amplified. It is written by our good friend, Hon. R. Walton Moore, the distinguished lawyer, at one time president, as I recall, of the Bar Association of Virginia, and also a distinguished ex-Member of the House of Representatives from the district in which Mount Vernon is located. I have read the article; it contains very much new material and is all from original sources. I should like to have it receive a wider reading than will be given it from having it in this journal. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

The article referred to is as follows:

GEORGE WASHINGTON AS A JUDGE AND HIS ATTITUDE TOWARD COURTS AND LAWYERS—IN ALL THAT HAS BEEN WRITTEN ABOUT WASHINGTON THE FACT HAS NOT BEEN STRESSED THAT HE WAS ONE OF THE JUDGES OF A COURT POSSESSING EXTENSIVE JURISDICTION AND INEVITABLY PROFITED BY THE CONTACTS AND INFORMATION INCIDENTAL TO THAT SERVICE—COUNTY COURT IN HIS TIME THE MOST IMPORTANT TRIBUNAL IN VIRGINIA—HIS WORK AS ONE OF THE "GENTLEMEN JUSTICES," ETC.

(By Hon. R. Walton Moore, former president of Virginia Bar Association and former Member of House of Representatives from the Mount Vernon district)

Washington was through with school in the ordinary sense of the term when, about 15 years old, he took up his residence with his brother at Mount Vernon. In a letter to his mother attributed, perhaps mistakenly, to Lord Fairfax, the writer was correct in saying "his education might have been bettered" but correct in predicting, on the basis of his estimate of the youth's unusual qualities, that he "would go to school all his life and profit thereby." In that way certainly no one of the time had more opportunity or was a more intelligent and receptive student. Much has been written of how he was thus trained at almost every step for the great tasks which awaited him, for example, by his service as a young surveyor in a wild and thinly settled region, as a young soldier in the frontier wilderness, as a member of the colonial house of burgesses, and a Member of the Continental Congress.

But the fact seems not to have been at all stressed that for years he was one of the judges of a court possessing extensive jurisdiction and inevitably profited by the contacts and information incident to that service. While it is mainly the present purpose to say something about that one element of the education which the Fairfax letter predicted for him, a further word or so may be permitted with respect to his protracted legislative career as a burgess during the period from 1759 to 1775 and as a Delegate to the first and second sessions of the Continental Congress. In the House of Burgesses his associates were the ablest and most accomplished Virginia contemporaries, and in Congress the most eminent men of the thirteen Colonies. Of course, not as a speaker, but by his industry and wisdom, he won the admiration and confidence of his colleagues. Convincing proof of this is that in 1774 the house selected him as one of the seven Delegates of the first Congress. He was placed in distinguished company. The others were Benjamin Harrison, Richard Henry Lee, Richard Bland, Peyton Randolph, Edmund Pendleton, and Patrick Henry, the last three remarkable lawyers. As to how he was regarded in Congress, there is the testimony of Henry, who was destined to be offered by President Washington the post of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Henry, answering an inquiry, said: "If you speak of eloquence, Mr. Rutledge, of South Carolina, is by far the greatest orator, but if you speak of solid information and sound judgment, Colonel Washington is unquestionably the greatest man on that floor."

A recent writer says that when Washington returned to Mount Vernon in 1758, after British rule had been pretty firmly established in the West, he led "the quiet life of a country gentleman." But the life of a man could not have been very quiet who, besides his legislative duties, closely looked after his own large estate and the large estates of his wife and stepson, was busy with the affairs of the church as an energetic member of the vestry of his parish at a time when it had serious official responsibilities, who traveled much in and out of Virginia, and was exceptionally active in political and social relations with the influ-

tial people of the Colony. Added to all this, it is clear that not later than the spring of 1768 and thence on until the outbreak of the Revolution, he was a justice of the peace, and as such not only charged with disposing of minor cases but, along with other justices, was engaged in conducting the business of the county court of his county. As one may see from the court minutes, they were invariably, when holding court, styled "gentlemen justices." Due to the loss of colonial records showing the appointment of justices and the absence here of information understood to be available in England, where there are copies of those records, it is not possible at this moment to determine the precise date when Washington's judicial career started. But there remain two of the Fairfax County court order books covering the period from 1770 to 1775 which, if there were no other reason, are worth examining as an example of the beautiful and still perfectly clear writing of the old-time clerks who wrote up the minutes of the court proceedings.

From these two books it appears that Washington served in the court from 1770 to 1774. It is otherwise shown, however, that his service began prior to 1770, for turning to the first volume of his diaries, which give bare facts with little or no comment, there is this entry under date of April 18, 1768: "Went to court and returned in the evening." Then follow at intervals more than 20 such entries. Now and then they show that the sessions of the court ran several days. For instance, on June 20, 1769, having been at court the day before, the entry is: "Went up to court again and returned in the evening with Colonel Mason, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Bryan Fairfax," all of whom were justices. Mason, as we all know, was the author of the Virginia constitution of 1776, which included the Bill of Rights, this the first instrument ever written and promulgated which set up a complete system of government. Though not a practicing lawyer, he was deeply versed in the history and philosophy of the law. He was Washington's near neighbor and friend and one of his most trusted advisors. For instance, the day and evening before the famous Fairfax resolves were adopted by the citizens of Fairfax in 1774, he and Washington in conference at Mount Vernon agreed on the elaborate statement of the grievances and rights of the colonists which was embodied in the resolves, and the next day went from Mount Vernon to the meeting at the county seat in Alexandria, at which Washington presided. The last entry in the diaries relative to the court is June 17, 1774, subsequent to which date Washington was doubtless too much engrossed by affairs affecting the entire country to have much time for local matters.

Along with Mason the 1774 meeting had the benefit of the presence of Robert Hanson Harrison, a learned lawyer, who was a leader of the bar of Fairfax County while Washington was a member of the court. In many a case he had seen Harrison's character and ability tested, and he singled him out as one of a group of great lawyers, among them Marshall and Hamilton, on whom at various stages of his career he was accustomed to rely when the most dependable counsel was needed. Harrison was not only at his side when the resolves flung defiance at the Crown but at his side as a member of his staff during the Revolution, and when he became President he commissioned him as one of the original appointees to the Supreme Court. Turning again to the diaries, there is found this interesting entry dated February 6, 1790: "The resignation of Mr. Harrison as an associate judge (he declined the appointment a few days after being commissioned, preferring to be chancellor of the State of Maryland), making the nomination of some other character to supply his place necessary, I determined after contemplating every character which presented itself to my view to name Mr. Iredell, of North Carolina. * * * I had recourse to every means of information in my power and found them all concurring in his favor." In passing it may be noted that Iredell, who was to have a fine career in the court, was a native of England and his wife a sister of Dr. Samuel Johnson.

The evidence is abundant that no one has had more respect than Washington for the legal profession and that no President has been more solicitous about the importance of the judiciary and the maintenance of its integrity and strength. This is variously indicated. To illustrate, it is indicated by the appointments he made when he took up his duties as President and it is indicated in his letter to Edmund Randolph when he invited him to become Attorney General. "Impressed," he wrote Randolph, "that the true administration of justice is the firmest pillar of good government, I have considered the first arrangement of the judicial department as essential to the happiness of our country and the stability of its political institutions. Hence the selection of the fittest characters to expound the laws and dispense justice has been an invariable subject of my most anxious concern." It can be believed that such a high conception was in no small measure derived from his own participation in the work of expounding the laws and dispensing justice and that this was a factor in the education which it was predicted he would acquire.

In Washington's time and long before and after the county court was the most important tribunal in Virginia. While he was serving, with the exception of comparatively trifling cases, it had unlimited jurisdiction of civil cases, law and chancery, of probate matters, and of a large class of criminal cases. It had wide administrative powers touching the fiscal affairs of the county, the construction of public buildings, the laying out and construction of highways, building bridges, providing and operating ferries, the care of orphan children, the licensing of innkeepers and the fixing of their charges. Relative to the last matter, the order books show that periodically the rates to be charged for liquor, the surprisingly many kinds then in use being enumerated, and for lodg-

ing and food were determined by the court. Very commonly the final item in the list is, "For a night's lodging, with clean sheets, 6d., otherwise nothing." The trifling nature from our point of view of some of the business of the court can not prevent us from seeing that very much of it was of a kind to require able and discerning men on the bench and lawyers who were representative of the learning and skill of the profession.

Justices for a county were appointed by the governor, not fewer than eight and often more, there being no restriction as to the number. They remained in office indefinitely, and the court recommended appointments to fill vacancies. Without the presence of four no court could be held. The clerk was an appointee of the court and in effect so was the sheriff, though he held his commission from the governor. The justices were not lawyers but nearly always the most prominent and reliable citizens of their county. They received no compensation whatever. They were thought sufficiently compensated by the honor of holding an office regarded as of outstanding importance and dignity with the opportunity of contributing to the common good by attending to the settlement of small controversies out of court, and in court by taking part in the performance of duties which affected the property and liberty of persons and the general welfare of the public. When the Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1829-30 had under discussion the county court, then composed and having much the same jurisdiction as in Washington's day, Chief Justice Marshall, a member of the convention, said: "It was the truth that no State in the Union had hitherto more internal quiet than Virginia. There is no part of America where less discord, less ill feeling between man and man, is to be found than in this Commonwealth, and he firmly believed that that state of things was mainly to be ascribed to the practical operation of our county courts. The magistrates who composed these courts consisted in general of the best men in their respective counties. It was mainly due to their influence that so much harmony existed in the State. His emphatic opinion was that these courts must be preserved." Supporting Marshall's view, another member, Philip P. Barbour, who was appointed to the Supreme Court by President Jackson, said he had practiced in those courts for a quarter of a century and he could say with the utmost truth that his confidence in them had grown with his growth and strengthened with his strength. At the same time Benjamin Watkins Leigh said he had heard of but two instances of corruption in the county courts in 200 years. As to alleged incompetency and ignorance he had seen county courts which were among the ablest tribunals before which he had practiced. Speaking of the type of men who served in these courts, it will be remembered that both Jefferson and Madison were justices; that Monroe, after two terms in the Presidency, accepted an appointment and served as a justice in his county, and that in 1784 the victor of the Revolution was named as a justice for Fairfax County.

That the county court had a central place in the estimation of the public is easy to understand. The population was sparse and the people mainly engaged in agriculture. There were no cities and few villages large enough to be called towns. It was at the county seat when the court was in session that the inhabitants gathered. From several historians, including Fiske, we have this picture: The court day was a holiday for all the countryside, particularly in the fall and spring. From all directions came in the people on horseback, in wagons, and on foot. On the courthouse green assembled people of all classes—the hunter from the backwoods, the owner of a few acres, and the great landowner. Old debts were settled and new ones made; there were auctions, transfers of property, and if election times were near stump speaking, when questions pertaining more or less to some real or fancied encroachment on popular liberty of the Crown were apt to be debated. All else aside, as one of the historians has remarked, the county court was one of the main agencies of spreading political education. In every way it was one of the agencies which furthered the education of Washington according to the prediction which had been made.

Perhaps before he had any idea of being identified with the court, Washington must have frequently witnessed such a scene as that just outlined. Such was probably the scene when in his eighteenth year he appeared in the court of Culpeper County to qualify as the surveyor of that county, and such may have been the scene when four years afterwards, on March 17, 1754, he appeared early one morning in the Fairfax court and presented his commission from the governor as lieutenant colonel (he was preparing to set out on the campaign to the West, the year before starting on the fatal expedition with Braddock) and took the prescribed oaths. The courts were not leisurely. In spite of the fact that the justices sometimes had to travel a considerable distance over wretched roads to the county seat, the Fairfax court never convened later than 9 o'clock. Our ancestors seem to have been very industrious in discharging official duties and to have attached high value to the oaths under which they acted. On the occasions just mentioned Washington "took the usual oaths to his majesty's person and government, and took and subscribed the abjuration oath and test," and in Culpeper took also the oath as surveyor. The oath which was subscribed was a disclaimer of belief in the theological doctrine of transubstantiation.

Though a layman, Washington as a member of the court necessarily progressed in his knowledge of the law and of the importance of those who were trained in that profession. That he consulted statutes and law books bearing upon such matters as he was obliged to deal with is reasonably evident from the number of such works listed in the inventory of his estate. It will be plain to anyone who reads the statutes prescribing the jurisdiction

and procedure of the courts that he could not have escaped becoming fairly familiar with the rules of pleadings and practice, with the distinction between law suits and chancery suits and the methods of conducting both, with attachment and injunction, with the organization and functioning of grand juries and trial juries, with the means of executing judgments and decrees, with the duties of clerks, sheriffs and other officials. He necessarily became saturated with a good deal of the knowledge and acquired to some extent the habits of mind now assumed to be confined to those who have been equipped for judicial work by long study and then by some experience at the bar.¹ Several years ago in an address lauding the Virginia county court system, the late Holmes Conrad, who was Solicitor General under President Cleveland, not with Washington or any other particular man in view, visualized what occurred when a planter of high character and strong sense, but unlearned in the law, became identified with the court, and in reading what he says we may think of its application to Washington. The difficulties which the new judge encountered at the outset are described. He had difficulty in detecting the real questions involved and in following the testimony and argument, and he distrusted the conclusion which he reached. But "after the novelty wears away, he is able to fix his mind upon the business in hand; he detects and is able to follow the clue which leads him through conflicting testimony. He sees dimly at first, but steadily in the light of conscience he discerns the right and wrong of the case; and now he begins to apprehend and appreciate the arguments of advocates. He feels gaining on him a sense of responsibility and the importance of the work. There is slowly but gradually developing the faculties of his mind, of the powers of which he was before unconscious. He is undergoing a process of education, the effects of which become apparent to himself as also to his friends and neighbors. He is no longer led away by first impressions or whatsoever of the mere surface of matters. He learns to hold his judgment in abeyance until his mind is informed and his conscience satisfied. He goes down from his place on the bench and receives the confidence and manifest respect of the people of his locality."

Whenever it was that Washington qualified as a justice he of course took the same oaths as when he qualified as a lieutenant colonel. In addition, he took a lengthy oath as "justice of the peace" and another as "Justice of the County Court of Fairfax in Chancery." In the former he pledged himself, among other things, to "do equal right to the poor and rich after your cunning wit and power according to law; and you shall not be of counsel of any quarrel hanging before you; and the issues, fines, amercedments² that shall happen to be made, and all forfeitures which shall be before you, you shall cause to be entered without any concealment or any imbeziling."³ In the latter oath he was pledged to "do equal right to all manner of people, great or small, high and low, rich and poor, according to equity and good conscience and the laws and usages of his colony and dominion of Virginia, without favor, affection, or partiality." The praise that can be given these "gentlemen justices" is that they lived up to their oaths.

There is no way of knowing the extent of Washington's activities as an individual justice having exclusive jurisdiction of a class of minor cases. But as he resided in the most populous section of his county and enjoyed everybody's respect and confidence, it is safe to conjecture it must have been considerable and that he always exerted his influence to quiet controversy and promote the tranquil condition for which Marshall thought the county court and those composing it were largely responsible.⁴

Far less is known than could be desired of the proceedings of the Fairfax court during Washington's service. The court papers have long since disappeared and about the only source of information are the two order books already mentioned. Looking at the one of them, which runs from April, 1770, to January, 1772, containing 330 pages, it appears that Washington attended over half of the monthly terms, which was more regular than the attendance of a majority of his colleagues, Mason not excepted. In the period to which the book pertains, hundreds of civil cases were brought and in great variety—actions of debt, trespass, trespass on the case, trover and conversion, detinue, replevin, and ejectment. There was constant resort to attachment. There were suits in chancery, and injunctions were issued to restrain the collection of judgments and prevent irreparable injury. The names of the plaintiffs and defendants are always given and often the names of the lawyers, not only Mr. Harrison heretofore spoken of but others still unforgettably, among them William Grayson, who was to be one of the first United States Senators from Virginia; Benjamin Sebastian, ancestor of one of the first Senators from Arkansas; and George Johnston, who was on Washington's staff in the Revolution. He was the son of that George Johnston, like Mason a neighbor and friend of Washington, and one of the leaders of the Virginia bar, who as a member of the house of burgesses in 1765, according to Jefferson, who listened to the debate, delivered a powerful legal

argument in support of Henry's resolutions condemning the stamp tax. The resolutions were carried by a very narrow majority and would have been lost but for the votes of Johnston and Washington. The cases were tried by juries unless the defendant failed to appear or waived a trial in that manner, and verdicts and judgments were made payable in tobacco or currency and sometimes partly in each.

Now and then the jurors disagreed after lengthy deliberation, and in one instance a juror was withdrawn and the case continued for "reasons exciting as well the said justices as the said parties"; but the reasons for the excitement are not set out. There were now and then exceptions to the refusal of the court to set aside verdicts, and in a certain case not otherwise notable the bill of exceptions was signed by Washington and sealed with his seal. Delinquent debtors were ordered to be imprisoned and were released after 20 days' confinement upon proof of insolvency. Lawyers were admitted to practice, wills were admitted to probate, letters of administration granted, guardians appointed, and the accounts of fiduciaries passed on. Poor children were directed to be bound out as apprentices and taught trades. There was much done in supervising and enforcing the collection of taxes and making expenditures for local purposes.

Relative to ferries there is this entry: "Ordered, that George Mason and George Washington, Gent., be summoned to appear at the next court to give security according to law for keeping the ferries at their respective landings." Both lived on the shore of the Potomac, and ferries were operated across the river to Maryland. The court was required to see to the construction, when needed, and to the upkeep of the courthouse and jail and warehouses for the storage of tobacco turned in for taxes. In obedience to the statute it had the duty of providing a "pillory, whipping post, and stocks." Notwithstanding, the criminal jurisdiction of the court embraced all offenses except those punishable by death, loss of limb, or outlawry, the order book refers to very few serious offenses. But the court was called on to deal with a great deal of the same comparatively unimportant kind of criminal business which now crowds the dockets of the United States district courts. The order books of the time back of Washington show that many people were charged with not attending their parish churches "within two months last past," with being "idle vagrants," and with "tending of seconds," which meant gathering a second growth of tobacco from the same stalks. The order book now referred to is full of presentments of women for having "base-born children," and people for violating the liquor laws and getting drunk, for violating the Sabbath, for failing to list themselves or their property for taxation, of road overseers and other officials for neglecting their duties. There seems to have been a good deal of profanity. A man would be presented for "prophane swearing by his God one time," or more than one time might be specified, and there was an individual presented for "prophane swearing by his God five times within three days." Enough has been said to suggest that here was the one nisi prius court operating in a nearly limitless field conducted by picked men who, albeit laymen, necessarily as the years went on, came to know very much of the law applicable to governmental and personal affairs, and the manner of its administration.

Fairfax County was a part of the princely domain called the Northern Neck of Virginia, of which Lord Fairfax was proprietor, embracing what are now more than 20 Virginia and West Virginia counties. He was one of the justices, and on his appearance he was noted at the head of the list as the presiding justice. On the occasions when he and Washington happened to be on the bench together it may be imagined that he was glad to see with his own eyes how constantly there was being verified his prediction quoted at the outset that Washington "would go to school all his life and profit thereby."

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, just as an indication of how widespread the interest in Washington this year has been, I am in receipt of a letter from Uruguay, from a personal friend of mine, who happens to be sojourning in the capital of that far-away country. I want to read one paragraph from that letter:

It is really touching the way people here feel about George Washington. They seem to regard him as the first great hero of the Americas and to feel that he belongs partly to them.

I also have a letter from Venezuela that runs in like vein. In other words, it seems to me that recognition of the character of Washington is more widespread throughout the world than that of any other character who ever lived.

I want to make this remark with no reference to any comparison in which invidious references have been made this morning, all of which will be properly appraised because they carry their own condemnation.

PROPOSED PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter quoting a resolution favoring the granting of immediate independence to the Philippine Islands, adopted by the convention of municipal presidents of Pangasinan, P. I., received by the

¹ His will, prepared a short time before his death, consisting of more than 20 large pages, wholly in his own handwriting, now preserved in the Record office at Fairfax and disposing of the largest estate of that time, tends to show his reliance upon the knowledge of law which he had acquired. Toward the end he modestly says it would be evident "that no professional character has been consulted or has had any agency in drafting the will."

² The old spelling is retained.

³ In another way he exerted the same sort of influence. As shown by the diaries he was often chosen and acted as an arbitrator.

War Department through the office of the Governor General of the Philippines, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS, CONVENTION OF AMERICAN INSTRUCTORS OF THE DEAF

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Washington, D. C., submitting, pursuant to law, the proceedings of the twenty-seventh meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

BALANCE SHEET AND LIST OF STOCKHOLDERS OF WASHINGTON RAPID TRANSIT CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the treasurer of the Washington Rapid Transit Co., of Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the balance sheet and list of stockholders of that company as of December 31, 1931, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the secretary of the Ardmore (Okla.) Chamber of Commerce, transmitting a resolution adopted by the Southern Oklahoma Oil and Gas Association, representing 17 producing counties in southern Oklahoma, protesting against the imposition of a Federal tax on gasoline and favoring the application of an equalizing excise tax on imported oil, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Pasadena, Calif., favoring the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a petition of sundry citizens of Yorkville, Ill., praying for the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FESS presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Ohio, praying that the specifications on which Federal institutions in Ohio buy coal may be so amended as to make possible the purchase of coal mined in Ohio, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BLAINE presented a resolution adopted by Group No. 1681 of the Polish National Alliance, of Lublin, Wis., favoring the passage of legislation requesting the President to proclaim October 11 in each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KEAN presented resolutions adopted by groups of the Polish National Alliance of Camden, Cartaret, Bayonne, and Paterson, in the State of New Jersey, favoring the passage of legislation requesting the President to proclaim October 11 in each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Coffeyville, Kans., praying for the passage of legislation for the Federal supervision of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Coffeyville, Kans., praying for the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALE presented memorials of sundry citizens of Augusta, Houlton, and Richmond, in the State of Maine, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for the closing of barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia, or other restrictive religious measures, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Lions Club of Bangor, Me., favoring the imposition of a protective tariff duty on chemical pulp, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I think no bureau in the Government has been of greater service than the Federal Trade Commission; yet there seems to be a movement and an effort to cripple it, to destroy its usefulness, by cutting down its appropriation.

I have here an editorial on this question from the Portland (Me.) Evening News, which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD.

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

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Portland (Me.) Evening News of Tuesday, March 1, 1932]

HANDS OFF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Following its general policy, the Budget Bureau has cut \$390,000 from the appropriation to the Federal Trade Commission for next year. The commission's estimate was for \$1,626,000; the Budget Bureau's, \$1,236,000. Under this decreased appropriation the Federal Trade Commission would be forced to discharge 184 of its 528 employees—a decrease of 35 per cent in personnel.

Furthermore, because the United States Senate enlarged the scope of the commission's activities by directing an additional investigation—into the building trades and cement industries—without making additional appropriation, and called for completion of the work by December, 1931, a deficit last year of \$70,000 was incurred. The Budget Bureau refused to consider this deficit as warranting supplementary appropriation; hence it must be either paid for out of next year's appropriation—equivalent to a further 5 per cent reduction in the commission's efficiency—or else the commission must dismiss 75 employees March 1.

The Federal Trade Commission has been engaged in important investigations into public utilities, chain stores, and the cotton-seed, cement, and building-materials industries. In addition, there are before Congress the Nye bills setting up a Federal trade court to make trade-practice agreements judicially enforceable under the Sherman and other antitrust acts dealing with restraints of trade, monopolies, and unfair competition.

To do this, and to continue its investigation of public utilities and other industries, the Federal Trade Commission needs more funds, not less. It would be nothing but calamitous were the commission forced to retrench at this time, when the fruit of its labors is so near at hand. It would be but the silliest kind of prodigality to dissipate because of any misguided motives of economy the results of three years' investigation, particularly when at some time this investigation will have to be started over again and the same expensive marshaling of fact and figure, the same careful scrutiny of ledger and statement, again undertaken. Economy is and should be the watchword of Congress.

But under the guise of economy certain powerful corporate interests, those who operate effectively through lobbies, will work enthusiastically to cripple investigations which expose their less savory practices. These investigations have never been more important than in this crisis. For almost alone they point to many of the grave abuses which have precipitated the present depression and must be cured if we are to emerge from disaster and profit by its lessons.

A very large part of the present trouble may be traced to frenzied finance—reckless inflation, pyramiding holding companies, abuses which have resulted in losses of untold millions of dollars to American investors—of which the full tale is by no means as yet told. The Federal Trade Commission's investigation of the electric utilities has disclosed an almost incredible attempt to pervert public opinion to private gain, a story of greed and plunder in which the consumer's money was used so that he might continue to be exploited as he has been.

In short, the Federal Trade Commission, operating dispassionately, has nevertheless proved the bulwark of the people against exploitation. At least it furnishes the facts upon which those Congressmen and Senators who serve the people and not the vested interests may act. The commission's work should be facilitated and amplified rather than restricted and hindered by Budget curtailment. Considerable talk has been heard lately that we should not even in times of depression curtail our Budget for "defense." But who is the enemy to-day? The enemy is depression within, and the forces and errors that have brought it about. To combat that we certainly should not cut down our appropriation for "defense," but, if anything, increase it. And the Federal Trade Commission has in recent years proved itself to be the first line of defense.

SHORT SELLING

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I present a brief editorial from the News-Telegraph, of Sharon, Pa., in its issue of Monday, February 29, 1932, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and printed in the RECORD.

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

The editorial is as follows:

[From the News-Telegraph, of Sharon, Pa., Monday, February 29, 1932]

SHORT SELLING

Both branches of Congress are interested in possible legislation looking toward abolishing the practice of stock-market speculators in "selling short," but members of the committees considering this say they are in a quandary as to the means whereby the vicious practice could be stopped. To the noncongressional mind the answer appears easy.

Make it a criminal offense for anyone to sell anything he does not own. That would instantly stop "short" sales. Brokers defend the infamous practice on the pretense that it "cushions" the market, but to hundreds of thousands of investors who have seen the value of their holdings steadily declining for more than two years past, largely because of "short" sales; no evidence of any cushioning has been apparent.

It is a criminal offense for anyone to circulate rumors likely to affect any bank unfavorably. It should likewise be illegal for any person to engage in a practice that so disastrously affects the value or values in other forms.

Speculators who sell "short" expect to be able to buy such stocks later at a lesser price. Accordingly they are extremely interested in doing everything possible to depress the price of stocks in order that they can grab a profit by buying many points below where they "sold short."

Brokers allege that had "short sales" been barred after the 1929 crash it would have been necessary to close the stock exchange because of a lack of business. That would have been a good thing. Had the stock exchange been closed two years ago the depression might have been over by this time. At least, security prices would not have been driven down by financial wolves who circulated any rumors they could concoct to lessen public confidence.

Congress should make it a prison offense for any person to sell something he does not own. That would effectively end "short" sales.

WELFARE AND HYGIENE OF MOTHERS AND CHILDREN

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I present a telegram from Governor Harvey Parnell, of Arkansas, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

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

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., March 2, 1932.

Senator JOE T. ROBINSON,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

The Arkansas division of the White House conference, composed of 46 organizations now assembled, urge your support of Senate bill 572, known as the Jones bill. Sound Commerce Committee before it comes to a vote Thursday, the 3d. In the opinion of those assembled the passage of this bill is vital to the welfare of our people. Use your best effort to secure immediate favorable action.

Governor HARVEY PARNELL,
Chairman Conference Mission,
EARL CHAMBERS, Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

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

S. 3086. An act relating to the construction of a Federal building at Ponca City, Okla. (Rept. No. 383);

H. R. 375. An act amending the public building act approved March 4, 1931, authorizing acquisition of building sites and construction of public buildings at Hibbing, Minn., and other places (Rept. No. 384);

H. R. 6739. An act to amend the authorization contained in the act of Congress approved March 4, 1929, for the acquisition of site and construction of building in Jackson, Miss. (Rept. No. 385); and

H. R. 7899. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to negotiate and to enter into an agreement regarding the south boundary of the post-office site at Plattsburg, N. Y. (Rept. No. 386).

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3602) authorizing the modification of a certain contract for the sale and purchase of the St. Johns Bluff Military Reservation, in Florida, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 387) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 3376) for the relief of William Burke, reported

it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 390) thereon.

Mr. REED, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3173) authorizing the President to class as secret or confidential certain material, apparatus, or equipment for military or naval use, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 389) thereon.

Mr. CAREY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1975) to amend an act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, as amended, by including Roger P. Ames among those honored by said act, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 391) thereon.

Mr. NORRIS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 941) relating to the review of cases tried in the district courts of the United States without a jury, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 388) thereon.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

Mr. ODDIE, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. REED, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported favorably sundry nominations of officers in the Regular Army.

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

NOMINATION OF CHARLES A. JONAS—VIEWS OF THE MINORITY (Exec. Rept. No. 1)

As in executive session,

Mr. SCHALL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to leave heretofore granted, submitted the views of the minority on the nomination of Charles A. Jonas, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina, which were ordered to be printed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

SELMA A. TRACY

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 168 submitted by Mr. WATSON on February 17, 1932, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the appropriation for miscellaneous items, contingent fund of the Senate, fiscal year 1931, to Selma A. Tracy, widow of Archie W. Tracy, late assistant superintendent of the Senate press gallery, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

LELA C. BROWN

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the same committee, reported back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 171, submitted by Mr. HATFIELD on February 25, 1932, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the appropriation for miscellaneous items, contingent fund of the Senate, fiscal year 1931, to Lela C. Brown, widow of William Brown, late a laborer of the Senate under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the same committee, reported back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 169, sub-

mitted by Mr. PATTERSON on February 19, 1932, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Mines and Mining, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized during the Seventy-second Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the same committee, reported back favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 110, submitted by Mr. WALCOTT on December 18, 1931; and the Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to its consideration.

The amendment was, on line 4, to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$1,500," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate not to exceed \$1,500 for expenses in connection with the hearings before said committee on Senate bill No. 1, Seventy-second Congress, first session, to provide emergency financing facilities for banks and other financial institutions, and other purposes, upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of said committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

SHORT SELLING ON STOCK EXCHANGES

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the same committee, reported back favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 84, submitted by him on December 14, 1931, and the Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Let the resolution be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution as proposed to be amended by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 4, after the word "the," to strike out "practice of 'short selling' of" and insert "practices with respect to the buying and selling and the borrowing and lending of"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "stock," to strike out "exchanges and the effect of such practice upon the actual or normal values of such securities" and insert "exchanges, the value of such securities, and the effect of such practices upon interstate and foreign commerce, upon the operation of the national banking system and the Federal reserve system, and upon the market for securities of the United States Government, and the desirability of the exercise of the taxing power of the United States with respect to any such securities"; on page 2, line 11, after the word "such," to strike out "practice should be prohibited" and insert "practices should be regulated"; and on page 3, line 3, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$50,000," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed (1) to make a thorough and complete investigation of the practices with respect to the buying and selling and the borrowing and lending of listed securities upon the various stock exchanges, the values of such securities, and the effect of such practices upon interstate and foreign commerce, upon the operation of the national banking system and the Federal reserve system, and upon the market for securities of the United States Government, and the desirability of the exercise of the taxing power of the United States with respect to any such securities; and (2) to report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of such investigation and, if in its judgment such practices should be regulated, to submit with such report its recommendations for the necessary remedial legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the first session of the Seventy-second Congress, to employ such experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was stricken out.

FEDERAL FARM BOARD AND GRAIN EXCHANGE

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I should like to know the status of the resolution to investigate the Farm Board and also the grain exchange.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the first resolution, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], was reported favorably. That resolution is now before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. Subsequently the Senator from Nebraska introduced another resolution, which is before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and will be considered as soon as he can attend a meeting of the committee some day next week.

Mr. WHEELER. I simply desire to say, Mr. President, that unless the resolution is reported out of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate in the very near future, I shall move to discharge the committee from its consideration. As I understand, the committee has held up the resolution for nearly a month, and has not reported it.

Mr. McNARY. Let me disabuse the Senator's mind of that impression. I personally am responsible for the action of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I have held up the matter because the Senator from Nebraska has changed his resolution, which contemplates that there shall be an investigation jointly by the Senate and House. I requested the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND], to withhold action until we decided under which resolution we wanted to proceed. So the responsibility is all my own; and if there is any censure due, it should be visited upon the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WHEELER. I did not so understand the situation. I am very thankful for the explanation, but I wish to see action upon the resolution.

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

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

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The practice of that committee has always been that if a Senator has introduced a resolution, we do not act upon it until we have the author of the resolution before us, if there is any opposition at all. That is why the resolution has never come up.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 3924) granting an increase of pension to Edward Shaw; and

A bill (S. 3925) granting a pension to Minnie Cantlon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL:

A bill (S. 3926) for the relief of William C. Campbell (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3927) for the relief of L. E. Geary (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 3928) granting a pension to Mary E. Bordwell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3929) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close certain alleys and to set aside land owned by the District of Columbia for alley purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GLENN:

A bill (S. 3930) granting a pension to Jessie Parker Booth (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 3931) granting a pension to Hannah M. Duncan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3932) granting a pension to Parrish E. Empey (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3933) granting an increase of pension to Samantha Ann Stennett (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3934) for the relief of Leo Emil Tiede; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 3935) to extend the benefits of the civil service retirement laws to fourth-class postmasters; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 3936) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Brooks (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3937) granting an increase of pension to Arpa Montgomery (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS:

A bill (S. 3938) to provide for the transportation of certain juvenile offenders to States under the law of which they have committed offenses or are delinquent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 3939) authorizing the President to present a gold medal to Paul Siple; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 3940) to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the assessment years 1932 and 1933; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. GORE (by request):

A bill (S. 3941) granting a pension to Charles Herron;

A bill (S. 3942) granting a pension to Nora Kizer Russell;

A bill (S. 3943) granting a pension to Mary L. Sewell;

A bill (S. 3944) granting a pension to Charley W. Lanford;

A bill (S. 3945) granting a pension to Susie Wichita Tekits-kush; and

A bill (S. 3946) granting an increase of pension to Annie R. C. Owen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 3947) to supervise and regulate the sale of securities within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GLASS:

A bill (S. 3948) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, adjudicate, and enter judgment on the claim of William W. McElrath against the United States for compensation for the use or manufacture of an invention of William W. McElrath covered by reissue letters patent issued by the Patent Office of the United States on the 19th day of February, 1924; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 3949) for the relief of Michael Victor Moth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 3950) to amend section 21 of the act approved June 5, 1920, entitled "An act to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes," as applied to the Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, Senate bill 3477, for the relief of the Playa de Flor Land & Improvement Co., was referred to the Committee on Claims. I have spoken to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL], and he says he has no objection to my asking that it be referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals. I therefore make that request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Committee on Claims will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

ANNUAL REPORTS OF DISTRICT PUBLIC-UTILITY COMPANIES (S. DOC. NO. 66)

On motion of Mr. CAPPER, it was

Ordered, That the annual reports of the following-named public-utility companies in the District of Columbia, for the year ended December 31, 1931, heretofore transmitted to the Senate, be printed as a Senate document: Capital Traction Co., Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., Georgetown Gas Light Co., Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington Gas Light Co., Washington Interurban Railroad Co., and Washington Railway & Electric Co.

RECOMMITTAL OF A BILL

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There is on the calendar a bill reported by me from the Finance Committee adversely, which I ask to have recommitted to the Finance Committee for further consideration. I refer to Order of Business No. 354, being the bill (S. 2324) to extend the time for allowing suits on insurance contracts under section 19 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, the bill having been introduced by the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. MCGILL].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is recommitted to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT, as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting nominations, a withdrawal of a nomination, and a convention, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, and withdrawal of a nomination, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7912) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I inquire what point has been reached in the progress of the pending agricultural appropriation bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no amendment pending. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee amendments have all been acted upon?

Mr. McNARY. Yes; they have all been disposed of.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated. The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Colorado offers the following amendment:

On page 48, line 21, to strike out the figures "\$528,980" and insert in lieu thereof "\$534,280."

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, the cut of \$5,300 made by the House of Representatives from the Budget and restored by the amendment for conference consideration would eliminate the work done at the Rocky Mountain Experiment Station at Colorado Springs, Colo. The annual allotment for this work is \$5,300. If this amount is restored, the work will continue on the same basis as in the past.

The work of this station began in 1906 and it has operated continuously until now. The work of the station is not limited to Colorado. It covers the forest regions of Colorado, Wyoming, and parts of Nebraska and South Dakota.

During its existence the station has shown its usefulness in many ways. It has studied the influence of windbreaks on agricultural crops in the Great Plains section, and a farmers' bulletin produced in 1910 has been issued to the extent of about 150,000 copies, the demand continuing regularly and without any stimulation. Other publications have dealt with the growth and management of the Engelmann spruce forest of Colorado, the production of lodge-pole pine,

and the growth of valuable western yellow pine and Douglas fir.

I am credibly advised that much of the success obtained by the Forest Service in planting in Nebraska may justly be attributed to research carried on by this station.

The station has operated on about the same basis since its inception and, in fact, instead of being restricted the work already done merits the establishment of a full-fledged experiment station adequate to handle the problems of forest production, forest protection, range management, erosion, and stream flow affecting the specified regions.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I understand from the statement of the very able Senator from Colorado that this amendment simply adds \$5,300 to the amount carried by the bill so as to equal the estimate of the Director of the Budget.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 65, line 16, after the word "employed," insert the following proviso:

Provided, That hereafter in the administration of the Federal highway act and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto the first paragraph of section 9 of the act of November 9, 1921, shall not apply to publicly owned toll bridges or approaches thereto, constructed and operated by the highway department of any State.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this bill contains a number of items to which I desire to call especial attention before the measure is finally voted upon. Before referring to the particular items, however, I desire just for a moment to review the way in which appropriation bills are passed in the Congress.

The Director of the Budget prepares a bill, say, like the agricultural appropriation bill. It is approved by the President. It is sent down to the House of Representatives and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, which, in turn, refers it to the subcommittee on the agricultural appropriation bill. All the items that have theretofore appeared in the bill—generally speaking, of course, because occasionally there are exceptions to the rule—are included in the bill. If there has been an authorization, say, in 1862, or in 1880, or in 1890, or in 1930, the matter appears in order in the bill. In other words, if a bureau was once established in the Department of Agriculture, it is continued year after year and year after year.

The agricultural subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations takes the bill and considers it for amendments. The great body of the bill is taken just as a matter of course as sent down by the Budget Director and the President. When the agricultural subcommittee reports the bill the amendments that are made, either striking out or adding to the bill of the previous year, are put in italics; and the bill is thus passed and sent to the Senate.

When the bill reaches the Senate it is referred to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and by that committee is referred to the agricultural subcommittee. When the subcommittee goes over the bill as it came from the House all the regular appropriations, the year-to-year appropriations, those previously authorized, are taken simply as a matter of course; and the subcommittee merely reports amendments that it recommends, adding items to the bill or striking out items found in it. The report of the subcommittee comes to the full committee, and the bill takes the same course there and is reported to the Senate. The Senate committee's addition or subtractions are put in italics; and that is the way this bill has reached here.

Mr. President, a number of items to which I wish to call attention to-day are items that have appeared in the bill year after year during all these years. They do not receive consideration at the hands of the committee; and, as a matter of fact, there is a reason for it, because there are so many of them that it is almost impossible to go over all of them.

I have before me, however, 29 items in the bill, calling for the expenditure of very large sums of money, as to which the reasons for the appropriations have long since passed. There is really but one reason for keeping them there, and that is because a bureau has been established. In other words, each one of the 29 amendments I am proposing has to do with a bureau here in Washington or sometimes outside of Washington—some of the duties of the bureau are outside of Washington, but for the most part they are here in Washington—that has just gone on, year by year, without ever receiving any consideration at all; and that is the way these appropriation bills are framed.

The first of these items of long standing to which I desire to call attention, found on page 80 of the bill, is our old friend the European corn borer. In the year 1919 somebody in Massachusetts found that there were some worms in the sweet corn that grows in that State, and he got the late Senator Lodge, if I remember correctly, to introduce a bill authorizing an appropriation of \$10,000 that year to examine, investigate, and if possible eradicate the European corn borer. As I say, it was a bug or worm that existed in sweet corn.

Since that time the corn borer, so the documents say, has increased, has spread, but as rapidly as the corn borer spread it did not spread half as rapidly as this bureau created in Washington. I find that the Budget officer and the President have recommended for this year an appropriation of \$795,000—by the way, an increase of \$45,000 over the appropriation of last year—to help eradicate the corn borer.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. I ask the Senator whether he has investigated and knows how that money was spent last year and the year before?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will be just a little patient with me, I think I can tell him the situation.

Mr. BROOKHART. I heard a comment that it was largely spent for tractors of the International Harvester Co. and things like that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say to the Senator that it was spent under the supervision of bureaus here in Washington, which had \$750,000. The President has recommended that it be increased to \$795,000. What did they do in 1919, when the \$10,000 was first appropriated for Massachusetts? The first thing that was done was to establish a bureau here in Washington. The next year they wanted a very much larger appropriation, because they wanted to expand the bureau. They did prepare a bulletin, a very elaborate bulletin, on the European corn borer, and it is a very proper document, and ought to be very helpful to the farmers, because I suppose there is a corn borer somewhere, notwithstanding the fact that we made more corn last year than we ever made before, and the price is down to 23 cents a bushel. Yet we are asked to spend \$795,000 this year, during this state of depression, with men hungry in the United States, largely for a bureau here in Washington, to help eradicate the European corn borer.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, right along that line, I was out through Ohio last summer, at a farm experimental school there, and the head of it told me that he had been out several days in the county where his school was located looking for corn borers, where they had been prevalent, and he had succeeded in finding three.

Mr. McKELLAR. I see one of the Senators from Florida here. I believe the corn borer bureau in the department has been very much more successful than the Mediterranean fruit fly bureau has been. The corn borer bureau, this bureau which costs from three-quarters of a million to a million dollars a year, has found several corn borers; in

other words, they have found several worms in growing corn. Every man who ever lived on a farm knows that there never was a field of corn in which occasionally you did not find a worm. But they did not find many of these borers; at that, however, they found more corn borers than the other bureau found Mediterranean fruit flies. We spent some \$7,000,000 to find the Mediterranean fruit fly, and no man in the United States has ever seen one alive, I am reliably informed.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. KING. I want to state to the Senator from Tennessee that last evening, in conversation with Hon. HAMILTON FISH, Representative from New York, he stated that last summer, when he was in Canada, he received telegraphic news that 96 men had been sent by the Department of Agriculture into his congressional district alone to hunt for corn borers, and they were kept there all summer. There was not a single corn borer, he said, in his district; none could be found; but those men were getting large compensation and all their expenses paid, 96 of them, and that organization was fostered by the Department of Agriculture. That is merely one illustration of the incompetency, the inefficiency, the extravagance, the waste—I was about to say the criminal waste—of the Department of Agriculture and a lot of those so-called specialists and doctors who infest it and to-day infest the country.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is not important, but I want to have the RECORD show that the amount of money available for the year 1932 is \$950,000, and the action of the House committee and the Senate committee brought the sum down to \$295,000, a reduction of \$650,000 for the fiscal year 1933.

Mr. McKELLAR. That has been done since the bill has been sent here?

Mr. McNARY. This cut was made by the House of Representatives and that action sustained by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to hear it. I am glad to know that the committees have cut it down. The objection I have is that the committees ought to have found out what it would take to send this bulletin to a farmer, a bulletin which has already been printed, and they ought to have limited any appropriation simply to a few dollars for the distribution of this very valuable bulletin if, perchance, any corn borers can be found worthy of the name.

I want to call attention to this pamphlet. The Budget officer and the department and the President sent an authorization here of \$795,000 for the eradication of the corn borer this year, and I call attention to this in the pamphlet:

Thus far investigations have shown conclusively that the total eradication of the European corn borer in this country is beyond the realm of possibility.

Mr. President, I want to read just this from the pamphlet:

Thus far investigations have shown conclusively that the total eradication of the European corn borer in this country is beyond the realm of possibility. It has been found feasible, nevertheless, to reduce the numbers of the borers in any given area to such an extent, by improved farm clean-up methods and other cultural practices, that the damage by the insect will be kept below the point of serious commercial loss.

HISTORY OF THE CORN BORER IN THE UNITED STATES

When the European corn borer was reported and identified in 1917 it was found to be causing severe damage to sweet corn in the vicinity of Boston, Mass., and to be present within an area of at least 100 square miles in that section.

There may have been a few corn borers. There is no place in the country where corn is grown where some insect will not be found occasionally in an ear of corn, as we all know. But just look at the establishment there is to look after the corn borer. The first salary is \$6,400 a year to look after the European corn borer. The next one is \$4,600. The third one is \$4,200. The fourth one is \$4,800. The fifth one is \$4,600. The next one is \$3,800. The next one is \$3,450. The next is \$3,200. The next is \$3,700. The next is \$2,900, then \$2,700, and on down to \$1,500. In other words, there is a bureau employing 92 men, year after year,

trying to eradicate the European corn borer, when there have been very few corn borers ever seen or identified in this country.

I am happy the committees have reduced this appropriation; it ought to be stricken out altogether.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. KING. Will not the Senator call attention to the large appropriation which was secured a year or two ago, as I recall, from fourteen to seventeen million, for the extermination of the corn borer, most of which was used in one or two States, and paid to the farmers for pulling down or burning their own corn after the corn had been removed from the stalks?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a large part of the money that has been spent for the eradication of the corn borer has been spent for damages done to growing crops. The corn borer has not done half the damage this bureau and its agents have done, and it ought to be abolished. That is what I propose here in an amendment, to abolish this bureau entirely, and strike out the appropriation. Here is a pest which the department says can not be eradicated. This bulletin says it can not be eradicated. Yet we find that they are spending this vast sum.

I come next to another item in this bill, not an amendment, just one of those items which go along year by year, the appropriation for controlling the Japanese and Asiatic beetle. We spent last year \$445,000 for the control and the prevention of the Japanese beetle. By the way, there are two separate bureaus working on the Japanese and Asiatic beetle, not one expensive bureau but two expensive bureaus working on that item.

The Japanese beetle was discovered in the State of New Jersey in 1916. Two years later we began appropriating for its control. They discovered a bug somewhere, and immediately applied for an authorization from Congress. That was \$10,000 or \$20,000—infinitesimal—but the next year it was double that amount, and it just continues to double and double, until we are now spending \$445,000 for the control and prevention of the spread of the Japanese beetle; and the President and the Budget Director, the economists, recommend but \$400,000 this year to do away with these little bugs which are found in yards, and ought to be cleaned up by the people who own the yards.

There is a bulletin about that, and the bulletin says that, in 1916, when there was no appropriation, only a few beetles could be collected. In 1919, after an appropriation was received, there were as many as fifteen or twenty thousand beetles collected up in one little area in New Jersey, as I remember. It seems that these beetles eat a great many kinds of trees, both fruit and shade, and it is claimed they injure the trees.

The department has published a pamphlet of 67 pages on this beetle. Of course it is very interesting, and after reading it it is difficult to believe that this pest has destroyed property to the extent of one-tenth of the appropriation.

Senators will not believe it when I say to them that the records show that the American Government in the last 10 years has spent \$4,152,212 in the so-called attempt to eradicate a beetle which is named, for the purpose of making the bureau seem important, the Japanese and Asiatic beetle.

Nearly all of this \$400,000 we are asked to appropriate in this bill for the control of the Japanese and Asiatic beetle is to be spent right here in Washington, paying a great number of clerks in a bureau for that purpose. By the way, there are two bureaus, not one, but two separate bureaus for the control of the Asiatic and Japanese beetle. So much for that.

Now I come to an item which President Wilson used to say was of greater importance and nearer consequence.

I come now to the pink bollworm which has to do with my part of the country. The Congress appropriated last year \$497,000, and this year the President cut it down to \$436,000.

The Government has prepared a most interesting bulletin on the pink bollworm. Like the other two pests, it is claimed that he came from foreign countries. This one came from Asia. However, from the list of places where he now ranges, the world seems to be his stamping ground. A full description of the pink bollworm is given. Full advice is given in this bulletin as to how the cotton farmers can combat him.

It will be remembered that several years ago the pink bollworm destroyed enormous amounts of cotton in the extreme Southern States. It got up as high as northern Mississippi, and then the pink bollworm seems to have quit his operations and for a number of years has not greatly injured the cotton crop. Whatever the Government could do to combat this pest it has done except to send out the pamphlets; and yet we find, out of this appropriation of \$436,000, that \$314,720 is for personal services.

It is merely the institution of a bureau and that bureau will stay with us. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. La FOLLETTE], a very young man, may be here 50 years more, and if he is here 50 years from now he will hear read year after year appropriations for the control of the pink bollworm and the European corn borer, because once established as a bureau in the department, that bureau goes on forever. I will later refer to a bureau that was established as far back as 1862 and is still in existence and still operating, though the reason for it has long since passed away. The only reason for its existence now is to pay the employees of the bureau their salaries.

Salaries of \$4,000 and \$5,000 and some of nearly \$6,000 are paid to employees of the bureau to combat the pink bollworm that has not infested any part of the cotton crop of the South since at least 1924. Since 1917 we have spent the enormous sum of \$6,833,580 on the pink bollworm and the end is not yet, because we propose to appropriate \$400,000 for it this year. Yet we made more cotton last year than ever before in our history. I think the President or one of his Cabinet officers recommended that we plow up every third row of cotton in order to better the price of cotton, and yet we are spending this money on bugs that no longer exist; and the Government, by the expenditure of this money, could not prevent their existence under any circumstances. The only thing the appropriation does is to enable the bureau to send out its bulletins to the farmers. They would be helpful if the test should occur again, but the only purpose now is to keep the bureau in existence and going along with this willful waste of the people's money.

Incidentally, before leaving the pink bollworm, I find on page 134 of the Budget another appropriation of \$276,820 for insects affecting cotton, including research on the pink bollworm of cotton, and another large bureau where the personal services amount to \$190,200. These two bureaus might at least be coordinated and consolidated; and, inasmuch as the President has recommended the consolidation of bureaus, I believe I will call his attention especially to these two bureaus, both looking after the bollworm that has left our part of the country, at any rate.

On page 95 of the Budget I find another bureau for cotton, for investigation and control of diseases. Whether this includes the bollworm I do not know; but, at any rate, the appropriation for that is \$221,040, of which \$180,184 is spent for personal services. That is just the building up of another bureau.

Now I come to one of the most peculiar of all of these matters that I have been investigating. It is called the "phony peach disease," and the appropriation is made for the eradication of that disease. They have a bulletin on that disease. But I have learned that "phony" is not the proper term for it. I want to call this to the special attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. The appropriation bill says it is for the "phony peach disease." The bulletin issued by the bureau says "pony peach disease." What do you suppose, Mr. President, this money has been used for year after year? It is a most remarkable thing. Let me tell you about

it. Some man went into a peach orchard down in Georgia. He found there some trees smaller than others. He called the smaller trees "pony" trees. He conceived the idea that all peach trees in a peach orchard ought to be of the same size. He said the fruit on the "pony" trees was not quite so good as the fruit on the larger trees. Therefore, he became instrumental in getting an appropriation from Congress which was authorized several years ago, and when it was authorized what happened?

The bureau sent one of these highly paid experts down to Georgia and he destroyed the "pony" peach trees. Think of that for a moment! Here is a peach orchard with several small trees in it. The trees are not uniform in size, said the bulletin, so they ought to be made uniform. I suppose on that theory we ought to organize a bureau to make men all the same size. What a splendid idea it would be to have another bureau, a bureau to investigate the causes for the differences in the height and size of men and of women, and to determine whether they could not be made uniform and equal. Would not that be a beautiful thought? Would not that be a beautiful use to which to put the Government's money?

Yet that is what we are doing in the case of the "pony" peach disease. The bureau is breaking up the little trees in an effort to make the trees all uniform in size. While the amount is not large, yet this year there is a recommendation for an appropriation of \$82,000. It is just that much money of the people that is thrown away. The bureau can not make fruit trees all the same size any more than it could make men or animals all the same size. It is ridiculous to undertake it, and yet we are spending about \$100,000 a year in an effort to make fruit trees of the same size and strength—certainly a ridiculous proposition.

I next come to our old friend the Mediterranean fruit fly. I heard of a very funny thing that happened with reference to that. We have appropriated \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 up to this time for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruit fly. The Mediterranean fruit fly was discovered in the fruit warfare between California and Florida several years ago. We have spent already over \$7,000,000 to eradicate the Mediterranean fruit fly. There is not a man alive, so the bulletin says, who has ever seen in this country a live Mediterranean fruit fly. The bureau found a dead one one time, and they have him in a glass case in the bureau. There may be several that they claim are Mediterranean fruit flies, but so far as that is concerned it has never been seen alive in this country. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] will remember, and other Senators will remember, that several years ago we authorized in one year, I think, \$6,000,000 for the eradication of this great pest. What was done with it? I am going to tell a story on a friend of mine, without mentioning his name, that indicates how the money was spent in Florida.

This friend of mine drove down to Florida several years ago when this enormous appropriation was made. When he got across the Georgia line going into Jacksonville, Fla., he was stopped by a man who was driving a fine automobile. He was overhauled by this man and his car stopped. This agent came up to him and said, "I want to examine your automobile." It happened that my friend had a bottle of liquor in his automobile, and he at first suspected that it was a prohibition officer hunting for liquor, so he said, "Have you a warrant?" The man said, "Oh, I do not need a warrant." My friend said, "You will have to have a warrant to search my automobile." The man said, "I don't suppose you have one anyhow." My friend knew that he did have a bottle of liquor in his automobile and he said, "Whether I have it or not, I do not want you to investigate and search my car." The man said, "My friend, I am afraid you do not understand. I want to investigate to see whether you have a Mediterranean fruit fly in your automobile." When my friend found that was all he wanted, he let him go ahead with his investigation.

I have forgotten the exact number of times, but, as I recollect, that traveling friend of mine in Florida going down

down the east coast as far as Miami was held up and his automobile examined 17 times for the purpose of seeing whether he had a Mediterranean fruit fly, which he had never seen and which no one else had ever seen. That is the way the Government is spending its money.

In 1924 or 1925 we appropriated so much money for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruit fly that had never existed that most of the appropriations are still left on hand and we are still reappropriating the unexpended balances of the fund for its eradication. We ought not to do that. We ought to let the money be returned to the Treasury.

Another way our money was spent was in the destruction of many orchards. Occasionally some worm was found in an orange, as a worm may be found in any orange grove anywhere in the world. There is always some fruit of any kind that has a worm in it. The agents of the Government went down there and plowed up and grubbed up whole orange groves. As I understand it, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] offered an amendment to the Agricultural Department appropriation bill to require the Government to compensate Florida orange-grove owners for the losses sustained in having their orange groves grubbed up in attempting to find a Mediterranean fruit fly. May I ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether that amendment was agreed to?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the amendment was rejected by the vote of the Senate on yesterday.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. We spent \$7,000,000 in attempting to eradicate a fly that no one has ever seen, and then, after our agents went down there and destroyed great orange groves, the grove owners come and want the Federal Government to pay for their losses. Sooner or later—and it is just a question of time—the Federal Government will have to pay for every one of those orange groves that this bureau destroyed. Some were destroyed by poison, others by grubbing them up, and others in other ways. That is what we are getting into by making these appropriations year after year. I doubt if the appropriations to which I have referred were even brought to the attention of the Senate by having the items read. I am not blaming anyone for that. We are just continuing to keep these bureaus in existence as a matter of form. I think the chief of this bureau got something like \$8,000, and they are keeping the same old bureau going now under another name. So much for the Mediterranean fruit fly.

The next item I want to discuss is the white-pine blister rust. The estimate of the President for white-pine blister rust this year was \$469,997. We have spent on white-pine blister rust since 1916—the bureau was established that year—\$5,186,175.

What is white-pine blister rust? A bulletin has been issued on it. The Government has ascertained what it is. White-pine blister rust is a little insect that first forms on the bark of the white pine tree as a little worm. It develops into a moth or fly and then flies to a currant bush. That is what the bulletin says. The moth when it becomes a moth flies to a currant bush nearby the white-pine forest. There it lays its eggs on the currant bush; then the eggs become worms; then they become moths or flies again, and they fly back, and when they get back to the white-pine trees they are more vigorous than they previously were. The bud of the currant bushes or the sap of the currant bushes seems to strengthen their boring qualities, and they bore through the pine a little bit. I do not know to what extent they may bore into the pine tree. The Senator from Idaho possibly can tell me, as he lives in a pine-tree country. However, the Government has found out just exactly what white-pine blister rust is. A bulletin has been sent out, and that is all the Government can do. The Government can not go there and prevent those moths from flying first to the currant bush and then back to the pine tree; it is impossible to do it. All we have to appropriate for is the bulletin, to enable it to be sent out to the pine-tree owners, so that they may know how to take care of the pest.

It is true that the high-priced technical men in the bureau have dug up some 15,000 currant bushes. I do not

know whether we will have to pay for the currant bushes after they are dug up or not. I imagine that those who own the currant bushes will follow suit of the orange growers in Florida and come back here with a bill asking the Government to pay for the destruction of the currant bushes on which the moth laid the eggs. So that is white-pine blister rust on which under this bill we are going to spend \$469,997 and on which we have already spent \$5,186,175. Think of it! With over 8,000,000 people unemployed in this country and hundreds of thousands of people hungry, the Government is spending its money—millions of dollars—on white-pine blister rust, keeping a big bureau in operation here, with highly paid officials doing ostensibly a work that it is impossible for them to do, because they admit that all they can do is to tell the owners of the white-pine forests what they should do to save them. This bureau has been in existence since 1916.

I next come to an amendment to which I desire to refer. I presume it has already been agreed to. May I ask the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], if he will be kind enough to tell me whether the amendment providing an appropriation of \$1,450,000 for grasshopper eradication was agreed to?

Mr. McNARY. That was agreed to day before yesterday.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is already agreed to, but I think I ought to have a word or two to say about it. I have bulletins here on the subject. The department has already prepared the bulletins and sent them out. I have a bulletin on each one of these items. The bulletin as to grasshoppers says that no human being can tell ahead of time whether there is going to be a plague of grasshoppers sweep over the country. There are places in the West, in Kansas, Nebraska, and other States, that are sometimes afflicted with grasshopper plagues, but no man can tell six months ahead whether the grasshoppers will appear; and yet there is appropriated in this bill the enormous sum of \$1,450,000 to enable the Government to investigate whether there is going to be a grasshopper plague this spring in certain States.

If there should be such a plague, will the appropriation of \$1,450,000 save the people in the areas affected from this pest? Not at all. They can not find anything out about grasshoppers except what they know, the appropriation of \$1,450,000 will not save them, but it will be very good to have such an amount of money expended in States of the West. A very large number of men can be sent out with \$1,450,000 hunting grasshoppers during the spring, and this is a fine time to send them out. They may need the jobs very badly. Who can tell?

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. NORBECK. If the Senator will look at the appropriation item he will find the money can not be used for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will turn to it he will see for what purposes the appropriation is to be used. The Senator's State is one of the States affected, his State is one of the States that occasionally has a grasshopper plague, and such plagues are bad; we all know that to be so; but the Government has already told exactly what to do when a grasshopper plague comes. If every dollar of this appropriation were spent in South Dakota it would not keep South Dakota from having a grasshopper plague if one should come; and the Senator does not know, and no other human being knows, whether or not there is going to be a grasshopper plague during the coming spring or summer. Yet here is an appropriation proposed in the Senate, and put on this bill in the Senate, providing \$1,450,000 to eradicate grasshoppers that do not now exist and that no human being can tell whether they will ever exist. I am just wondering about it.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. NORBECK. If the Senator will read the Budget Bureau report, he will find their estimate was that to do a

good job it would take \$3,000,000, of which the Government proposes to furnish half. In other words, the money provided by the Government must, in effect, be matched by the people in the respective localities, by the States, or by the counties before it shall become available. So there has got to be a very deep interest and a willingness on the part of the people in any locality to take hold of it or none of the Federal money will be available to them.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to ask has the Senator any inside information as to whether there is going to be a plague of grasshoppers this year?

Mr. NORBECK. The only information I have is outside information.

Mr. McKELLAR. What sort of information—just so it is information, I should like to have it—what kind of information has the Senator that there is going to be a grasshopper plague in South Dakota this year?

Mr. NORBECK. Large areas have been infested; the eggs have been deposited; and during the farm spell they are beginning to hatch.

Mr. McKELLAR. That happens every year, does it not?

Mr. NORBECK. No; the Senator is mistaken about grasshoppers. He must keep in mind that it is a problem in itself that has got to be studied carefully.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am speaking from the record. I will get the grasshopper bulletin in just a moment. We have spent millions already to exterminate grasshoppers. I will look up the exact amount. I have a bulletin here, which I will find in a moment. Here it is—Grasshopper Control. That is one bulletin; I have another one which is entitled "A Study of the Lesser Migratory Grasshoppers." Listen to the way this very costly bulletin begins:

A survey of the publications—

Not a survey of grasshoppers, but—

A survey of the publications relating to grasshoppers has shown the need of a more detailed study of the life history and habits of these insects.

I will digress here long enough to say that there is an appropriation—quite a large appropriation, though not as large as the grasshopper appropriation—for the study of the marital relations of microscopic insects. I will call the Senator's attention to it a little later on. But this bulletin says:

A survey of the publications relating to grasshoppers has shown the need of a more detailed study of the life history and habits of these insects. Most of the existing literature deals with the subject of taxonomy and control.

Taxonomy, as the Senator no doubt knows—I did not know it until I looked it up—means the habits, relations, virtues and lack of virtues, correlations, and propagation of infinitesimal microscopic insects. They are related to the grasshopper because it seems that the grasshoppers in the evolutionary stage are microscopic insects, and it may be the Senator has some information that these microscopic insects are going to get bigger this year and become grasshoppers. I do not know; but here is all this literature about grasshoppers—A Study of the Lesser Migratory Grasshoppers.

I would be glad to show these bulletins to the Senator. In North Dakota and Montana there are sections where sometimes grasshoppers have been unusually widespread and destructive, but every way of dealing with grasshoppers is set out in these two bulletins.

If I were a farmer in the State of the Senator from South Dakota, the only possible way I could deal with grasshoppers, if they came, would not be to get the highly paid experts here in Washington to study the subject of taxonomy of grasshoppers, but I would have to follow the instructions contained in these bulletins and take such means of destroying the grasshoppers when they came as would be possible. The Government can not do that. We could spend every dollar of the \$1,450,000 proposed to be appropriated under an amendment which has been agreed to for the eradication of grasshoppers; but no one would know whether they would come or not; no human being can tell whether they are coming; and if there was spent every dollar of the appropriation there will have to be just as big an

appropriation next year if there should then be trouble about grasshoppers.

Mr. NORBECK. The Senator has forgotten that I told him they were already there; it is not a question of their coming.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was there any evidence before the committee that they were there? I never heard of that in the hearings before the committee. It may be they are there. If the Senator says that he has seen them, he has given us some information; if he has seen grasshoppers or has seen the bugs out of which the grasshoppers come, I take his word for it; but before the committee, prior to the time I left, there was not one scintilla of evidence except what is contained in this bulletin, and the bulletin says that no one can tell six months ahead or three months ahead whether or not there will be a grasshopper plague.

Mr. NORBECK. I call the Senator's attention to the Budget estimate that was submitted to the committee, and which is printed in the committee's report. That gives a good deal of information as to this particular subject.

I may say that a meeting was held at Sioux City last fall in which a half dozen Western States were represented to determine what to do with the question. Areas 100 miles across are completely devastated; there is not a cornstalk left; there is not a straw or grain left; the orchards have been destroyed; the ground has been infested with these eggs; and we know that the next crop of grasshoppers is almost here.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator mean to say that this appropriation of \$1,450,000 and a like appropriation by the States affected would enable them to prevent the devastation of the crops by grasshoppers?

Mr. NORBECK. That is the opinion of those men who spent last summer studying the problem and who succeeded in exterminating them in certain areas. I myself am not a grasshopper expert; I can not qualify as such.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know nothing about it except what I find in the Government bulletins, and they state that no one can tell when there is going to be a plague of grasshoppers.

Mr. NORBECK. No; let me correct the Senator on that. They can not tell when the grasshoppers may come into new territory. The bulletin does not say that they can not tell whether the grasshoppers are going to come after they are there, and have laid their eggs.

Mr. McKELLAR. All right. Let us see where that takes us. We are going to appropriate \$1,450,000 to prevent grasshoppers from despoiling certain portions of Nebraska and North Dakota and South Dakota.

Mr. NORBECK. Or, rather, from spreading to other States.

Mr. McKELLAR. From spreading to other States. It would be necessary to make an appropriation of at least three or four hundred thousand dollars in every other State so as to be certain that the grasshoppers did not cross the boundary lines.

Mr. KING. They ought to be branded.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; as the Senator from Utah says, they ought to be branded. We ought to appropriate enough money here to brand these grasshoppers and prevent their crossing State lines.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator was absent yesterday; otherwise, he would have still further exhibits to offer. He has not told half of the story.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; of course, I have not. The story of the grasshopper is a wonderful story.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Under the precedent it was sought to establish yesterday—and I am sorry to advise the Senator that the precedent was supported by practically all the Senators on his side—we are not only supposed to pay for killing the grasshoppers, but we are supposed to pay for the grasshoppers after we have killed them. That is the theory under which we are supposed to proceed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am certainly very grateful to the Senator from Michigan for his enlightening statement. I

was not here yesterday, I am sorry to say, or I would not have brought up the subject again.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President—

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

Mr. TRAMMELL. I think the Senator from Michigan probably is referring to a little colloquy between himself and the Senator from Florida on yesterday, but he has not very accurately stated the situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am willing to have any light on the subject that I can get.

Mr. TRAMMELL. No one said that the Government would have to pay for killing the grasshoppers. I did state, in response to an inquiry of the Senator from Michigan, that if the Government agents displayed a total disregard for the interests of the farmers in that territory, and by inefficiency and by abuse of their rights ruthlessly destroyed the property of farmers, under the policy which has been established by the Government ordinarily they would expect some compensation; and, so far as I was concerned, I thought the compensation was all right.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not want to get into a controversy as between the western grasshopper and the Mediterranean fruit fly. I am afraid I would be ground between the upper and the nether millstones; so, if the Senators will permit me, I will go along.

The idea of appropriating \$1,450,000 to protect us from an expected pest of grasshoppers, to my mind, is monstrous.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. In just one minute. We are already \$2,000,000,000 in the hole on running expenses. We have already appropriated at this session \$1,250,000,000 more. We are going to appropriate, for the running expenses of another year, \$4,601,000,000. We now have an income of only \$3,000,000,000, and do not expect an income next year of more than \$4,000,000,000. Where in the world are we going to get the money? Men and women are starving in this country, and here we are spending \$1,450,000 to ward off grasshoppers when no man on earth knows whether we are going to have them or not.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I have great sympathy with the Senator's position; but let me remind him that if this expected grasshopper plague does not materialize the money will not be spent.

Mr. McKELLAR. Suppose we should apply that theory to other matters. We may have an earthquake next year. How foolish it would be to appropriate \$100,000,000 to erect homes for the people because an earthquake might come and shake down those that they now have! Yet this appropriation for grasshoppers, in my judgment, is just as futile and just as foolish. It is a willful waste of the people's money that ought not to be indulged in for a moment. I am very fond of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK]; but when this amendment goes to conference, I hope the conferees will strike it out.

I now come to another one. Listen to this. I do not know whether Senators know what it is or not. I did not before I looked it up. I am perfectly frank to say so.

The President has recommended that we appropriate this year, and we have just appropriated, \$452,445 for the Parlatoria date scale. This, by the way, includes several other purposes. It includes Japanese and Asiatic beetles; and it takes \$55,000 of the unexpended appropriation for the Mediterranean fruit fly and proposes to use it for another purpose.

Where is the Senator from Florida. This refers to the appropriation he secured some years ago to eradicate the Mediterranean fruit fly. Fifty-five thousand dollars of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the Mediterranean fruit fly contained in the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1931 is to be available until June 30, 1933, for what purpose? To do away with Parlatoria? Oh, no; for research work in the Hawaiian Islands!

Do you know what that means? The distinguished gentlemen of the bureau, drawing these perennial salaries from

the Government for the purpose of dealing with Parlatoria, would like to have a little trip out to Hawaii; and if we appropriate this money, these distinguished gentlemen will go to Hawaii and make an investigation. They will look at those insects out there, and they may cross them and get us into all kinds of trouble.

You remember that the Commonwealth of Australia is suffering from a pest of rabbits—jack rabbits. You know how they got them. They got them by a mistake. They got them by interbreeding the rabbits of Australia, which were harmless, with rabbits from Texas or Arizona—I believe from Arizona, where they grow larger—and they formed the Australian jack rabbit, which has become one of the greatest pests of the world. I believe in Great Britain they have a little animal that has become a great pest there, that was brought about by the interbreeding of some pests in England and those in this country. So that is what we are likely to get into. We ought to keep these men at home and let them work on something that will be of real value. The idea of keeping a bureau here to examine into the habits of Parlatoria, or rust of dates! Perhaps these gentlemen need a vacation in Hawaii, and they may have it.

Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to this item. We are appropriating \$452,445 for this bureau. How much of it is used for looking for Parlatoria or rust, a little, infinitesimal insect? Why, \$399,700 out of the \$452,000 is used for the pay of bureaucrats. That is what it is for. No wonder our Government is \$2,000,000,000 in the hole when we allow these perennial bureaus to grow in this fashion. The first one that I have here was established in the year 1862, 70 years ago. Year by year they have been taking the people's money and getting larger all the time.

I next come to a very unusual thing—gypsy and brown-tail moths. I am sorry the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] is not here, because that is a moth that seems to be indigenous to New Jersey. We are told that it came from foreign countries. It is an aristocratic moth. It eats the grass on aristocratic lawns only. It must be a lawn that is cut with a mower. That is where they thrive best; and they sometimes eat up the grass there.

Mr. KEAN entered the Chamber.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from New Jersey has come in now, and I want to tell him about what is being done in his own State. I am quite sure the Senator is familiar with it. This bureau has antiquity about it. The bureau was established long before the distinguished Senator from New Jersey came to this body. It was established in the year 1907 to deal with the gypsy and brown-tail moths. Of course the Senator from New Jersey knows about them. He shakes his head, but I am sure he does know about them.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. I think that is confined to Massachusetts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then the bulletin is wrong, because the bulletin says "New Jersey."

Mr. KEAN. We have none in New Jersey. We have eliminated them.

Mr. McKELLAR. You have eliminated them? I am glad to hear they are eliminated.

Mr. KEAN. So am I.

Mr. McKELLAR. This bureau is like one of the oaks in the forest of bureaucracy. It was begun in 1907. The Government has spent to eliminate those little moths \$11,781,769, and the Senator says they are eliminated. As a matter of fact, he has just as many moths there as there ever were. This money has been spent largely by bureaus here in Washington. It has just been going on from year to year. It started with a very small appropriation and had, perhaps, one or two people in the bureau. It has grown and grown and grown each year. Now it comes in as a matter of course. The department head recommends that a little more be given each year. It is not discussed in the Congress; and the result is that \$11,781,769 has been spent on gypsy

and brown-tail moths, largely in New Jersey, and the Senator say it does not exist there!

There is a fine bulletin on the subject. This moth does exist also in Massachusetts. There are a few there; or, rather, the bulletin says that a few have been seen there. The States have taken control of the matter and probably have eradicated it. The money is spent very largely down here in Washington.

I next come to a very insignificant amount appropriated for work in connection with the Mexican fruit worm. The total estimate for 1933 for the quarantine against the Mexican fruit worm is \$123,580, of which \$92,000 is for a bureau here. It has been growing year by year.

The people want to know where their money goes. There is where it goes—for building up these bureaus. By the way, there are 29 of these bureaus that I am talking about. Most of them I have already referred to, and I have three or four more to talk about. They have been growing up steadily since 1862. This is the year when the first one was started, and the last one was started in 1930. They are getting a little larger every year, coming in with the bills as a matter of course. Their work is done. They did all they could do when they investigated and published a bulletin. There is nothing else for them to do, and yet they go on.

Mr. President, we have spent this sum on the Mexican fruit worm, which has never come over. The Mexican fruit worm is not here. We have fruit worms of our own, but the Mexican fruit worm has not come.

I next come to the cotton-insect investigation. I have already talked about the bollworm. The cotton-insect investigation in another old friend. This bureau now is 28 years old. It was started in 1904. The President cut down this estimate somewhat, and he is to be commended for it. Last year the amount was \$304,820. This year it is only \$276,820, and the most of that is for personal services.

Cotton insects. The Government has spent in the last few years millions of dollars in the study of cotton insects. Yet the President some time ago recommended that every third row of cotton be plowed up so as to keep the farmers from producing too much. Such appropriations as these are a waste of the people's money, and should not be indulged in, and I think these amendments should be agreed to. The most that has been done by this bureau since 1907 has been the publication of a bulletin.

Now I come to another bureau, that having to do with insects affecting men and animals. I do not know exactly what insects they refer to. There are certain kinds of lice and bugs which bite both men and animals. The estimate sent down this year by the President was for \$149,000. Of this, \$110,000 is for the bureau represented. The salaries begin with \$5,000 and go down. It is an ancient bureau; it has been in existence since 1913. I suppose this money is largely spent on fleas. Fleas, I believe, attack both men and animals; do they not? I know they attack men, because I have felt them. Here we are running \$2,000,000,000 behind in the running expenses of the Government, borrowing money wherever we can borrow it to keep the Government going, with 8,000,000 men out of employment, with hundreds of thousands, perhaps, hungry at this very minute, and we are asked to spend \$149,000, according to this recommendation of the President, on bugs which affect both men and animals, whatever they may be. It is just another means of creating a bureau. It is just another bureau kept running, another way of spending the people's money for easy, light work.

I next come to taxonomy. I did not know what taxonomy meant. That was a word that was never in my vocabulary; I never had occasion to use it. But I find it treats of the interrelations of insects, microscopic insects, their habits, their methods of reproduction, their marriage, their lives, and their fortunes.

Let me see how much we appropriate for that. We appropriate but \$235,730 for taxonomy, on these microscopic insects, their marital relations and lives, their methods of reproduction. By the way, there is another subbureau. This bureau over here can allow immigrant microscopic

insects to come into this country and be exchanged for like microscopic insects to go to foreign countries. In other words, they are mixing the breeds of these microscopic insects, at a cost of \$235,000. That is very small, but here is a bureau which I think was started in 1910, and they are still studying the marriage relations and the methods of reproduction of these microscopic insects. They have not finished the study yet. This bureau has been in existence about 22 years, and it seems to me that they must finish their study before a great while. I want to read from the bill:

For taxonomy and interrelations of insects, and including the importation and exchange of useful insects and an insect-pest survey, \$234,930.

Nearly all of that goes for personal services. This bureau has been doing this work for 22 years, but, so far as I am able to see, they have not been able to prepare a bulletin to show the interrelations of these insects. They do not show how many they have imported, though they are directed by law to import them. Think of it! Think of our spending our money for the importation of microscopic insects at a time like this, with our Government in the situation in which it finds itself. It is a crying shame. The whole country is waiting, no doubt, on this bureau right now to know how many insects they are going to exchange the next year. Yet we do not have a report from the bureau. It has been in existence 22 years and there is no report yet.

What the people who are engaged in this work, and who have been engaged in it 22 years, have been doing I can not say. I suppose they have their agents in Asia and Europe and other countries trying to get proper insects so that they can bring them over here and interbreed them with our insects, and see if we can not get a better stock. To my mind, it is very reckless for these people to bring in insects which may be exceedingly dangerous to our country. Whether or not the European corn borer was brought in in that way, the record does not show. Whether or not the Asiatic beetle was brought in in that way, the record does not show. Whether or not the pink bollworm was brought in in that way, the record does not show. Whether or not the Mediterranean fruit fly was brought in in that way, the record does not show. I am merely pointing out to this bureau the dangers of taxonomy.

I call the attention of this bureau, if they would deign to listen to such an unimportant person as I am, to the fact that there may be danger in bringing these foreign insects here, just as there was danger in carrying rabbits to Australia and muskrats to Great Britain. I understand that the rabbits in Australia are a perfect pest, and that the muskrats in Great Britain are becoming a great pest. The European starling has become a great nuisance in this country since its introduction, and the authorities are at their wits' end to know how to deal with it. The mongoose, though useful in its native country of India, when taken to Jamaica, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and other places to destroy vermin, became very destructive to poultry, game, and various harmless native animals.

Let us be warned by what happened about the carp, a native of Asia. A standard authority says:

Within a few years it has been introduced into America and widely distributed by the Government, but has proved a nuisance in many localities, destroying the natural growth of water plants and increasing to such an extent that other and more valuable fish can not exist. It is rapidly extending its range. In America it is not generally considered fit for food. (Webster's International Dictionary.)

No doubt the Government agents who distributed this fish in America were confident they were performing a useful service for the public. What actually happened shows that they were badly mistaken. Let our taxonomy specialists take warning from occurrences of this kind.

We are told by authorities on the subject that nature provides checks and balances on these animals and insects in their native countries, but that when they are taken to other lands the balance is upset, and they often increase beyond all reason and control. So I hope the bureau, which is importing what it regards as useful insects, will be ex-

ceedingly careful to see that those brought in will not prove a danger to this country.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do not desire to differ with the object and purpose of the Senator; I think he is performing a splendid service to his country in directing attention to many of these abuses in the way of appropriations. But I am sure he wishes to confine himself to the facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed, I do.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do not know of any \$7,000,000 claim in regard to the Mediterranean fruit-fly damage at all. I think that statement is a little erroneous. Of course, we do not know what we may ask for in Florida.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say to the Senator that I have a great deal of sympathy with his contention. I think that if the Government sends a lot of agents and has them patrolling the roads in Florida, holding up every passenger who comes along in an automobile or on horseback or in any other way to see whether that man has a Mediterranean fruit fly in his possession, and if those agents destroy orange groves without cause, if they poison the trees, if they cut down the trees, and there are no Mediterranean fruit flies, I am not so sure but what there are some equitable considerations which should lead the Government to make those orange-grove owners whole.

What I am complaining of are these useless appropriations, these useless and worse than useless bureaus which are being kept up here in the department. That is what I am complaining of.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I am thoroughly in sympathy with many of the criticisms being made by the Senator from Tennessee, but I did not want the Record to indicate that we were asking for \$7,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. What was the amount?

Mr. TRAMMELL. There has been no amount ascertained. I do not think it would run over two or three million, but it has not been ascertained. That is the point; there is no definite amount ascertained.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator called my attention to it, because I do not want to do him or Florida an injustice.

I come to the next bureau, fruit and shade tree investigations. It was estimated by the President for this year, in these hard times, that \$452,445 would be required to look after fruit and shade tree insects. We have enumerated nearly all the insects that are hurtful to fruit and shade trees. There are the Mediterranean fruit fly and the Mexican fruit worm. There is a difference between a worm and a fly. I think the fly comes a few days after the worm. There is the rust in Massachusetts and New Jersey, and other things. But here is another bureau, to cost \$452,445, to look after fruit and shade tree insects. But our old friend the Japanese beetle and the Asiatic beetle needed a little more money, so this also included Japanese and Asiatic beetles.

We have a bureau for the specific purpose of looking after the Asiatic and Japanese beetles, but they come along and add this. There is another bureau looking after *Parlatoria*, and here comes along this general one, and they give the *Parlatoria* a little more money, so that they could put a few more men in the bureau.

It is a wonder these bureaucrats do not get worse mixed up than they are. They have to get their money in various bureaus, and there are so many of them doing the same thing, I imagine they have a great deal of trouble. Here is a bureau that is dealing with the Asiatic beetle, and another one with the Japanese beetle, another one with both beetles, another with *Parlatoria*, and so on, and so on, and so on, ad infinitum. Then they also include in this the fruit fly, both the Mexican and Mediterranean; there are not any. Oh, no; there are no Mediterranean fruit flies and there are no Mexican fruit worms in this country yet; but we have spent ten or twelve million dollars up to date in an effort to keep them out. The idea of Congress appropriating money

for these purposes year by year is absolutely indefensible, in my judgment.

The President should not send these estimates to Congress; the Bureau of the Budget should not send them here; there ought to be an examination of these bureaus.

However, this fruit and shade tree insect investigation has been going on for 22 years, and they have spent \$2,437,979 in carrying it on. This is one of the smaller bureaus. These insects are well looked after, because the personal services alone amount to \$399,700, personal services to insects, maids to insects. This is a bureaucratic maid to aristocratic insects. This is one of the smaller bureaus. These insects are well looked after because the personal services alone amount to \$399,700. That is the amount expended for personal services rendered to insects. This is a bureau for the rendering of personal service to these insects. Just think of that, Mr. President. Practically all of the appropriation is taken up in personal service. What is the bureau for if it is not to render personal services?

I now come to one of the strangest of all—barberry eradication. I suppose every Senator knows what it is. Some bureaucrat went out near a cornfield and found a barberry bush, and he evolved the theory that a worm that generated in corn or wheat and became a moth or a fly and flew over to the barberry bush did not hurt the corn at all in the beginning, but it eventually became a fly and flew over to a barberry bush and laid an egg and became a moth again and then flew back to the corn or the wheat, and it destroyed the corn or wheat. The department reports that it has pulled up by the roots 18,000 barberry bushes to do away with barberry rust. Think of that! They were asked if all barberry produced such a bug. They said no; that it is very strange that near many cornfields where there were barberry bushes around and where the bugs flew over to the barberry bushes and then flew back they did not do any harm. In other words, some barberry bushes are good and some barberry bushes are bad. So here we are appropriating year by year to eradicate the barberry bushes of the country. It is a very ornamental bush, a harmless bush.

We made more corn last year than the country could even use. It is down to 23 cents a bushel, and yet since this bureau has been established we have spent \$4,385,086 to destroy the barberry bushes of the country. Most of it has been spent for personal services here in this city. This amendment ought to be adopted. More than \$45,000 of this appropriation will be spent for travel pay on trains or in automobiles hunting barberry bushes. From the bulletin on barberry bushes I want to quote the following:

The first survey is completed in all the 13 northern Central States except one, and the second and more extensive survey is in progress.

The first survey has been in existence or progress since 1918, only 14 years. The barberry bureau for the eradication of the barberry bush was created because a bug flew from a corn field onto a barberry bush and then flew back to the corn, and it might destroy the corn; and yet we have made more corn every year since 1918, with one or two possible exceptions, than we ever made before. Even so, in those 14 years we have spent \$4,385,086 for the purpose of eradicating barberry bushes, and the bureau does not know which are the good and which are the bad.

Of course, this bureau ought to be abolished. It is a shame to legislate this money year after year for any such foolish purpose as is suggested here. Since 1918 there have been 18,000,000 barberry bushes destroyed. This bureau has located and destroyed 18,000,000 barberry bushes in 14 years. In passing, let me say that the barberry is a native of Europe and was imported into this country. The bureau say it is an undesirable immigrant. The bureau say they have reduced the rust somewhat by the expenditure of about \$4,500,000. Probably if we appropriate \$1,000,000,000 for them this year they might destroy more bushes, but the bushes come up just as rapidly as they are destroyed.

I read further from the bulletin:

Many persons insist that all barberries ought to be killed out at this time.

I think that is a reasonable insistence.

In much of the barberry-eradication area, however, people have been planting barberries for the last 50 or 100 years. These have escaped from cultivation and have run wild in many places. It is asking a great deal of the Government and States to undo the work of so many years in a short time.

Yet they have had only 14 years. Perhaps when the great-great-grandson of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] is in the Senate they will still be eradicating barberry bushes out in New Mexico. It must be remembered that the bureau has had only 14 years in which to do this work.

Then, too, the barberry seed will lie in the soil a long time before germinating. They have all these troubles to consider. The bulletin closes with this injunction:

By all means keep up the barberry eradication campaign.

Sure! If they can keep up the campaign, they can keep up the bureau.

By all means keep up the barberry eradication campaign. It is perfectly clear that it is solving the rust problems in the States east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio, and certainly it has been reducing the rust losses in other sections where the campaign has been in progress.

That does not follow, for this reason: We made more corn and wheat than ever before, and more than we could consume here or sell abroad.

And now we come to foreign plants introduction. This is a small appropriation, only \$204,925, recommended by the President. Of this amount, \$171,487, or practically all of it, is used for personal services. Let us see what they are to do.

For investigations in foreign seed and plant introduction, including the study, collection, purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries and from our possessions, and for experiments with reference to their introduction and cultivation in this country.

The man who wrote that knew how to establish a bureau. He put enough things in that so that the bureau might work for a thousand years almost. This is a hoary bureau. It was established in 1899, and \$3,189,651 has been expended on it already. There are 56 high-salaried bureaucrats who have been doing the work, and in the 33 years, after spending more than \$3,000,000, they have not yet completed their investigation. That is sad. I think the best way to complete it is to strike the provision from the bill.

I sent for a bulletin on this subject. I thought perhaps in 33 years they had had time to prepare a bulletin, but one was not sent to me. Apparently they have not had time yet to prepare a bulletin. Thirty-three years is a very short time for a bureau to prepare a bulletin.

There is one thing that possibly may be studied by the bureau. I have been informed that they have introduced broccoli into this country. Like Mutt and Jeff, I am very fond of broccoli, and perhaps the introduction of broccoli will make up for the 33 years of existence of this hoary-headed bureau. If it is true that this bureau secured the introduction of broccoli into this country, I hope the chief of the bureau will advise me. I should like to claim it as a great accomplishment for the bureau.

Next we come to the botany investigation. We have 8,000,000 men out of employment in this country and the Government running \$2,000,000,000 behind in operating expenses, and yet Mr. Hoover this year asks for \$52,260 to further investigate botany:

For investigation and improvement in the utilization of wild plants and grazing lands, and to determine the distribution of weeds and means of their control.

Here we are asked to spend over \$50,000 a year to know what to do with weeds. Those of us who were born and reared on a farm know what to do with weeds. It takes elbow grease and a good hoe or a good plow to get rid of weeds. We do not have to go to a bureau that has been in existence all these years to learn how to dispose of weeds.

Of this sum of \$52,260, \$47,210 is for personal services and \$2,000 for travel pay. I suppose they have to travel

out through various parts of the country to find out where the weeds are. There is \$3,000 left, and I suppose that is spent for investigation, though, of course, I can not be certain, as some of it apparently was spent for rent, equipment, printing, and such things.

What could be more important at this time, I ask the Senate, than to determine the distribution of weeds and the means of their control? With our Government \$2,000,000,000 behind in operating expenses, what an overshadowing question has been brought by the President and the Bureau of the Budget to the attention of the Senate in this item. What must we do with the weeds of the country? I suppose the 1932 weeds have not come up yet. When they come up next spring we must know how they are distributed and how to segregate them, so we have a bureau here in Washington to tell us about it. I remember, and I suppose other Senators remember, how our fathers taught us to dispose of weeds. We were given a hoe and told to go out and cut them down. We did not need any bureau here in Washington to tell us how to do it. Yet here is a bureau 64 years old that is still investigating to find out how to dispose of weeds and about the distribution of weeds.

Mr. President, this item shows how we allow these bureaus and their expenditures to grow. I sent to this bureau and asked for a bulletin on botany. While I have many bulletins that were sent to me, I find none on botany. I do not know much about botany and can not discuss it. I regret that in the short time this bureau has been in existence, only 60 years, we have not any bulletin from them on botany, and I hope some day when they get one I can read it, because when they get out a bulletin it is usually a good one. I hope these gentlemen, when they have had sufficient time—remember they have only been in existence 64 years—to get out a bulletin on botany will be good enough to send me a copy.

Botany was one of the subjects that I did not study when I was in school, and it is one that I have long wanted to study. I have an idea, away back in the back part of my head, that when this bureau gets time to prepare a bulletin on botany it is going to be a marvel of its kind, and I can get some real information on the subject, especially on the distribution of weeds.

Surely this bureau that has been established for 64 years, studying the distribution of weeds, can possibly give us some scientific information on that matter. Think of it, Mr. President, in this time of oppressive taxation, with the Government \$2,000,000,000 behind in its operating expenses, with 8,000,000 people out of employment and many of them hungry—think of the Government spending all of this money to ascertain, among other things, the distribution of weeds! Again I say, it is a travesty upon Government.

INVESTIGATION OF HORTICULTURAL CROPS AND DISEASES

Another venerable bureau has charge of the investigation of horticultural crops and diseases. Whoever is at the head of that bureau is a fine financier. He has a splendid financial mind. I find that during the 44 years of the history of that bureau he has separated the Government from \$14,038,929. Over \$14,000,000 has been spent for the investigation of horticultural crops and diseases, and yet the bureau has not finished the investigation. Of course, by the time the Senator's great-grandson becomes old enough to become a Member of the Senate they may have a bulletin ready on the subject. We may have something of real interest after the expenditures, not only of \$14,000,000 but of \$14,000,000,000.

Now let me show just what this money is used for.

For investigation and control of diseases, for improvement of methods of culture, propagation, breeding, selection, and related activities concerned with the production of fruits, nuts—

I want to emphasize "nuts"—

vegetables, ornamentals, and related plants; for investigation of methods of harvesting, packing, shipping, storing, and utilizing these products; and for the study of the physiological and related changes of such products during the process of marketing and while in commercial storage.

And so forth, and so forth.

Apparently there has been no specific bulletin on this subject. Of course, the bureau, having been in existence only 44 years, has not yet had time, probably, to get out a bulletin; but there ought to be something to show for this \$14,000,000. All I can say is that they certainly have a dandy bureau. Apparently it is the best bureau in the Government. They have 1 man at \$9,000 a year, 19 men at about \$5,000 a year, 14 men at \$4,000 a year, and 21 men at \$3,400 a year.

That is the way we are spending the Government's money. Here is a recommendation by the Budget and approved by the President of the United States where this mammoth bureau which is virtually doing nothing, the head man getting \$9,000 a year, 19 men receiving about \$5,000 a year, 14 men \$4,000 a year, and 21 men \$3,400 a year. Any man who can build up a bureau like that ought to be Secretary of the Treasury. My heavens, what a financier he must be to extract all that money from the Government on such a pretext!

That is a real bureau! They have evidently built it up through the ages that have passed since it was started, and apparently it is in fine running order. The salary list is the best that I find in the agricultural budget. The total appropriation asked for by the President is \$1,447,660.

Think of it, \$1,447,000—of which \$1,110,000 is for personal services, which means salaries of officials and clerk hire, and, in addition to that, there is a trifling sum for traveling expenses of \$75,000.

Think of it, Mr. President! This has been going on for more than 40 years, and there is no let-up in it. When is this thing going to end? When will they get this information that they were asked for some 44 years ago? Do investigations never cease?

INVESTIGATION OF RUBBER, FIBER, AND OTHER TROPICAL PLANTS

The next item is so important to the people of this country it can not be overlooked. It is the investigation of rubber, fiber, and other tropical plants—"other tropical plants." We are not a tropical country; rubber does not grow in the United States; and yet, Mr. President, since the organization of this bureau nearly \$2,000,000 have been appropriated to investigate the growth of rubber in the United States.

The appropriation for the investigation of rubber, fiber, and other tropical plants is a very small one. It began in the year 1900 and only \$1,754,913 has been expended. I read the provision as given by the President:

Rubber, fiber, and other tropical plants: For investigation of crops introduced from tropical regions, and for the improvement of rubber, abaca, and other fiber plants by cultural methods, breeding—

Listen to this—here is what this bureau is doing:

Breeding, acclimatization, adaptation, and selection, and for investigation of their diseases—

That would require the services of a "rubber" doctor, I suppose—

and for determining the feasibility of increasing the production of hard fibers outside of the continental United States.

The total appropriation is \$115,430 and the amount for personal services is \$84,487.

Mr. President, here is a bureau that has been trying since the year 1900 to ascertain whether rubber and kindred tropical plants can be introduced into this country. I asked for a bulletin about this matter, and one has not been furnished me, so I suppose there is no such bulletin; but, as they have had only 32 years in which to get out a bulletin, we must not hurry them. It may be that one of these days we will get a bulletin as to how to raise tropical plants in the United States.

NEMATOLOGY

There is a very small appropriation in this bill for crop technological investigations, including the study of plant-infesting "nematodes."

We have other bureaus looking into worms, as has heretofore been shown. There appears to be some duplication; but this has such a fine name—"nematology"—that I do not see how any Senator could find it in his heart to vote for

just \$58,260 to investigate very small worms, especially when those worms are called "nematodes."

This is another rather hoary bureau. It has been with us since 1906. It is true that the appropriations never have been large. Evidently the financial head of this bureau has not shown himself a good money getter. If he had adopted the methods of those engaged in investigating horticultural crops and diseases, he would have gotten a great deal more money out of the Government. It may be, though, because this is a microscopic worm that the chief was good enough to take the position that we ought to have a microscopic appropriation for it.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. President, I am told—of course, I myself do not know, but I am told—that a great deal of good has been done by appropriations to combat the foot-and-mouth disease. It has been suggested facetiously many times that animals were not the only ones afflicted with foot-and-mouth disease; and that may be so.

This is another rather hoary bureau. It has been with us since 1902. There has been appropriated since that time, all told, the sum of \$10,561,503 to eradicate this disease. The last big appropriation seems to have been in 1924. There seems not to have been any foot-and-mouth disease since that time; so we have just been reappropriating the unexpended balances of the appropriation of \$3,500,000 contained in the second deficiency appropriation act of 1924; and all that is done this time is to reappropriate the portion still unexpended. I find that there is an unobligated balance of \$1,436,017.

Mr. President, we have a bureau standing by ready at any moment to attack the foot-and-mouth disease; and the bureau no doubt will last as long as that unexpended balance can be carried on from year to year.

Of course, this item ought to come out of the bill. The Congress is nearly always in session, and if the foot-and-mouth disease breaks out it can be looked after and will be looked after. We ought not to keep a perpetual bureau here waiting for the foot-and-mouth disease to break out.

HOG CHOLERA

The bureau dealing with hog cholera was established in 1914. There has been expended up to date \$4,533,150 to stamp out hog cholera. It is true that although it has been only 18 years since the work was started the bureau has issued a bulletin. The bulletin is very complete and shows exactly how the disease can be prevented and treated and eradicated. It seems to me the department has done everything that is possible. As I understand, there has been no epidemic of hog cholera in quite a number of years, and there ought not to be an appropriation for that purpose; yet the President has recommended \$466,380 for that purpose for this year.

SOUTHERN CATTLE TICKS

Another hoary bureau is the one charged with looking after southern cattle ticks. It was established in 1907. The Government has contributed \$13,695,595 since that time. The President estimates that \$724,400 will be used for that purpose in 1933.

A bulletin has been issued on this subject, in the foreword of which this is said:

The methods of eradication have been improved from time to time as new facts became known; and it may be stated that the methods have reached such a degree of perfection and have had such a wide practical test that the question of how to eradicate the tick is no longer an essential part of the problem. The main part of the task is to have hearty, vigorous, and conscientious co-operation of the people. In other words, the work will progress just as rapidly as the people desire it shall.

In that statement, Mr. President, is to be found a complete answer to this large appropriation for southern cattle ticks. The bulletin shows just precisely how the ticks can be eradicated, and the only appropriation necessary is one to enable these bulletins to be distributed. It is a waste of the people's money to do anything else, according to the statement of the bulletin itself; yet we have a large bureau here in Washington, and out of this appropriation of

\$724,000 the sum of \$573,500 is spent for personal services. This shows how, when a bureau once gets started, it never lets go.

CROP AND LIVESTOCK ESTIMATES

The work of preparing crop and livestock estimates was begun in 1864 during the Civil War. There has been spent on it altogether a total of \$13,687,816. The President recommends that \$790,320 be expended for this purpose in 1933.

This bureau, as I say, has been at work since 1864. Whether or not it does any good to the farmers is very doubtful. I think the crop estimates now provided for by law are exceedingly hurtful to prices. I know that there are certain great classes of cotton in Memphis where the Government virtually fixes the price by publishing every morning a statement as to the value of that cotton. We ought not to do it. The Department of Agriculture has been making these crop estimates, and they have simply become a part of the cotton-gambling program of the various cotton exchanges of the country. I should like to see the whole thing done away with, certainly the way it is used.

Let me add, Mr. President, that to my mind there is nothing more hurtful to the prices of cotton and wheat in this country than the crop estimates that are issued from time to time by the Bureau of Crop Estimates in the Department of Agriculture. Sometimes they hit it and sometimes they miss it, but at all times the farmers are injured by the publication of the estimates. I do not think we ought to spend a cent for such work; I think it ought to be stopped.

COTTON STATISTICS

The same thing is true, and even more true, of the work of the Bureau of Cotton Statistics. We have spent \$1,773,898 on cotton statistics, and I do not believe they do any good.

MARKET-INSPECTION SERVICE

The same thing is also true of the market-inspection service. This bureau has been in existence since 1918. We have spent \$4,671,946 on it since that time. While we spend a large sum now on market-inspection service—namely, \$541,896, as shown on page 157—I do not believe it benefits the farmers in any appreciable degree.

COLOR INVESTIGATION

I next come to color investigations. The President has recommended \$90,960 for this purpose. With the Government \$2,000,000,000 behind in its running expenses and with the probability that it will be \$6,000,000,000 behind in another year, with 8,000,000 people out of employment, and probably hundreds of thousands of them hungry, we are spending the Government's money for color investigations. Let me read what the item is:

For investigation and experiment in the utilization for coloring, medicinal and technical purposes of raw materials grown or produced in the United States in cooperation with such persons, associations, or corporations as may be found necessary, including repairs, alterations, improvements, or additions to a building on the Arlington Experimental Farm.

Color investigations! Men and women starving in America, 8,000,000 out of employment in America, and the Government wasting its money on color investigations!

Here is another appropriation of \$71,040 for forest economics. What is forest economics?

Mr. KING. Jobs.

Mr. McKELLAR. We might just as well establish a bureau for goat economics. Out of the \$71,000 appropriated for this purpose \$53,264 is for personal services. It is just another bureau.

Forest research is an item of the same kind. The total appropriation is \$535,080, of which \$403,240 is for personal services. Up to date over \$13,000,000 has been spent for forest research, with people hungry and starving in America.

Mr. President, the various items I have named in these 29 amendments amount approximately to \$151,000,000. We talk about economy, and yet here is the Budget Bureau directing the appropriation of \$151,000,000 for these 29 bureaus, which, all put together, are either entirely out of date and serving no useful purpose or are altogether not worth a million dollars.

Mr. President, I am as much interested in agriculture as any man in this body, or any man in the United States for that matter, because I believe that the basis of all our prosperity is in the soil. I have selected these 29 appropriations in the agricultural bill simply because that bill came up first. There are equally useless bureaus in every department of the Government. Heaven knows, it is not because of anything against the farmer. These appropriations are not really for the farmer. They are for the bureaucrats who are working the farmer and at the same time working the Government.

We ought not to appropriate money to these bureaus in the way we have been doing. When the Government was rich and received more money than it could spend there might have been some excuse for this profligacy, but there is not any such excuse for it now. There ought to be a committee appointed by the Vice President to examine into the question of these appropriations.

I stop here long enough to say that I offered such an amendment some time ago, but after doing so I saw a bill that was introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, my friend Mr. ROBINSON, for a joint commission to be created by the House and the Senate, and I think that is the very best plan. I hope the bill may soon be reported out and passed by this Congress, so that the joint commission can take up this question of useless bureaus, of duplicating bureaus, of bureaus that are idly spending the people's money year after year, and the Congress does not even pass on the matter; because, as I explained to the Senate awhile ago, all these appropriations that have been authorized by law just come along year after year and are passed over without even reading them.

Mr. President, we must balance our Budget. It is the only way to keep this Government where it should be. Great Britain got behind \$600,000,000, and the very fact that she was behind \$600,000,000 in her running expenses caused a political revolution in that country. There was an overwhelming vote in favor of balancing the budget, and she did balance the budget, and she acted wisely when she balanced the budget.

Think where we are. We are not only \$600,000,000 behind; we are over \$3,000,000,000 behind right now, because we have appropriated \$1,250,000,000 since this Congress met in December. We already have a deficit of \$2,000,000,000. In addition to that we have authorized a billion and a half dollars of bonds for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. We are going to authorize other big appropriations; and the President has sent in to us a Budget of \$4,600,000,000. Our income is only \$3,000,000,000, and in fact it is not even that. We do not know that we will get that amount. Then we are going to add another billion to it, according to the news from the House; and, suppose we do. That will be \$4,000,000,000; and with all those additional taxes, the way I figure it out—and I believe my figures are correct—we will be somewhere between five and six billion dollars in the hole by July 1, 1933.

We can not balance the Budget in any other way than by cutting down these appropriations. We ought to start in with this first bill; and I am going to ask for a record vote, and I hope it will be granted, on the first one of these amendments. If it is voted down, I suppose it will be useless to go through the form in every case; but I am going to ask for a record vote on the barberry amendment.

I move to strike from the bill the appropriation for the barberry bureau; and I want to implore the Members of the Senate to consider the seriousness of what is in front of them. With our Government already owing all this money, and with the probability that the amount is going to increase greatly, I ask you, gentlemen of the Senate, to join me in cutting down these appropriations. As a practical matter, they are not needed. Let us cut them down where they can be cut down; and in these 29 bureaus they can be cut down.

I thank the Senate.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Then we are to understand that the Senator will be content with offering the one amendment to which he has referred?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; there are several very important ones. Let us try the barberry bush amendment. I should like to have a vote on that first, because it is a typical case.

Mr. McNARY. I agree with that; but the Senator will be content with that as a test, and will abandon the others if that one is not agreed to?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not feel like abandoning the others. I do not like the word "abandon." I never abandon a position I have taken where I thought it was right. If it was wrong, I am very happy to abandon it.

Mr. McNARY. Very well; then we will refrain from using the word "abandon."

Mr. McKELLAR. But let us see what the vote is. Let us have a vote on the barberry amendment. I will find it among the papers on my desk in just a moment.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement recently issued by the Secretary of Agriculture in regard to the bulletins prepared by that department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What is the request of the Senator?

Mr. PATTERSON. I requested unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement recently issued by the Secretary of Agriculture in regard to bulletins prepared by that department.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, pending the request of the Senator from Missouri I desire to bring a matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KING. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. PATTERSON] submitted a request for unanimous consent, which request has been temporarily suspended by myself.

I believe it is fair and just that the Senate should have brought to its attention the very unusual, the almost inexplicable, course which is being pursued by the Secretary of Agriculture. One finds difficulty in accounting for his action in certain particulars, to which attention is to be brought on any theory of fair-mindedness and intelligence on the part of the Secretary.

The particular document which it is asked shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is nothing more than an attempt on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to reply to criticisms which have been made here and elsewhere directed against publications and proceedings by the department of which he is presumed to be the head. For my part I have not the slightest objection to any statement which the Sec-

retary would like to have published in reply to criticisms of his administration of the office which he is so highly honored by being permitted to fill.

The bill before the Senate carries the astonishing sum of almost three and a half million dollars, to be accurate, in excess of \$3,369,350, for publicity purposes. The items which make up this aggregate appear on pages 69 to 72 of the bill before the Senate.

There is authorized \$812,320 "for acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing, handling, utilization, grading, transportation, and distributing of farm and non-manufactured food products, and the purchasing of farm supplies," and so forth.

There is also incorporated a provision for the appropriation of a fund of \$785,020 "for collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton, stocks, and value of farm crops, and numbers, grades, and value of livestock and livestock products on farms, in cooperation with the Extension Service and other Federal, State, and local agencies."

In addition to these two enormous sums there is provided a further fund of \$365,790 for "acquiring and diffusing useful information regarding agriculture, and for other purposes," having relation, among other things, to the export of agricultural products.

Finally, under Market News Service is this provision:

For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, cottonseed, hay, feeds, tobacco, and seeds, and other agricultural products, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, \$1,406,220.

Making the aggregate of almost three and a half million dollars of which mention was made in the beginning of these remarks.

The Secretary of Agriculture has assumed to frank out in official envelopes a statement made by himself consisting of an attack on Democrats in the body at the other end of the Capitol. He has done that at the expense of the Government, with money provided by the Congress of the United States.

I hold in my hand one of the official envelopes which incorporated the statement to which I have referred, and which, presumably, was sent out under the item last read, Market News Service. On the envelope is printed: "United States Department of Agriculture. Office of the Secretary. Washington, D. C. Official business."

Then there is the common stamp on the envelope, "Penalty for private use," and so forth.

It seems that the department has established the practice of sending out to country newspapers throughout the United States what is alleged to be information concerning the market, and to all newspapers which have been in the habit of receiving such communications from the department the Secretary is alleged to have sent the attack on the Democratic membership of the House of Representatives, which I mentioned a few moments ago.

The statement is headed:

Statement by Secretary of Agriculture Arthur M. Hyde, February 28, 1932.

I quote portions of the statement by the Secretary:

Yesterday the Democratic organization in the House railroaded through a bill for \$132,000,000 for roads.

Just what relationship that declaration has to "market news service" I would like to have the gigantic intellect which dominates the agricultural interests of this Nation in the name of the Secretary of Agriculture explain. There is, of course, no objection to the Secretary entertaining any view which he may be prompted to entertain concerning the

House Democratic leadership. There is no objection to his expressing it. But there arises a question of ethics and morals when he undertakes to carry on his political campaign by the misappropriation and false and improper use of public money, and if he or anyone here is lacking in the moral principle and the intelligence required to see the truth of this, I am unable to find language which can be properly spoken here to describe his lack of comprehension and intelligence. We are wasting public money by appropriating large general funds for publicity purposes—money which is used for political purposes by a Secretary of Agriculture, whose ethical standards are so at variance with those commonly accepted that they can not be described in parliamentary language.

Congress should hardly be expected, considering the condition of the Treasury, to provide campaign funds for members of the Cabinet in this administration.

To give an illustration of what newspaper editors and publishers think of the course pursued by the Secretary in abusing his power and in misusing public funds for political purposes, I read from the letter of a country newspaper publisher who, immediately upon receipt of this contemptible document, transmitted it to me:

I am sending you herewith a copy of what I think is the rankiest thing that has come under my observation during the 30 years of my experience in newspaper work. The Department of Agriculture maintains a publicity service which it furnishes to weekly papers such as mine, but such service is supposed to deal solely with matters of farm interest and not with politics. I can not conceive of such a thing being passed out to the country papers under the guise of "farm news service." I think this is one of the rawest things that ever came under my observation—

And so forth.

The Secretary, after repeatedly denouncing the measure referred to as having been railroaded through the House by the Democrats, characterized it as a "pork-barrel" measure. His object, of course, was not to influence legislation. What was his object? What was the purpose of the Secretary in sending in a franked envelope to newspaper publishers a statement of the character described? Was it in compliance with the lofty purposes which presumably inspire Cabinet officers? No; it was a display of pettishness, of littleness of mind that is reflected in neglect of public duty in order to promote political advantage. He could not have expected to do anything more than to arouse criticism of Democrats in Congress.

The bill referred to was not regarded as strictly a partisan measure. It was almost identical with another bill that passed this body and the House a year ago by a unanimous vote, or nearly such, in both bodies, and which received the approval of the President. True, it was an emergency measure. It is also true that the emergency which prompted and apparently justified the first bill has not yet passed. The vote in the House on this bill—that is, the bill which the Secretary characterizes and condemns in his message to country newspapers, in his "farm marketing news service"—was yeas 205, nays 109. Of the yeas, 150 were cast by Democrats and 55 were cast by Republicans. Of the 109 nays, 12 were cast by Democrats and 97 by Republicans. There was a large number of absentees, some Members voting "present."

The Secretary did not realize that, instead of popularizing his own attitude, he was, perhaps, inviting criticism of the position he occupied, because there is a general feeling that the construction of rural post roads is a very practical and effective way of providing employment for those who require it in communities remote from the great centers.

But the merits of the bill, the fact that an almost identical measure passed both Houses of the Congress nearly unanimously, and the fact that this measure passed the body at the other end of the Capitol by large votes on both sides of the Chamber, are not essential to the question that I am now discussing, and that is that it is immoral and well-nigh indecent to use public funds, moneys appropriated from the Treasury of the United States, for partisan political purposes. It can not be justified when done by anyone, no matter whether he be a Democrat or a Republican. But

when a member of the President's Cabinet resorts to methods of the character which I have described and pursues the policy of using trust funds in his hands—trust funds that have been amassed from 20-cent wheat and 5-cent cotton, or from whatever source—he puts himself in a position that no one in this body dare rise to defend unless he wishes to mark himself with the indelible brand of infamy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the request of the Senator from Missouri. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. I can see no objection. This is the matter which I answered in my speech in the Senate on yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR M. HYDE, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, FOR EDITOR AND PUBLISHER

The Department of Agriculture realizes it has much to learn. We welcome criticism. I hope we are not so impervious as to fail to profit from it. But the criticism should be constructive, and the critic should know his facts.

Lately we have had the other kind a plenty. I believe that editors who have followed the widespread tirades against our farmers' bulletins will agree that most of the statements have been short on truth. The criticism originated with the United States Chamber of Commerce, and was relayed via the Senate Chamber, barbed with wit, embellished with wisecracks, and camouflaged under the fair name of economy. But the gentlemen who originated and transmitted the outburst were in blissful ignorance of the facts.

A few of the facts:

Sixty per cent of the alleged bulletins criticized never were printed by this department. They were articles printed by commercial magazines, the unemotional editors of which paid their own hard money for typesetters and white paper because they thought the information was of some value.

A bulletin on window curtaining was printed by the department. We issued it with the double-barrelled purpose of offering to the wives in humble homes an inexpensive method of making the home attractive, and of widening the market for cotton. It was printed at the request of cotton producers for whom a large demand for cotton would be a boom. Indeed, Congress has instructed several branches of the Government to try to widen the market for cotton.

A bulletin called "Lamb As You Like It" did not prove to the liking of a senatorial humorist. In that respect he differs from more than 200,000 of his fellow citizens who took the pains and bought stamps to write for it. He differs from producers who realized that a prejudice existed against lamb because housewives did not cook the meat properly.

The statement, made by this same Senator and spread throughout the country, that "we could forego * * * the \$20,000,000 that we are using for the preparation and publication of bulletins" needs some important qualifications, reservations, and limitations, as well as much salt and ketchup before it can be swallowed.

The total output of the public Printing Office last year cost fifteen and one-half million dollars. Deduct two and one-half million spent by Congress. Deduct, roughly, another six and one-half million for job printing for the Treasury, Patent Office, and all other units of government, and the twenty million has shriveled to six and one-half million or thereabouts to pay for every governmental book, report, publication, or bulletin in all the executive and judicial branches of the Government. Many of these reports are required by acts of Congress.

Of the remaining six and one-half million, the Department of Agriculture spent last year \$212,601 for farmers' bulletins and leaflets. The people of the United States wrote in, asked for, and received 17,000,000 such bulletins. They cost 1¼ cents a copy!

An 8-page bulletin on rompers brought a snort of senatorial satire. The total cost of that bulletin was only \$1,018 for 130,000 copies. The cost therefore was about equal to the expense of printing the Senator's quips in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (free and bound editions). However, an important difference is that the people have already demanded 130,000 copies of the romper bulletin.

The Senator talked about a publication on the Love Life of the Bullfrog. Since when was the Bureau of Fisheries transferred to the Department of Agriculture? In any case, the only publication on frogs ever issued by the Department of Commerce was a technical treatise which came out back in 1919. It constituted a real contribution to biological knowledge and answered a demand for information on growing frogs for market.

For popular bulletins, which in a very real sense are part of this department's program of free education, we spend annually less than one-fifth of 1 cent per capita. Of the 750 different popular bulletins that we distribute, less than a dozen have been criticized. That's a pretty good average for any concern. These 12 are mostly in the field of home economics. It's a curious thing that our bulletins on fertilizers, plant propagation, disease, and insect control escape passing jibes, but as soon as we dare tell a

woman how to use cheap cotton fabrics in dressing her child healthfully, the wrath of the critics is turned loose. These criticized bulletins cost about \$2,300 a year! One recent speech by a Senator increased the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD printing bill by \$11,500.

We publish other bulletins, many of them technical studies. These are issued in small editions for scientists specializing in the subjects. They are not for the average reader. Strangely enough these are not criticized. They are science, and entitled to respect, but when science steps into working clothes and goes out to the kitchen or the field to give practical application to her truths through the medium of the inexpensive bulletins or leaflets, then she subjects herself to the jibes of the uninformed.

One idea behind popular bulletins is the idea behind the public schools and the State universities. It is the idea behind the second-class mail rate, the idea that education and information are worth while.

Editors ought to understand more clearly than most others the basic reason for these bulletins. Most newspapers accept the burden of answering questions from readers. Some newspapers subscribe for a syndicated service that agrees to answer the questions that come in from readers. Replies to readers cost money, but newspapers accept it as part of their job. How much more is it the job of a public agency like the Department of Agriculture, supported by public funds and employing specialists who are recognized as authorities in their fields!

Our knowledge—no matter how developed—is public property. Every citizen has the privilege of writing to the department for information. Our specialists are investigating under specific appropriations provided for study of specific problems. The information is on tap for anyone who wants it, whether it is new or old. If the 6,000,000 separate farms do not turn to us or to the cooperating State institutions for information in usable form, where are they to get it? If they can't turn to us, why have a Department of Agriculture?

In the early days of the department it soon became evident that specialists were spending time and effort in replies to oft-repeated questions which could be answered better, more comprehensively, and much more economically with printed pamphlets. To-day the interest of the public is the principal determinant in selecting subjects for new popular bulletins. While a bulletin costs about 1½ cents, a letter costs anywhere from 25 cents to a dollar. If a farmer writes to us and asks for information on onion culture and we reply, "We're sorry, but we can't tell you anything about onions because many people feel it wouldn't be a proper function of government," the cost for that short letter would be several times the cost of a bulletin that gives adequate information on growing onions. Quite obviously we wouldn't write such a negative type of letter. We would do the best we could to satisfy the request. The cost would be proportionately higher. If we spent less for bulletins we would spend much more for correspondence and many persons would have to go without.

From the standpoint of cost to the department and to the taxpayer we have found the press is the most economical channel for getting the fact to the man who can put it to work, but when editors find news or information in the achievements of the department they create a demand for bulletins that give more detailed information than a newspaper or periodical can be expected to supply. We try to meet the demand. Last year we were able to supply only about half the publications for which we had requests. It costs less on the average to print a bulletin than the 2-cent stamp the inquirer uses to ask for it.

A list of titles of agricultural publications sets off the hair-trigger humorist. An onion bulletin is good for a laugh except from the man who has his troubles growing and marketing onions. Ants make a picnic, and cheese is a strong spread for wisecrackers. But does this make for adequate or helpful criticism? In looking over examples of frothy fault-finding I have often wondered why it is that home economics bulletin titles draw so much male ridicule. Perhaps it is because it is easy to make fun of something you know little about.

One criticism that seems to me most deserving of consideration is that we are trying to teach in too many fields. I see the point of an editor in the Kansas wheat fields who wonders why we have a bulletin on mushroom growing. I have often wondered why a certain bulletin was published, and when I've investigated I have found there is a reason—usually a good reason—that the specialists need it to answer questions. That is the explanation for the leaflet on How to Make a Cat-Trap, which puzzled a good many. That 4-page leaflet, illustrated, makes a far better reply than a letter without illustrations. Why trap cats? Ask the man who wants the assistance of birds in his garden and orchard. Ask the farmer who wants to save his poultry. Ask the public-health official, who knows that stray cats spread disease.

Many people assume that the department scatters its bulletins helter-skelter, hoping that 1 out of 10, or thereabouts, will find a reader rather than a wastebasket. On the contrary, we do not mail bulletins unless an individual has written to the department and specifically requested information contained in a bulletin. We don't even try to stimulate requests. To the press we issue a notice of the availability of a new bulletin. The knowledge of the bulletin's availability spreads from there on. If the present barrage of criticism hasn't done anything else, it has certainly stimulated people to pour more requests for publications into our laps.

The department values and has benefited from intelligent criticisms of its publications. No group is more capable of giving us good advice in this respect than newspaper editors, who are pay-

ing more attention to science and agriculture than ever before. If I object to most of the recent comment on bulletins, it is because it obviously is based on misinformation which many editors appear to have accepted as trustworthy. When a Senator echoes a propagandist in suggesting that the Government could save \$20,000,000 if we stopped printing bulletins, it is claptrap. When editors accept this in good faith and reason accordingly it becomes serious. Any editor can demand and get the facts in regard to publications, or for any specific publication—how much it cost, why it was printed, and information in regard to demand for distribution.

If the propagandists who are taking pot shots at the department really mean that we should abandon what is one of the most economical and effective methods of popular education and information, if they think the Government should discharge all its scientists, or let them work on without revealing the results, it would mean a change in policy that ought to be discussed seriously. It would deserve treatment more substantial than facile wit and wisecracks.

On the other hand, if they are interested in seeing rigid economy practiced by all Government departments we are with them. We've reduced our budget by millions. We've decreased our printing fund by \$75,000. We've decreased travel. We will continue to take second place to none in economizing and in increasing efficiency. The chairman of the House Committee that handles the department's appropriation bill said the other day: "From my investigation I believe this department . . . has cooperated with the President 100 per cent in striving to reduce expenses. . . . It is striving with might and main to conduct an economical administration."

A bulletin is the most tangible evidence of a Government expenditure. The critic can hold it in his hand and shout about extravagance. The critic focuses on what seems to him a triviality and distorts it as characteristic of the whole. These bulletins are not published to waste the taxpayers' money. Rather they are our cheapest method of doing a very necessary job.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] yesterday moved to reconsider the vote by which the Budget recommendation favorable to an increase in the grasshopper item was incorporated in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McNARY. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would not the Senator be willing to take to conference the various amendments which I have offered and work them out there? In view of what has been said and what appear to be the facts in reference to the amendments, I hope that the Senator will be willing to accept them and let them go to conference.

Mr. McNARY. Oh, no. Of course, that is an unusual and fatuous request. It is unthinkable and unfair legislation. I would not be carrying out the desires and purposes and expressed views of the Senate. Of course, I would not do a thing like that.

The junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] yesterday, as he will recall, interposed a motion to reconsider the vote on the grasshopper item. Is it the desire of the Senator to discuss that subject at this time?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] desires to discuss the matter, and I wanted to use it as a vehicle for a few observations generally upon the bill. If it is agreeable to the Senator, I am willing to pass it over for the present.

Mr. McNARY. I had hoped we could conclude the consideration of the bill to-day.

Mr. KING. I do not think the Senator can do so. The Senator knows that I have made no observations at all upon the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator so desire?

Mr. KING. I expect to speak upon the bill.

Mr. McNARY. At any length?

Mr. KING. Yes; perhaps an hour.

Mr. McNARY. Could the Senator proceed at this time?

Mr. KING. Can we not proceed with some other amendments?

Mr. McNARY. I would prefer, if I may choose the course that may be pursued, to take up the amendments offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] at a later time. There is quite a number of them to be considered, and I should like to go through them without the interruption of a recess.

Mr. McKELLAR. I would suggest that we take them up when we convene to-morrow.

Mr. McNARY. It is the desire of an overwhelming majority that we may recess over this afternoon until Monday.

Mr. McKELLAR. That would be perfectly satisfactory to me.

DISTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED WHEAT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 110) authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress, which was to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Federal Farm Board is authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary to make available, at any time prior to May 1, 1933, on application by the American National Red Cross, or any other organization designated by the American National Red Cross, wheat of the Grain Stabilization Corporation, for use in providing food for the needy and distressed people of the United States and Territories, and for feed for livestock in the 1931 crop-failure areas. Such wheat shall be delivered upon any such application only upon the approval of the President of the United States, and in such amounts to each organization as the President may approve, except that the total amount of wheat delivered as hereinbefore authorized shall not be in excess of 40,000,000 bushels.

SEC. 2. No part of the expenses incident to the delivery, receipt, and distribution of such wheat shall be borne by the United States or the Federal Farm Board. Such wheat may be milled or exchanged for flour or feed, but if processed it shall be without profit to any mill, organization, or other person. In cities of over 25,000 population the American National Red Cross or any other organization designated by it may have said flour obtained in accordance with section 2 baked into bread or processed into food for distribution: *Provided*, That no part of the expense incident to such baking or processing shall be paid out of said wheat or flour and no part of said expense shall be borne by the United States or the Federal Farm Board.

SEC. 3. The Federal Farm Board shall keep account of all wheat delivered as authorized in section 1 and shall credit the account of the Grain Stabilization Corporation with an amount equal to the current market value thereof at the time of delivery.

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

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

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question or two regarding the joint resolution. In what respect does the amendment adopted by the House differ from the joint resolution passed by the Senate?

Mr. NORBECK. The Senate passed two measures.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that and the House has incorporated them into one measure.

Mr. NORBECK. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Is there any material difference between the measures passed by the Senate and the measure which now comes from the House of Representatives?

Mr. NORBECK. There is no material difference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota to concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, after conferring with other Senators who have amendments pending I think time would be made by recessing at this time until Monday.

RELIEF OF NAVAJO, ZUNI, AND APACHE INDIANS IN ARIZONA

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. Out of order, I submit a resolution and ask that it may be read, and then I shall ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the resolution be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 179), as follows:

Whereas a series of blizzards without precedent in the history of the Southwest has destroyed more than 200,000 of the sheep belonging to the Navajo, Zuni, and Apache Tribes, and has brought about a condition of starvation among the livestock which, unless met at once, will result in the destruction of

percentages of the Indian-owned sheep running as high as 60 per cent or higher in some areas; and

Whereas the destruction of the livestock of these tribes means the destruction of their chief and frequently their only source of self-support, and if allowed to go forward will necessitate the feeding of thousands of Indians at Government expense, with the incidental demoralization of the economic system of the tribes, and ultimately will compel the Government to spend a very large sum in the purchase of sheep to restock the reservations; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture has under its control funds which could immediately be lent to these Indians, with their sheep as security, thus making it possible for the Indians to keep their sheep alive by feeding until the spring grass comes; and

Whereas it is impossible for the Department of Agriculture to extend this aid to the Indians except with the consent and cooperation of the Department of the Interior and Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

Whereas, although informed of the facts, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has practically obstructed the action of the Department of Agriculture through proposing that funds legally under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture shall be transferred to the Department of the Interior, a proposal difficult or impossible to meet within the terms of existing law and regulations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs should move instantly to bring the help of the Department of Agriculture to the Indians in the manner which is feasible under existing law and existing regulations, by enabling the Indians to hypothecate their livestock to the Government and by assisting the Department of Agriculture with all means at their command to extend the necessary credit to the Indians in the most expeditious possible manner.

Mr. FRAZIER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the resolution involves a matter of departmental consideration. I think it is important to consider the resolution, and I would not want at this time to ask that it go over under the rule.

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

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

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I desire first to thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding. The resolution relates to a subject of some controversy and of vast importance. It will be remembered that on January 4 last I introduced to the deficiency bill my amendment for \$75,000 to purchase food for storm-bound Indians in northern Arizona and northern New Mexico and to purchase feed to save the flocks and herds of these Indians. At that time I told the Senate that commencing with November 21 last, snowstorms and blizzards of Siberian ferocity and Arctic fury had fallen upon the Indian reservations in northern Arizona and northern New Mexico, where dwell over 50,000 pure-blood Indians. These storms came at intervals and for many weeks the whole of that Indian country, 20,000 square miles in area, was as a marble ocean.

Indians perished in the snowdrifts, starved in the storms, and froze in the frosts. Their mainstays of support and subsistence are sheep and goats, and these winds and snows, with the thermometer ranging from 10 to 30 degrees below, decimated the Indians' herds and flocks.

The Indian Bureau here and the superintendents of the various reservations in the field put forth valiant efforts at relief, and I stated then that an appropriation of \$75,000 was necessary to purchase food for the Indians and feed for their sheep and goats.

The two Houses of Congress agreed to my amendment and the item became a law.

Since I spoke those words on January 4 last another snowstorm, accompanied by extreme cold and cyclonic winds, struck that region.

These Indians, in addition to following their immemorial pastoral pursuits, also make blankets, rugs, silver ornaments, and pottery.

These different tribes inhabiting this 20,000 square miles represent various cultural standards; one tribe may be nomadic and pastoral and another may be sedentary and agricultural.

Mr. President, it is sometimes asserted that noblesse oblige and gallantry are extinct in this mechanical and scientific

age, and that sympathy for human suffering does not touch the heart as once it did; but as against such assertions I now relate an episode of valor and high emprise as follows: The severity of the storms made it impossible for trucks or even for horsemen to traverse the storm-swept region, whereupon the Air Corps of the Army sent out seven bombing planes, and these bombing planes, like great birds of mercy, dropped down upon these widely scattered and famishing Indian families who could not be reached by horsemen, not steel messengers of death, but packages of food. Each package or bundle weighed 100 pounds and contained tea, coffee, sugar, bacon, and bread.

I do not agree with any suggestion made by resolution or otherwise that the Bureau of Indian Affairs was at all remiss or negligent in this behalf. On the contrary, I am bound to say, as a man who desires to be fair, that the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the superintendents and all the personnel in the field did everything within their power to extend relief.

Congress frequently thanks this soldier or that citizen, but I have the unique distinction this afternoon, on behalf of the Indians of that region, to thank Congress. Amidst the shower of approbrious epithets heaped upon Congress, I, on behalf of these Indian tribes and at their request, thank Congress for the passage of my amendment making available \$75,000, which went into the deficiency bill, to aid the Indians and to purchase feed for their sheep and goats.

These Indians are our wards, and if we permit them to perish, if we permit their holdings of livestock to be reduced to the point where the Indians become charges upon the Treasury, the fault and blame will be ours. Embraced in the membership of these different tribes are men of acumen, of industry, of purpose, and of upstanding integrity. It is well worth the attention of this Congress to take measures looking toward assisting them in replenishing their herds of sheep and goats, and I again say that I do not join in any criticism of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

To permit these tribes to be extinguished would be a foul blot and an angry scar upon our Government.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, the situation existing on the Navajo Reservation presents some very serious aspects. With every reasonable effort to lend assistance I am in hearty sympathy. The Senators from Arizona and the Senators from New Mexico have collaborated in an effort to aid in relieving the distress.

The resolution proposed by the Senator from North Dakota, however, is a proposal with which I am not familiar. I had no notice that he intended to offer it. He and I have not discussed it. The resolution presents a unique suggestion, and one that I should like to consider. In view of the fact that I have not considered it, and have had no opportunity to do so, I shall ask that it go over until Monday.

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

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 7, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4 (legislative day of March 2), 1932

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

Charles H. Sherrill, of New York, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Joseph Fritsch, Jr., of New York, to be United States marshal, western district of New York. (He is now serving in this position under an appointment which expires March 7, 1932.)

REAPPOINTMENT IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY

GENERAL OFFICER

To be brigadier general, Auxiliary Reserve

Brig. Gen. Henry Lewis Stimson, Auxiliary Reserve, from May 16, 1932.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

George F. Schad to be postmaster at Brewton, Ala., in place of G. F. Schad. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

John T. Mizell to be postmaster at Clio, Ala., in place of J. T. Mizell. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

Allie L. Boutwell to be postmaster at Flomaton, Ala., in place of A. L. Boutwell. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1932.

Jesse G. Moore to be postmaster at Florence, Ala., in place of H. A. Cathey, removed.

William A. Giddens to be postmaster at Frisco City, Ala., in place of W. A. Giddens. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Annie K. Fazenbaker to be postmaster at Fulton, Ala., in place of A. K. Fazenbaker. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

Blevins S. Perdue to be postmaster at Greenville, Ala., in place of B. S. Perdue. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

Robert O. Atkins to be postmaster at Heflin, Ala., in place of R. O. Atkins. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

Oliver P. Williams to be postmaster at Henagar, Ala., in place of O. P. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Ora B. Wann to be postmaster at Madison, Ala., in place of O. B. Wann. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Thomas C. Latham to be postmaster at Marvel, Ala., in place of T. C. Latham. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Grover C. Warrick to be postmaster at Millry, Ala., in place of G. C. Warrick. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

Willer B. Goodman to be postmaster at New Brockton, Ala., in place of W. B. Goodman. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

Harry E. Marshall to be postmaster at Orrville, Ala., in place of W. T. Cowan. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1931.

Albert H. Quinn to be postmaster at Quinton, Ala., in place of A. H. Quinn. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

Clyde Oldshue to be postmaster at Sulligent, Ala., in place of Clyde Oldshue. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

Lucious E. Osborn to be postmaster at Vina, Ala., in place of L. E. Osborn. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

ALASKA

Wilkie T. Pinkerton to be postmaster at Fairbanks, Alaska, in place of W. T. Pinkerton, removed.

Lydia Noble to be postmaster at Kodiak, Alaska, in place of L. H. White, resigned.

Owen E. Meals (Mrs.) to be postmaster at Valdez, Alaska, in place of George Warner, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Ernest H. Alfrey to be postmaster at Bentonville, Ark., in place of E. S. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1932.

Mary E. Catts to be postmaster at Washington, Ark., in place of M. E. Catts. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

CALIFORNIA

Purley O. Van Deren to be postmaster at Broderick, Calif., in place of P. O. Van Deren. Incumbent's commission expires March 14, 1932.

Peter Garrick to be postmaster at Camino, Calif., in place of Peter Garrick. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1932.

Lew E. Wickes to be postmaster at Castella, Calif., in place of L. E. Wickes. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1932.

Daniel G. Thomas to be postmaster at Colton, Calif., in place of D. G. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1931.

Floyd F. Howard to be postmaster at Courtland, Calif., in place of F. F. Howard. Incumbent's commission expires March 14, 1932.

Anthony G. Heerman to be postmaster at Dinuba, Calif., in place of A. G. Heerman. Incumbent's commission expires March 14, 1932.

Julia M. Arbin to be postmaster at Fairfax, Calif., in place of J. M. Arbin. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Maude H. Parsons to be postmaster at Gerber, Calif., in place of M. H. Parsons. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1932.

George L. Clare to be postmaster at Guerneville, Calif., in place of G. L. Clare. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Nelson S. Dilworth to be postmaster at Homet, Calif., in place of N. S. Dilworth. Incumbent's commission expires March 14, 1932.

Edwin J. Thompson to be postmaster at La Jolla, Calif., in place of E. J. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1932.

Frances E. Bennett to be postmaster at Mills College, Calif., in place of F. E. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expires March 14, 1932.

Albert K. Small, to be postmaster at Murrieta, Calif., in place of A. K. Small. Incumbent's commission expires March 14, 1932.

Winfield S. Buchner to be postmaster at Oildale, Calif., in place of W. S. Buchner. Incumbent's commission expires March 14, 1932.

Irven N. Rowen to be postmaster at Robbins, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Manuel S. Trigueiro to be postmaster at San Miguel, Calif., in place of M. S. Trigueiro. Incumbent's commission expires March 14, 1932.

Walter L. Milne to be postmaster at Talmage, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Rose C. Odell to be postmaster at Tulare, Calif., in place of R. C. Odell. Incumbent's commission expires March 20, 1932.

Walter M. Brown to be postmaster at Turlock, Calif., in place of W. M. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1932.

Jennie E. Kirk to be postmaster at Waterford, Calif., in place of J. E. Kirk. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1932.

COLORADO

Bessie Salabar to be postmaster at Bayfield, Colo., in place of Bessie Salabar. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Alice A. Blazer to be postmaster at Elizabeth, Colo., in place of A. A. Blazer. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Ben H. Glaze to be postmaster at Fowler, Colo., in place of B. H. Glaze. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Paul C. Boyles to be postmaster at Gunnison, Colo., in place of P. C. Boyles. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Thomas B. Scott to be postmaster at Meeker, Colo., in place of T. B. Scott. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1932.

John H. Mallot to be postmaster at Mount Harris, Colo., in place of J. H. Mallot. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1932.

Edward F. Baldwin to be postmaster at Nucla, Colo., in place of E. F. Baldwin. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

John R. Munro to be postmaster at Rifle, Colo., in place of J. R. Munro. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

CONNECTICUT

Henry G. Linsley to be postmaster at Branford, Conn., in place of H. G. Linsley. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Marshall Emmons to be postmaster at East Haddam, Conn., in place of Marshall Emmons. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Sidney M. Cowles to be postmaster at Kensington, Conn., in place of S. M. Cowles. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Herbert E. Erwin to be postmaster at New Britain, Conn., in place of H. E. Erwin. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1932.

Clifford E. Chapman to be postmaster at Niantic, Conn., in place of C. E. Chapman. Incumbent's commission expires March 9, 1932.

DELAWARE

James M. Montgomery to be postmaster at Edge Moor, Del., in place of J. M. Montgomery. Incumbent's commission expires March 20, 1932.

Jehu F. Hudson to be postmaster at Georgetown, Del., in place of J. F. Hudson. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1932.

William R. Risler to be postmaster at Lincoln, Del., in place of W. R. Risler. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1932.

FLORIDA

Gabriel I. Daurelle to be postmaster at Bowling Green, Fla., in place of G. I. Daurelle. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1932.

GEORGIA

Sallie G. Purvis to be postmaster at Pembroke, Ga., in place of S. G. Purvis. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1930.

HAWAII

Edward K. Ayau to be postmaster at Aiea, Hawaii, in place of E. K. Ayau. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1932.

IDAHO

Clarence P. Smith to be postmaster at Eden, Idaho, in place of C. P. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1932.

Arthur B. Bean to be postmaster at Pocatello, Idaho, in place of A. B. Bean. Incumbent's commission expires March 12, 1932.

ILLINOIS

Bryce E. Currens to be postmaster at Adair, Ill., in place of B. E. Currens. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1932.

Rose S. Beard to be postmaster at Arenzville, Ill., in place of R. S. Beard. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

Robert N. Bragg to be postmaster at Brimfield, Ill., in place of R. N. Bragg. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

William F. Lammers to be postmaster at Buckley, Ill., in place of W. F. Lammers. Incumbent's commission expires March 30, 1932.

Georgia W. Cooper to be postmaster at Congress Park, Ill., in place of G. W. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1932.

Guy H. McKelvey to be postmaster at Coulterville, Ill., in place of G. H. McKelvey. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

John W. Nelson to be postmaster at Donovan, Ill., in place of J. W. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

Edward F. Tedens to be postmaster at Lemont, Ill., in place of E. F. Tedens. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

Ulysses E. Smith to be postmaster at Metropolis, Ill., in place of U. E. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1932.

Arthur F. Sturgis to be postmaster at Middletown, Ill., in place of A. F. Sturgis. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

Frank Ohlhausen to be postmaster at Midlothian, Ill., in place of R. K. Cumming, resigned.

James W. Scott to be postmaster at Monmouth, Ill., in place of J. W. Scott. Incumbent's commission expires March 30, 1932.

Willard L. Dragoo to be postmaster at Pawnee, Ill., in place of H. E. Farnam, deceased.

Joseph R. Atkinson to be postmaster at Sidell, Ill., in place of J. R. Atkinson. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

Vern L. Shinneman to be postmaster at Weldon, Ill., in place of V. L. Shinneman. Incumbent's commission expires March 30, 1932.

INDIANA

Charles L. Winter to be postmaster at Bicknell, Ind., in place of Hugh Horn. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1932.

Foster V. Annis to be postmaster at Bremen, Ind., in place of F. V. Annis. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1932.

Jesse Downen to be postmaster at Carbon, Ind., in place of Jesse Downen. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1932.

LaFayette H. Ribble to be postmaster at Fairmount, Ind., in place of L. H. Ribble. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1932.

Earl H. Shepherd to be postmaster at Geneva, Ind., in place of O. A. Potter. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

William G. McNeelan to be postmaster at Holton, Ind., in place of W. G. McNeelan. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1932.

Harry F. Dutton to be postmaster at Martinsville, Ind., in place of R. E. Tilford. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

McKinley Elliott to be postmaster at Middlebury, Ind., in place of McKinley Elliott. Incumbent's commission expires March 14, 1932.

Herman A. Douglass to be postmaster at Monticello, Ind., in place of G. W. Gilbert, deceased.

James J. Patchell to be postmaster at Union City, Ind., in place of J. J. Patchell. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

William I. Ellison to be postmaster at Winona Lake, Ind., in place of W. I. Ellison. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1932.

IOWA

Charles O. McLean to be postmaster at Ankeny, Iowa, in place of C. O. McLean. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

Joseph D. Schaben to be postmaster at Earling, Iowa, in place of J. D. Schaben. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1932.

Edward A. Hansen to be postmaster at Holstein, Iowa, in place of E. A. Hansen. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

Marinus Jansma to be postmaster at Hospers, Iowa, in place of Marinus Jansma. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

Leander G. Kelley to be postmaster at Lamoni, Iowa, in place of L. G. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

Ray C. Edmonds to be postmaster at Le Mars, Iowa, in place of R. C. Edmonds. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

Anna A. Meek to be postmaster at Minburn, Iowa, in place of A. A. Meek. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

John E. Klutts to be postmaster at Mondamin, Iowa, in place of J. E. Klutts. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

Edna Hesser to be postmaster at Nichols, Iowa, in place of Edna Hesser. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1932.

Emil A. Larson to be postmaster at Red Oak, Iowa, in place of J. S. Baxter. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Perry B. Wilson to be postmaster at Shannon City, Iowa, in place of P. B. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

Ora L. Garton to be postmaster at Weldon, Iowa, in place of O. L. Garton. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

KANSAS

Jessie W. Lloyd to be postmaster at Athol, Kans., in place of J. W. Lloyd. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

Anna L. Miller to be postmaster at Bushton, Kans., in place of A. L. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

Joseph V. Barbo to be postmaster at Lenora, Kans., in place of J. V. Barbo. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Forrest L. Powers to be postmaster at Le Roy, Kans., in place of F. L. Powers. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

George J. Frank to be postmaster at Manhattan, Kans., in place of G. J. Frank. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Cyrus L. Holeman to be postmaster at Maplehill, Kans., in place of Olive Clements, resigned.

Nora J. Casteel to be postmaster at Montezuma, Kans., in place of N. J. Casteel. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Anna M. Bryan to be postmaster at Mullinville, Kans., in place of A. M. Bryan. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Andrew M. Ludvickson to be postmaster at Severy, Kans., in place of A. M. Ludvickson. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Walter R. Lathrop to be postmaster at Smith Center, Kans., in place of A. F. Reder, resigned.

James B. Pratt to be postmaster at Syracuse, Kans., in place of J. B. Pratt. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1932.

KENTUCKY

Clifford V. Bryant to be postmaster at Fleming, Ky., in place of A. G. Bryant, removed.

Claude T. Winslow to be postmaster at Mayfield, Ky., in place of C. T. Winslow. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1932.

Benjamin F. Shepard to be postmaster at Wayland, Ky., in place of Byrd Wicker, resigned.

LOUISIANA

George W. Varnado to be postmaster at Franklinton, La., in place of G. W. Varnado. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1932.

Lillian D. Gayle to be postmaster at Independence, La., in place of L. D. Gayle. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

Edwin A. O'Brien to be postmaster at Lafayette, La., in place of R. L. Mouton, resigned.

MAINE

Hugh Hayward to be postmaster at Ashland, Me., in place of Hugh Hayward. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1932.

Marion E. Brown to be postmaster at Belfast, Me., in place of W. C. Libbey, resigned.

H. Emily Cunningham to be postmaster at Damariscotta Mills, Me. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Bernard V. Thompson to be postmaster at Easton, Me., in place of B. V. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

Charles C. McLaughlin to be postmaster at Harmony, Me., in place of C. C. McLaughlin. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

Harry J. White to be postmaster at Jonesport, Me., in place of H. J. White. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1932.

Thomas E. Wilson to be postmaster at Kittery, Me., in place of T. E. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1932.

Harold C. Gates to be postmaster at Millinocket, Me., in place of H. C. Gates. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

Winfield L. Ames to be postmaster at North Haven, Me., in place of W. L. Ames. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1932.

Hiram Ricker, jr., to be postmaster at South Poland, Me., in place of Hiram Ricker, jr. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1932.

Carl W. Mitchell to be postmaster at Union, Me., in place of C. W. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1932.

George E. Sands to be postmaster at Wilton, Me., in place of G. E. Sands. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1932.

Parker B. Stinson to be postmaster at Wiscasset, Me., in place of P. B. Stinson. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1932.

MARYLAND

Harry E. Pyle to be postmaster at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md., in place of H. E. Pyle. Incumbent's commission expires March 6, 1932.

Thomas G. Pearce to be postmaster at Glenarm, Md., in place of T. G. Pearce. Incumbent's commission expires March 12, 1932.

MASSACHUSETTS

Fred C. Small to be postmaster at Buzzards Bay, Mass., in place of F. C. Small. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Isabelle Crocker to be postmaster at Cotuit, Mass., in place of Isabelle Crocker. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

Chestina B. Robbins to be postmaster at East Templeton, Mass., in place of C. B. Robbins. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

Edwin C. Howe to be postmaster at Enfield, Mass., in place of E. C. Howe. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

Bernard Campbell to be postmaster at Millville, Mass., in place of Bernard Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1932.

Maryetta Browne to be postmaster at State Farm, Mass., in place of F. P. Turner, resigned.

Harry W. Metcalf to be postmaster at Wrentham, Mass., in place of H. W. Metcalf. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

MICHIGAN

Homer E. Buck to be postmaster at Bay City, Mich., in place of H. E. Buck. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1932.

Arthur R. Gerow to be postmaster at Cheboygan, Mich., in place of A. R. Gerow. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

Bert E. Paul to be postmaster at Dowagiac, Mich., in place of John Fenine. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1932.

Melvin A. Bates to be postmaster at Grayling, Mich., in place of M. A. Bates. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Dudley E. Hewitt to be postmaster at Petersburg, Mich., in place of J. D. Housman, resigned.

Wilda P. Hartingh to be postmaster at Pinconning, Mich., in place of W. P. Hartingh. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Christina B. Grozinger to be postmaster at Woodland, Mich., in place of C. B. Grozinger. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

MINNESOTA

Ernest J. Grunst to be postmaster at Alpha, Minn., in place of E. J. Grunst. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Claude C. Stubbe to be postmaster at Ashby, Minn., in place of C. C. Stubbe. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1931.

Claire L. Lewis to be postmaster at Big Lake, Minn., in place of E. E. Putnam, deceased.

Agnes Doyle to be postmaster at Bovey, Minn., in place of Agnes Doyle. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Frederic E. Hamlin to be postmaster at Chaska, Minn., in place of F. E. Hamlin. Incumbent's commission expires March 29, 1932.

Olga P. Hatling to be postmaster at Dalton, Minn., in place of O. P. Hatling. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

Georgia C. Hompe to be postmaster at Deer Creek, Minn., in place of G. C. Hompe. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

Eva Cole to be postmaster at Delavan, Minn., in place of Eva Cole. Incumbent's commission expires March 19, 1932.

Ralph C. Peterson to be postmaster at Dilworth, Minn., in place of R. C. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

Theresa E. Thoreson to be postmaster at East Grand Forks, Minn., in place of T. E. Thoreson. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

Clarence W. Ivey to be postmaster at Elmore, Minn., in place of C. W. Ivey. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

John A. Gregerson to be postmaster at Fertile, Minn., in place of J. A. Gregerson. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

Edith B. Triplett to be postmaster at Floodwood, Minn., in place of E. B. Triplett. Incumbent's commission expires March 20, 1932.

Emanuel Nyman to be postmaster at Foley, Minn., in place of Emanuel Nyman. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1930.

George H. Baer to be postmaster at Frazee, Minn., in place of G. H. Baer. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

Erwin B. Whitney to be postmaster at Granite Falls, Minn., in place of E. B. Whitney. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Charles A. Anderson to be postmaster at Greenbush, Minn., in place of C. A. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

Herbert L. McChesney to be postmaster at Hewitt, Minn., in place of H. W. Noeske. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

Lewis H. Merrill to be postmaster at Hutchinson, Minn., in place of L. H. Merrill. Incumbent's commission expires March 20, 1932.

Louis W. Galour to be postmaster at Iona, Minn., in place of L. W. Galour. Incumbent's commission expires March 29, 1932.

Carl F. Peterson to be postmaster at Kennedy, Minn., in place of C. F. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

Roy Coleman to be postmaster at Lancaster, Minn., in place of Roy Coleman. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

Arnold E. Talle to be postmaster at McIntosh, Minn., in place of A. E. Talle. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

Clara M. Hjertos to be postmaster at Middle River, Minn., in place of C. M. Hjertos. Incumbent's commission expires March 29, 1932.

Francis S. Pollard to be postmaster at Morgan, Minn., in place of F. S. Pollard. Incumbent's commission expires March 29, 1932.

Vera M. Parks to be postmaster at Nisswa, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Edward J. Soland to be postmaster at Oklee, Minn., in place of E. J. Soland. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Abraham L. Ober to be postmaster at Palisade, Minn., in place of A. L. Ober. Incumbent's commission expires March 14, 1932.

Frank X. Virnig to be postmaster at Pierz, Minn., in place of Theodore Thielen. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1930.

Selma O. Winter to be postmaster at St. Hilaire, Minn., in place of S. O. Winter. Incumbent's commission expires March 20, 1932.

Charles J. Moos to be postmaster at St. Paul, Minn., in place of C. J. Moos. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Taliof T. Hamrey to be postmaster at Trail, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Alfred Anderson to be postmaster at Twin Valley, Minn., in place of Alfred Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1931.

Alfred Gronner to be postmaster at Underwood, Minn., in place of Alfred Gronner. Incumbent's commission expires March 20, 1932.

Mary A. Bradford to be postmaster at Verndale, Minn., in place of L. A. Bradford, deceased.

Milda Rieman to be postmaster at Vergas, Minn., in place of Milda Rieman. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

Milton P. Mann to be postmaster at Worthington, Minn., in place of M. P. Mann. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Henry Groth to be postmaster at Wright, Minn., in place of Henry Groth. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

MISSISSIPPI

Nettie Dorsett to be postmaster at Lucedale, Miss., in place of Nettie Dorsett. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1931.

MISSOURI

Edward A. Birkmann to be postmaster at Beaufort, Mo., in place of E. A. Birkmann. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Harry C. Grant to be postmaster at Cuba, Mo., in place of H. C. Grant. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1932.

Joseph P. O'Hern to be postmaster at Hannibal, Mo., in place of J. P. O'Hern. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

John M. Schermann to be postmaster at Hermann, Mo., in place of J. M. Schermann. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Oliver H. Simmons to be postmaster at Lancaster Mo., in place of O. H. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1932.

John S. McCrory to be postmaster at Linn Creek, Mo., in place of J. S. McCrory. Incumbent's commission expires March 20, 1932.

John A. Varney to be postmaster at Paris, Mo., in place of J. A. Varney. Incumbent's commission expires March 26, 1932.

Hattie Stierberger to be postmaster at Union, Mo., in place of Hattie Stierberger. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Charles A. Boyles to be postmaster at Urich, Mo., in place of L. C. Boyles, removed.

Artie B. Keadle to be postmaster at Wellsville, Mo., in place of A. B. Keadle. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1932.

MONTANA

Queenie B. Lyndes to be postmaster at Hysham, Mont., in place of Q. B. Lyndes. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

George I. Watters to be postmaster at Victor, Mont., in place of G. I. Watters. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

NEBRASKA

Charles W. Fritts to be postmaster at Crawford, Nebr., in place of C. W. Fritts. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1932.

William C. Hagelin to be postmaster at Friend, Nebr., in place of W. C. Hagelin. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1931.

Earle D. Willard to be postmaster at Genoa, Nebr., in place of E. D. Willard. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Louis R. Eby to be postmaster at Hartington, Nebr., in place of L. R. Eby. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

Ingebert J. Thomsen to be postmaster at Minden, Nebr., in place of I. J. Thomsen. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Edwin P. Clements, jr., to be postmaster at Ord, Nebr., in place of E. P. Clements, jr. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1932.

Leona V. Schrecengost to be postmaster at Papillion, Nebr., in place of L. V. Schrecengost. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1932.

Carl H. Oldero to be postmaster at Springfield, Nebr., in place of C. H. Oldero. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1932.

NEVADA

Isaac L. Stone to be postmaster at McGill, Nev., in place of I. L. Stone. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Alice L. Coughlin to be postmaster at West Ossipee, N. H., in place of A. L. Coughlin. Incumbent's commission expires March 20, 1932.

NEW JERSEY

Alfred J. Perkins to be postmaster at Atlantic City, N. J., in place of A. J. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1931.

Robert K. Greenwood to be postmaster at Elmer, N. J., in place of L. H. Greenwood, removed.

Fred F. Dennis to be postmaster at Fair Haven, N. J., in place of F. F. Dennis. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1932.

Frank Pierson to be postmaster at Lawrenceville, N. J., in place of Frank Pierson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Edith C. Reeves to be postmaster at New Lisbon, N. J., in place of W. A. Reeves, removed.

Frank C. Dalrymple to be postmaster at Pittstown, N. J., in place of F. C. Dalrymple, removed.

Mabel E. Tomlin to be postmaster at Sewell, N. J., in place of M. E. Tomlin. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1932.

James H. Masker to be postmaster at Somerville, N. J., in place of J. H. Masker. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1932.

NEW YORK

Harold L. Payne to be postmaster at Bainbridge, N. Y., in place of H. L. Payne. Incumbent's commission expires March 14, 1932.

Jennie M. Steinhilber to be postmaster at Beaver Falls, N. Y., in place of J. M. Steinhilber. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1932.

George H. Farley to be postmaster at Broadalbin, N. Y., in place of G. H. Farley. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

Elizabeth H. Oschmann to be postmaster at Broad Channel, N. Y., in place of E. H. Oschmann. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Peter R. Carmichael to be postmaster at Caledonia, N. Y., in place of P. R. Carmichael. Incumbent's commission expires March 20, 1932.

Edmund B. Windsor to be postmaster at Castile, N. Y., in place of E. B. Windsor. Incumbent's commission expires March 14, 1932.

John G. McNicoll to be postmaster at Cedarhurst, N. Y., in place of J. G. McNicoll. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

John F. Wickham to be postmaster at Clyde, N. Y., in place of F. A. Haugh, retired.

Laurance C. Baker to be postmaster at Comstock, N. Y., in place of L. C. Baker. Incumbent's commission expires March 5, 1932.

Stanley W. Parsons to be postmaster at Copenhagen, N. Y., in place of S. W. Parsons. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1932.

Harry L. Hedger to be postmaster at Glen Cove, N. Y., in place of H. L. Hedger. Incumbent's commission expires March 5, 1932.

Henry L. Sherman to be postmaster at Glens Falls, N. Y., in place of H. L. Sherman. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1932.

Oby J. Hoag to be postmaster at Greene, N. Y., in place of O. J. Hoag. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1932.

Carl Gardner to be postmaster at Groveland, N. Y., in place of Carl Gardner. Incumbent's commission expires March 20, 1932.

Neil S. Barclay to be postmaster at Hillsdale, N. Y., in place of N. S. Barclay. Incumbent's commission expires March 5, 1932.

Robert L. McBrien to be postmaster at Huntington, N. Y., in place of R. L. McBrien. Incumbent's commission expires March 14, 1932.

Estella Otis to be postmaster at Keene Valley, N. Y., in place of Estella Otis. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1932.

Ruth W. J. Mott to be postmaster at Oswego, N. Y., in place of R. W. J. Mott. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

John H. Quinlan to be postmaster at Pavilion, N. Y., in place of J. H. Quinlan. Incumbent's commission expires March 5, 1932.

Harry C. Holcomb to be postmaster at Portville, N. Y., in place of H. C. Holcomb. Incumbent's commission expires March 20, 1932.

Giles C. de Groot to be postmaster at Ronkonkoma, N. Y., in place of G. C. de Groot. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1932.

Asa C. Rowland to be postmaster at Salamanca, N. Y., in place of A. C. Rowland. Incumbent's commission expires March 5, 1932.

Conrad Happ to be postmaster at Sparrow Bush, N. Y., in place of Conrad Happ. Incumbent's commission expires March 5, 1932.

Walter W. Tilley to be postmaster at Theresa, N. Y., in place of W. W. Tilley. Incumbent's commission expires March 5, 1932.

James Richtmyer to be postmaster at Windham, N. Y., in place of James Richtmyer. Incumbent's commission expires March 5, 1932.

John T. Gallagher to be postmaster at Witherbee, N. Y., in place of J. T. Gallagher. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

NORTH CAROLINA

William H. Manning to be postmaster at Bethel, N. C., in place of W. H. Manning. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1932.

William T. Fletcher to be postmaster at Boonville, N. C., in place of W. T. Fletcher. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1932.

George E. Kestler to be postmaster at Concord, N. C., in place of G. E. Kestler. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1932.

John M. Crawford to be postmaster at Graham, N. C., in place of J. R. Guthrie, deceased.

Herbert C. Whisnant to be postmaster at Granite Falls, N. C., in place of H. C. Whisnant. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1932.

Theodore E. McCrary to be postmaster at Lexington, N. C., in place of T. E. McCrary. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1932.

Paul E. Bruce to be postmaster at Mars Hill, N. C., in place of P. E. Bruce. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1932.

William F. Ballard to be postmaster at Mount Holly, N. C., in place of W. F. Ballard. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1932.

May C. Campbell to be postmaster at Norwood, N. C., in place of M. C. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1932.

Charles E. Zedaker to be postmaster at Red Springs, N. C., in place of C. E. Zedaker. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1932.

Cyril L. Walker to be postmaster at Roper, N. C., in place of C. L. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1932.

W. Homan Hall to be postmaster at Rosehill, N. C., in place of W. H. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1932.

James A. Grogan to be postmaster at Spray, N. C., in place of J. A. Grogan. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1932.

Alexander B. Berry to be postmaster at Swanquarter, N. C., in place of A. B. Berry. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1932.

Lat W. Purser to be postmaster at Vanceboro, N. C., in place of L. W. Purser. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1932.

Nannie M. Moore to be postmaster at Warrenton, N. C., in place of N. M. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1932.

NORTH DAKOTA

Marie Toenberg to be postmaster at Alexander, N. Dak., in place of Marie Toenberg. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1932.

Rudolph G. W. Anderson to be postmaster at Ambrose, N. Dak., in place of R. G. W. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Reuben P. Semrau to be postmaster at Balfour, N. Dak., in place of R. P. Semrau. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

Ella C. Sweeney to be postmaster at Berthold, N. Dak., in place of E. C. Sweeney. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

Nellie Ribb to be postmaster at Donnybrook, N. Dak., in place of Nellie Ribb. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Oscar J. Haner to be postmaster at Douglas, N. Dak., in place of O. J. Haner. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Don E. DeLa to be postmaster at Hettinger, N. Dak., in place of D. E. DeLa. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1932.

Ole H. Larson to be postmaster at Killdeer, N. Dak., in place of O. H. Larson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Bernhard C. Hjelle to be postmaster at Mercer, N. Dak., in place of B. C. Hjelle. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1932.

Almeda Lee to be postmaster at Mohall, N. Dak., in place of Almeda Lee. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1932.

Martin H. Weber to be postmaster at New Leipzig, N. Dak., in place of M. H. Weber. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1931.

August Kreidt to be postmaster at New Salem, N. Dak., in place of August Kreidt. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1931.

John C. Black to be postmaster at Plaza, N. Dak., in place of J. C. Black. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Lottie A. Nelson to be postmaster at Powers Lake, N. Dak., in place of L. A. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Albert F. Harris to be postmaster at Reeder, N. Dak., in place of A. F. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Viola C. Marking to be postmaster at Scranton, N. Dak., in place of Hazel Ronning, removed.

Seth E. Garland to be postmaster at Tioga, N. Dak., in place of S. E. Garland. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Chase E. Mullinex to be postmaster at Tolley, N. Dak., in place of C. E. Mullinex. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Axel G. C. Strom to be postmaster at Williston, N. Dak., in place of A. G. C. Strom. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Sidney O. Dundas to be postmaster at Watford City, N. Dak., in place of S. O. Dundas. Incumbent's commission expired June 21, 1930.

OHIO

Edward M. Barber to be postmaster at Ashley, Ohio, in place of E. M. Barber. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Frank A. Brown to be postmaster at Batavia, Ohio, in place of F. A. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires March 20, 1932.

Charles E. Kniesly to be postmaster at Bradford, Ohio, in place of C. E. Kniesly. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

James G. Mills to be postmaster at Cardington, Ohio, in place of W. E. Smiley. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1931.

Edgar C. Allison to be postmaster at Cumberland, Ohio, in place of E. C. Allison. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

Andrew L. Brunson to be postmaster at Degraff, Ohio, in place of A. L. Brunson. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Wade W. McKee to be postmaster at Dennison, Ohio, in place of W. W. McKee. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Francis E. Cook to be postmaster at Galion, Ohio, in place of F. E. Cook. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

Frank H. Shaw to be postmaster at Germantown, Ohio, in place of F. H. Shaw. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1932.

Charles H. Morrison to be postmaster at Hebron, Ohio, in place of C. H. Morrison. Incumbent's commission expires March 20, 1932.

Ida H. Cline to be postmaster at Kings Mills, Ohio, in place of I. H. Cline. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

William H. Snodgrass to be postmaster at Marysville, Ohio, in place of W. H. Snodgrass. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Clem Couden to be postmaster at Morrow, Ohio, in place of Clem Couden. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

George B. Fulton to be postmaster at North Baltimore, Ohio, in place of G. B. Fulton. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Oliver Ferrell to be postmaster at Paulding, Ohio, in place of Oliver Ferrell. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

William E. Whitcomb to be postmaster at Perrysville, Ohio, in place of W. E. Whitcomb. Incumbent's commission expires March 20, 1932.

Marion E. Campbell to be postmaster at Sardinia, Ohio, in place of M. E. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

Harry Setzen to be postmaster at Shelby, Ohio, in place of A. H. Anderson, deceased.

Iris L. Bloir to be postmaster at Sherwood, Ohio, in place of I. L. Bloir. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Nathan S. Hall to be postmaster at Summerfield, Ohio, in place of N. S. Hall. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

Charles O. Eastman to be postmaster at Wauseon, Ohio, in place of C. O. Eastman. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

William E. Thomas to be postmaster at Wellston, Ohio, in place of W. E. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1931.

Asher O. Earley to be postmaster at Woodsfield, Ohio, in place of A. O. Earley. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

OKLAHOMA

Ira A. Sessions to be postmaster at Grandfield, Okla., in place of I. A. Sessions. Incumbent's commission expires March 26, 1932.

Ada M. Thompson to be postmaster at Mannford, Okla., in place of A. M. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires March 9, 1932.

Nellie V. Dolen to be postmaster at Okemah, Okla., in place of N. V. Dolen. Incumbent's commission expires March 5, 1932.

Charles C. Chapell to be postmaster at Okmulgee, Okla., in place of C. C. Chapell. Incumbent's commission expires March 5, 1932.

James W. McKay to be postmaster at Stonewall, Okla., in place of J. W. McKay. Incumbent's commission expires March 26, 1932.

Greenberry Peters to be postmaster at Texhoma, Okla., in place of Greenberry Peters. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1932.

Margaret E. Williamson to be postmaster at Wanette, Okla., in place of M. E. Williamson. Incumbent's commission expires March 26, 1932.

OREGON

Henry A. Barrett to be postmaster at Athena, Oreg., in place of H. A. Barrett. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1932.

David S. Young to be postmaster at Dufur, Oreg., in place of D. S. Young. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1932.

Don Ellis to be postmaster at Garibaldi, Oreg., in place of Don Ellis. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1932.

Fred C. Holznagel to be postmaster at Hillsboro, Oreg., in place of F. C. Holznagel. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1932.

William R. Logus to be postmaster at Oregon City, Oreg., in place of W. R. Logus. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

Celia M. Tozier to be postmaster at Rainier, Oreg., in place of C. M. Tozier. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1932.

William I. Smith to be postmaster at Redmond, Oreg., in place of W. I. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

George W. Trommlitz to be postmaster at Toledo, Oreg., in place of G. W. Trommlitz. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

PENNSYLVANIA

William A. Leroy to be postmaster at Canonsburg, Pa., in place of W. A. Leroy. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1932.

Harvey J. Smoyer to be postmaster at Clairton, Pa., in place of H. J. Smoyer. Incumbent's commission expires March 5, 1932.

Thomas Collins to be postmaster at Commodore, Pa., in place of Thomas Collins. Incumbent's commission expires March 9, 1932.

Marion C. Hemmig to be postmaster at Elverson, Pa., in place of M. C. Hemmig. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

John T. Painter to be postmaster at Greensburg, Pa., in place of J. T. Painter. Incumbent's commission expires March 14, 1932.

Allen L. Shomo to be postmaster at Hamburg, Pa., in place of A. L. Shomo. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1932.

Harry C. Myers to be postmaster at Holtwood, Pa., in place of H. C. Myers. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Michael A. Grubb to be postmaster at Liverpool, Pa., in place of M. A. Grubb. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1932.

John M. Hayes to be postmaster at Montoursville, Pa., in place of J. M. Hayes. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1930.

William Tyndall to be postmaster at Mount Joy, Pa., in place of William Tyndall. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

John H. Francis to be postmaster at Oaks, Pa., in place of J. H. Francis. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

A. Milton Wade to be postmaster at Quarryville, Pa., in place of A. M. Wade. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Edward G. Carper to be postmaster at Roaring Spring, Pa., in place of E. G. Carper. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1932.

Fred F. Cannan to be postmaster at Rome, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Newton E. Arnold to be postmaster at Roslyn, Pa., in place of N. E. Arnold. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Nathaniel Shaplin to be postmaster at Windgap, Pa., in place of Nathaniel Shaplin. Incumbent's commission expires March 12, 1932.

Jay W. Clark to be postmaster at Woodlyn, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Randall H. Weaver to be postmaster at Worthington, Pa., in place of Jennie Sutton. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1931.

Edmund W. Tomb to be postmaster at Youngwood, Pa., in place of E. W. Tomb. Incumbent's commission expires March 5, 1932.

RHODE ISLAND

Howard E. Munroe to be postmaster at Barrington, R. I., in place of H. L. Yager, removed.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Fred L. Timmerman to be postmaster at Graniteville, S. C., in place of F. L. Timmerman. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1932.

SOUTH DAKOTA

John V. Drips to be postmaster at Belvidere, S. Dak., in place of J. V. Drips. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1932.

Paul M. Rickert to be postmaster at Sisseton, S. Dak., in place of O. S. Opheim, resigned.

Volney T. Warner to be postmaster at Woonsocket, S. Dak., in place of V. T. Warner. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1932.

TENNESSEE

William F. Osteen to be postmaster at Chapel Hill, Tenn., in place of W. F. Osteen. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

James E. Graham to be postmaster at Jasper, Tenn., in place of S. P. Raulston, resigned.

Christine M. Meister to be postmaster at Loretto, Tenn., in place of C. M. Meister. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1932.

Ben M. Roberson to be postmaster at Loudon, Tenn., in place of B. M. Roberson. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Thomas H. Hale to be postmaster at Pikeville, Tenn., in place of S. L. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1930.

Wilbur Walker to be postmaster at Tiptonville, Tenn., in place of Wilbur Walker. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

Simon C. Dodson to be postmaster at Sparta, Tenn., in place of S. C. Dodson. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1931.

TEXAS

Maggie P. Rhew to be postmaster at Anderson, Tex., in place of M. P. Rhew. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

William F. Hofmann to be postmaster at Carrollton, Tex., in place of W. F. Hofmann. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

Charles H. Bugbee to be postmaster at Clarendon, Tex., in place of C. H. Bugbee. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Gustav A. Wulfman to be postmaster at Farwell, Tex., in place of G. A. Wulfman. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

James S. Carter to be postmaster at Grand Saline, Tex., in place of J. S. Carter. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

Ira S. Koon to be postmaster at Hallsville, Tex., in place of I. S. Koon. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

John V. Lackey to be postmaster at Hico, Tex., in place of J. V. Lackey. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

Allen M. Huddleston to be postmaster at Hubbard, Tex., in place of W. M. Huddleston, deceased.

John A. McFarland to be postmaster at Ladonia, Tex., in place of J. A. McFarland. Incumbent's commission expires March 27, 1932.

Lilburn C. Graham to be postmaster at Lancaster, Tex., in place of L. C. Graham. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

John T. Hopkins to be postmaster at Longview, Tex., in place of J. T. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expires March 29, 1932.

Walter E. Hall to be postmaster at Lufkin, Tex., in place of W. E. Hall. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1932.

William M. Owens to be postmaster at Memphis, Tex., in place of W. M. Owens. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1932.

Theodor Reichert to be postmaster at Nordheim, Tex., in place of Theodor Reichert. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Everett A. Vordenbaum to be postmaster at Randolph Field, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1932.

Silas J. White to be postmaster at Rising Star, Tex., in place of S. J. White. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1932.

Henry E. Cannon to be postmaster at Shelbyville, Tex., in place of H. E. Cannon. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

Charles E. Binnings to be postmaster at Strawn, Tex., in place of I. B. Davidson, deceased.

Willie M. Prouty to be postmaster at Wallis, Tex., in place of W. M. Prouty. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1932.

Fannie Dawson to be postmaster at Wilson, Tex., in place of Fannie Dawson. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1932.

VERMONT

Isabel Neary to be postmaster at Shelburne, Vt., in place of Isabel Neary. Incumbent's commission expires March 29, 1932.

Robert A. Slater to be postmaster at South Royalton, Vt., in place of R. A. Slater. Incumbent's commission expires March 26, 1932.

James S. Brownell to be postmaster at Woodstock, Vt., in place of J. S. Brownell. Incumbent's commission expires March 22, 1932.

VIRGINIA

Roscoe C. Travis to be postmaster at Bowling Green, Va., in place of R. C. Travis. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1932.

Alvis T. Davidson to be postmaster at Faber, Va., in place of M. S. Roberts, deceased.

Ludema Sayre to be postmaster at Fairfax, Va., in place of Ludema Sayre. Incumbent's commission expires March 26, 1932.

Daniel E. Davis to be postmaster at Forest, Va., in place of M. P. Leftwich, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Mabel G. Lamm to be postmaster at Burlington, Wash., in place of M. G. Lamm. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1932.

Nellie Tyner to be postmaster at Dishman, Wash., in place of Nellie Tyner. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1932.

Paul B. Davis to be postmaster at Longmire, Wash. Office became presidential July 1, 1931.

Francis H. Lester to be postmaster at Tieton, Wash., in place of F. H. Lester. Incumbent's commission expires March 12, 1932.

WEST VIRGINIA

James O. Buskirk to be postmaster at Holden, W. Va., in place of J. O. Buskirk. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

Ernest E. Ritter to be postmaster at Red Jacket, W. Va., in place of E. E. Ritter. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1932.

Guy E. McCutcheon to be postmaster at Reedy, W. Va., in place of G. E. McCutcheon. Incumbent's commission expires March 21, 1932.

Ernest T. Morrison to be postmaster at Sutton, W. Va., in place of E. T. Morrison. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1932.

James H. Trail to be postmaster at Winding Gulf, W. Va., in place of J. H. Trail. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1932.

WISCONSIN

Archibald G. Campbell to be postmaster at Barneveld, Wis., in place of Annie Jordan. Incumbent's commission expired June 19, 1930.

Arthur Nortwen to be postmaster at Conover, Wis., in place of G. C. Dobbs. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1931.

Beatrice Ring to be postmaster at Osseo, Wis., in place of J. L. Ring, deceased.

Cynthia T. Goodell to be postmaster at Platteville, Wis., in place of R. A. Goodell, deceased.

WYOMING

Albert J. Schils to be postmaster at Cokeville, Wyo., in place of A. J. Schils. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1930.

John A. Stafford to be postmaster at Rock Springs, Wyo., in place of J. A. Stafford. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1932.

Fred W. Smith to be postmaster at Glenrock, Wyo., in place of F. W. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1932.

L. Roy Ness to be postmaster at Powell, Wyo., in place of L. R. Ness. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1932.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 4 (legislative day of March 2), 1932

POSTMASTER

OKLAHOMA

Laura M. Hopkins to be postmaster at Woodward, Okla.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Heavenly Father, we lift our hearts unto Thee and pray for a quickening of all our best powers. So direct us that our duties shall be performed in wisdom and in discretion. If we have anxiety, quiet it; if we have groundless fear, put it to rest. O God, may we have a deep, sincere appreciation of moral values. Bless us with the tenderest sympathy for human frailty and sustain us with faith in the final triumph of the right. Merciful God, constantly abide with those who carry great sorrows. Bless any of our officers and Members who may be in distress; give them courage and hope, that they may trace the rainbow through the rain. Comfort the shattered home about which our country is pouring its fervent prayers; do Thou answer them. May the parents be fed no longer with the bread of tears. Strike down the dull, hardened, and blackened souls of the killers and the robbers of life, and let righteousness and justice have their way. In Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PENSIONS

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9575) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and so forth, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make a preliminary inquiry of the gentleman from South Carolina. Will the gentleman inform the House as to the policy his committee is following in recommending favorable reports on private pension bills, and particularly as to whether the persons who are listed for pensions are already receiving pensions? In providing pensions and increase of pensions, what general policy is followed in granting the preferment of the Government to certain persons as listed in the omnibus bill?

Mr. GASQUE. I will state to the gentleman that the committee, as he probably already knows, acts on cases which can not come under the general law. In other words, it acts in the capacity of an equity court where cases are shut out by some technical point in the law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, as I understand from the gentleman's statement, it would not be possible to include these cases in any general law?

Mr. GASQUE. It would not.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are numerous instances where we have increased the pensions of widows of soldiers who served in certain wars who are now receiving pensions which could be covered by a general law. I am fundamentally opposed to special legislation which gives a preferred status to any individual. I favor general legislation, and I am seeking information as to whether it is possible, in connection with the cases which the gentleman's committee reports

favorably, to have a general law rather than special laws giving preferment to selected individuals.

Mr. GASQUE. I agree with the gentleman. I think a general law covering most of these cases could be passed, but it has not yet been worked out.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, that is very important information. The gentleman states it might be possible to cover these cases by a general law?

Mr. GASQUE. To cover most of the cases, but not all of them.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think it would be highly proper to have general legislation covering these cases rather than to have them appeal to Members for special consideration, and the gentleman's committee has jurisdiction over general legislation.

Mr. GASQUE. The committee is working along those lines in attempting to arrive at some legislation that would cover a large majority of these cases.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give us any hope that at this session legislation will be reported from his committee that will cover these cases by general legislation rather than by specially designating them?

Mr. GASQUE. I might state for the benefit of the gentleman that the committee has already reported a bill granting uniform pensions to the widows and dependent children of all wars, which makes a beginning. I have never believed that the widows of any one war should be given preference over the widows of another war. My committee now has a bill, H. R. 7230, known as the uniform widows' pension bill, on the calendar, which I hope the gentleman will help us pass.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the policy of the committee as to the granting of original pensions to members of the Regular Army, including those who served in Indian wars?

Mr. GASQUE. The only bills we have reported with regard to veterans of the Indian wars are such as I mentioned in the beginning—cases in which they can not quite comply with the law, but almost comply with it. I might state that a subcommittee of my committee is now considering a number of Indian war bills in an effort to arrive at some method of unifying them and putting all of the Indian war veterans on the same basis.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has furnished the information I desired, and I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what bill is this?

Mr. GASQUE. It is an omnibus pension bill.

Mr. RANKIN. This is a bill providing special pensions in individual cases?

Mr. GASQUE. Yes; it is an omnibus pension bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to said committee:

H. R. 501. Margaret McAllister Barron.	H. R. 1074. Philip Aaron.
H. R. 502. Mary J. Burris.	H. R. 1095. Richard E. Hibbard.
H. R. 503. Nellie L. P. Earlewine.	H. R. 1107. Jane Jones.
H. R. 565. Ada May Fuller.	H. R. 1114. Armina E. Smith.
H. R. 588. Jennie Bowman.	H. R. 1119. William O. Whitaker.
H. R. 590. Zenobia Blanche Sniffen.	H. R. 1153. Malissa Hoover.
H. R. 647. Nettie E. Dennison.	H. R. 1189. Clare Elsworth Hawley.
H. R. 658. Ellen Scully.	H. R. 1213. Clarence B. Cline.
H. R. 760. Willis E. Van Vranken.	H. R. 1281. Marie Beck.
H. R. 762. William A. Symington.	H. R. 1336. Dorothy D. Grabenstatter.
H. R. 763. Addaline Collins.	H. R. 1349. Frank Sornborger.
H. R. 851. Charles O. Thomas.	H. R. 1365. Clara Stevens.
H. R. 852. Erastus J. Griffin.	H. R. 1366. Mary J. Glace.
H. R. 902. Martha Foley.	H. R. 1372. Agnes Fuhrmeister.
H. R. 921. Julia J. Godley.	H. R. 1423. Addie Foster.
H. R. 932. Leo J. Nagele.	H. R. 1534. Richard M. Aylward.
H. R. 939. Charles W. Bentley.	H. R. 1590. Mrs. Lee J. Bethel.
H. R. 942. Carl H. Ziebell.	H. R. 1604. Anastasia Watts.
H. R. 1052. Hiram P. Marcum.	H. R. 1719. Louis d'Orville Chabut.
H. R. 1057. Roscoe Eversole.	H. R. 1750. John Charles Inglee.
H. R. 1068. James G. Carr.	

H. R. 1771. William Kiefer.	H. R. 4394. John Wesley Smalles.
H. R. 1772. Anna V. Brower.	H. R. 4402. Julian D. Haynes.
H. R. 1862. Mamie G. Poindexter.	H. R. 4410. Robert Eakin.
H. R. 1898. Commodore P. Fuller.	H. R. 4420. Hattie L. McDaniel.
H. R. 1946. Stanford A. Lasater.	H. R. 4426. James B. Newman.
H. R. 1947. Clara E. Braden.	H. R. 4433. Louis R. Reibold and Louis Reibold, jr.
H. R. 1958. John D. Nite.	H. R. 4953. Minerva Wagner.
H. R. 2001. Grace A. Coates.	H. R. 5032. Matthew S. Scott.
H. R. 2163. William Henry Coffey.	H. R. 5167. Mary Willoughby Osterhaus.
H. R. 2228. Nellie L. Axe.	H. R. 5205. Ida M. Mathison.
H. R. 2301. Ollida Irene Hansen.	H. R. 5281. Cicero G. Rowden.
H. R. 2315. Charlotte Dean.	H. R. 5302. Michael J. Carroll.
H. R. 2321. Lewis Garner.	H. R. 5379. Nancy Ann Whitehead.
H. R. 2334. Mabel Jane Maher Boosey.	H. R. 5451. Harriet Trombly.
H. R. 2386. Alexander Lane.	H. R. 5534. William Patterson.
H. R. 2401. Wilson Branch Cook.	H. R. 5663. Catherine E. Burke.
H. R. 2406. William Long.	H. R. 5665. Cora C. Cheever.
H. R. 2407. Ida Alice Bricker Lewis.	H. R. 5693. Marie M. Colby.
H. R. 2413. Susan A. Holden.	H. R. 5711. Henry W. Baylor.
H. R. 2448. Elizabeth Spafford.	H. R. 5712. James Whitecotton.
H. R. 2459. Alice Brayman.	H. R. 5713. Wyatt E. Heard.
H. R. 2484. Rose M. Young.	H. R. 5714. George W. Baylor.
H. R. 2538. William R. Minter.	H. R. 5715. Sidney J. Baylor.
H. R. 2636. Robert E. Swingle.	H. R. 5723. Mary H. Wright.
H. R. 2652. Lucy M. Chapman.	H. R. 5741. Lella Deal.
H. R. 2655. George W. Baker.	H. R. 5797. Edith Chambers Feehan.
H. R. 2688. Lucille E. Hanigan.	H. R. 5985. Eleanor and Robert Snyder.
H. R. 2690. Ingelov Johnson.	H. R. 5991. Theodore V. Cowart.
H. R. 2728. George W. Kelley.	H. R. 6254. Cornelius J. Phillips.
H. R. 2729. Mary Connelly.	H. R. 6265. William Clark.
H. R. 2755. Stephen D. Graves.	H. R. 6320. Joseph Lang.
H. R. 2756. Rye Fairbanks.	H. R. 6563. John P. Hurley.
H. R. 2830. Peter Furlong.	H. R. 6756. Della Dabbs.
H. R. 2951. Marelida Pennington.	H. R. 6769. Henry Knight.
H. R. 3021. Mary A. M. Laferty.	H. R. 6795. Anna T. Walsh.
H. R. 3026. Leonie E. Fisher.	H. R. 6799. Pearl A. Phearsen.
H. R. 3073. Harry C. Miller.	H. R. 6816. William H. Wooton.
H. R. 3092. Charles Wheatley.	H. R. 6831. Ida L. Von Harten.
H. R. 3123. Willis E. Dudley.	H. R. 6859. Mary E. Moen.
H. R. 3140. John Grosbush.	H. R. 6870. Alice Coe.
H. R. 3182. George A. Morgan.	H. R. 6911. James A. McMasters.
H. R. 3183. Hiram E. Morrill.	H. R. 6916. Hakon B. Duee.
H. R. 3215. Shirley R. Slevin.	H. R. 6919. Sarah Penberthy.
H. R. 3226. Lloyd O. Taylor.	H. R. 6924. Sarah Ann McNiece.
H. R. 3230. George F. Thornton.	H. R. 6941. Ross Huston Horner.
H. R. 3428. Mary J. Stearns.	H. R. 6961. Charles Farris.
H. R. 3432. Martha Hill.	H. R. 6988. Rose Harkin.
H. R. 3452. Maggie R. Cooper.	H. R. 7018. Margaret E. Hoffman.
H. R. 3453. Ella Elizabeth Ayers.	H. R. 7044. Pauline Forger.
H. R. 3536. Marie Geiger.	H. R. 7048. Irl E. Moats.
H. R. 3617. John A. Petty.	H. R. 7083. Julia May Townsend.
H. R. 3647. Mary Shoch.	H. R. 7090. Julius Hansen.
H. R. 3651. Joseph A. Dally.	H. R. 7091. Mary Virginia Davis.
H. R. 3765. Mary R. Dickman.	H. R. 7156. Eleanora Emma Bliss.
H. R. 3772. Chester E. Stevenson.	H. R. 7303. Harriet S. Weeks.
H. R. 3833. Fredrika Monstrom.	H. R. 7340. Ruth T. Stuart.
H. R. 3834. Bertha Branning.	H. R. 7347. Jack J. McLawhorn.
H. R. 3857. Dorothy King.	H. R. 7464. William F. Stevens.
H. R. 3896. Bella F. Osgood Kern.	H. R. 7544. Estelle Foster.
H. R. 3912. John Bettridge.	H. R. 7589. Edward H. Laterell.
H. R. 3924. Thomas E. Cruess.	H. R. 7689. John E. Stringer.
H. R. 3947. Tandy A. Key.	H. R. 7738. Alexander Kalish.
H. R. 3956. Samuel W. Mabry.	H. R. 7968. Leon Lavigne.
H. R. 4000. Carl Kobis.	H. R. 8005. Katherine Mueller.
H. R. 4063. Sadie M. Melk.	H. R. 8033. Margaret E. Cantrell.
H. R. 4084. Bert T. Robinson.	H. R. 8061. Alma A. De Coen.
H. R. 4088. Jennie M. Bonnell.	H. R. 8134. Ida A. Davis.
H. R. 4135. Velma Johnson.	H. R. 8268. Howard S. Ford.
H. R. 4140. Old Coyote.	H. R. 8285. R. M. Collins.
H. R. 4141. May McGee.	H. R. 8436. Guy H. Stedham.
H. R. 4189. Nellie B. Hughett.	H. R. 8604. Bertha H. McArthur.
H. R. 4192. Louis C. McKnight.	H. R. 8744. Mary Baldwin Kennedy.
	H. R. 9465. Helen K. Snowden.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BABIES AND DADDIES

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, because of the great sorrow that has come to the Lindbergh home the whole Nation is thinking of parent and child love; and in this connection I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an article which I wrote some 20 years ago on the subject "Babies and Daddies."

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

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

This is about babies. It is, in fact, mainly about one very small baby. At this springtime and Eastertide we have on our farm calves, colts, lambs, pigs—yes, and downy-coated chicks; but it is not of these little creatures that we write. Our thoughts turn to the farm's best crop—children. You have no baby and are not interested in these pink-toed bits of humanity that cry and "coo"? But you were once somebody's baby, and somebody—yes, two "somebodies"—thought you a perfectly wonderful child. If in your home you have a baby, a real bouncing boy, you address him something like this: "Hello, old man!" "Howdy, partner!" "How do you do, fine fellow?" "Good morning, good man," or "How's my mannie man?" All the time you are gaily gesticulating and going through more motions than were ever thought of by a movie maker. And it is a paid performance that you are giving, for the smile and laugh—ever notice how babies laugh, even with their eyes?—that baby gives us is better by far than gold. Yes; and there is music sweeter than ever came from a Stradivarius or the melody of murmuring brook—a baby's laugh.

There is a language of Babyland. It is a language that parents only can understand. Babies alone can speak it, but all fathers and mothers try. No mere linguist, however learned, has succeeded in any attempt to reduce it to the printed page; nor for the shortest word is there so much as a suitable symbol, for the smile, the smile that no camera ever yet has caught, is a part of this language of love. To be sure baby, your baby, can talk to you and make you understand. He tells you things that he tells none other—none other, save mother. He knows not words, yet his are the sweetest of stories—and again and again perchance you say as you hug him tighter in your arms or toss him higher in the air, "Dat's fine; tell fahdie 'nother story."

When evening comes and the work of the day is done, you draw the window shades or close the shutters and say half to yourself and half to your little son, "Good night, Mr. Day."

Just why we do not know, but babies take us into the Kingdom of Make-believe, where live fancies and fairies. After you have held baby up so that he may stretch his little legs and "dance a set," his restless "footsies" being allowed barely to touch your lap, lest he be bowlegged, you talk to him about going to "Sleepy House." Or if he is strong enough you give him a ride on your foot while you dream of your youth and of stick horses (stick horses of children become the staffs of old age) and plan how, later, you will buy him a pony so that he may ride with you over the farm.

When little eyes are heavy with sleep mother takes "the man" as he goes to slumber land. Comes your own bedtime, and you look to see if all is well with the little sleeper. Then, it may be that you notice a smile play over a very small face tinted like the sea shell, and you wonder if he is talking with the angels—yes; and at that moment you feel that heaven must be very near. As you look there comes to mind the words:

"Here is my past and present; yea, and here
The days that shall be counted my hereafter;
Here is my sweetest and my bitterest tear,
And here my laughter."

Did you ever feel the touch of a baby's hand, your own baby's hand, chubby, soft, and velvety? Did baby's hands, the little hands of your own baby, ever pat you tenderly and lovingly on your cheeks? Magical almost is the touch of a baby's hand. The little fingers clasp your own big ones and lead you into a world, the existence of which you never before knew. Or gently and confidently a hand almost too small to seem real is placed in your own. Then it is, for the first time, you know the meaning of "a little child shall lead them."

Baby brings out the best that is in us. If, at this Easter time, you in your heart hold hatred for some fellow man who seems rough and unfeeling, you would forgive if you could but see and hear him in his own home and with his baby on his knee.

It is a fine thing after you have come in from the field to see, as your near the house, a little nose pressed against the window pane until it seems only a tiny round spot. What if there are fingerprints on the glass? Who cares, when a pair of little hands are upheld to his? Or baby may be in his little bed or buggy and gaily pounding his rattle. You hear it and somehow your feet carry you in that direction and your arms reach down, when up comes "the fellow." Then, although you may not be able to distinguish America from Dixie, you attempt to imitate the band or to sing.

Some babies, they say, are a bit spoiled and bad, but nobody ever had such a baby in his own home. A few fathers are perfectly foolish, too, they say, but never was there a fond father who felt that he was "perfectly foolish" over his baby. His baby is different—to him. Take him up when he frets? Why not? Maybe the little fellow is sick, has the "tummy" ache, or is going to cut a "tooth." It doesn't seem strange that the dreadful pain goes away when he is up in papa's lap and at the table. "There, look, mamma, look! Did you see that? Boy put his hand in the custard and quick as a wink his little fingers went into his mouth. Wasn't that smart of the little rascal? Not many babies like him, bless his heart. See how he is still sucking his thumb?" No; that was not somebody else's baby.

All babies are clever. Each has his own special repertoire of clever tricks. What father has there ever been who did not enjoy watching baby in his effort to get his toe into his mouth, and what mother who did not pick him up and hug and kiss him

when he succeeded? A wonderful thing is a baby. He drives away "the blues" and lets in the sunshine.

Babies all, bless 'em. One day, too soon it will seem, they will leave the home nest for the wonder world without. Back on the old farm father and mother may be left alone. Yet on Easter Day and other days as they see the world through the eyes of a son, the baby of the yesteryears, they will find joy in this thought:

"The glory age, be it understood,
Is a boy out there who is making good."

BRIDGE ACROSS THE RAINY RIVER, MINN.

Mr. MILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5064) authorizing Vernon W. O'Connor, of St. Paul, Minn., his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn., with a Senate amendment, and move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 20, insert:

"The said Vernon W. O'Connor, his successors or assigns, shall within 90 days after the completion of the bridge constructed under the authority of this act file with the Secretary of War an itemized statement under oath showing the actual original cost of such bridge and its approaches and appurtenances, which statement shall include any expenditures actually made for engineering and legal services; and any fees, discounts, and other expenditures actually incurred in connection with the financing thereof. Such itemized statement of cost shall be investigated by the Secretary of War at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge, and for that purpose the said Vernon W. O'Connor, his successors or assigns, in such manner as may be deemed proper, shall make available and accessible all records connected with the construction and financing of such bridge, and the findings of the Secretary of War as to the actual cost of such bridge shall be made a part of the records of the War Department."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLIGAN. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I noticed when I read the Senate amendment it was rather different in phraseology and policy from what we have heretofore incorporated in bridge bills. Will the gentleman kindly inform the House of the reason he is moving to adopt the Senate amendment?

Mr. MILLIGAN. For the reason this is an international bridge, and the committee was of the opinion that it was better to exclude the general provision that is included in bridge bills, because it would be necessary, by treaty, to make provisions relative to the bridge, due to the fact it is international in character; but the Senate was of a different opinion and insisted that this amendment should go in the bill, and the amendment was placed on the bill in the Senate.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman states the Senate insisted. I thought when this bill came over on yesterday the gentleman would ask for a conference on the Senate amendment, but the gentleman is now moving to accept the amendment without any conference.

Mr. MILLIGAN. Yes; and I may say that I advised with the Senator who had the bill in charge before it was passed by the Senate.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to have the gentleman yield so that the gentleman from Minnesota, who is deeply interested in this bill, because it is in his district, may explain the reason why we depart from the general policy in the amendment proposed by the Senate, if the gentleman knows.

Mr. KNUTSON. I may say to the gentleman that I conferred with the Senator who insisted on this amendment. Of course, personally, I can not see the necessity for it, but the Senator thought it should go into the bill, and rather than delay the matter any longer I accepted the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was this at the insistence of the junior or senior Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KNUTSON. It was at the insistence of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. STAFFORD. He thought it was a good policy to be adopted generally or only in connection with this international bridge bill?

Mr. MILLIGAN. In connection with this particular bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will notice that this itemization of cost is to be investigated by the Secretary of

War at any time within three years. Of course, we know that is a mere formality that will rarely, if ever, be undertaken by the Secretary of War. It is simply an idle gesture.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLIGAN. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It is, as the gentleman says, a gesture; but when abuses do take place they have appealed, and in one instance, they had quite an extensive hearing on the rates.

Mr. KNUTSON. And it helps determine the toll that should be charged, I may say to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to concur in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

DEPENDENTS OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have filed with the Clerk of the House a petition to bring out of the Rules Committee the bill (H. R. 8578) for the relief of the widows, orphans, and dependent parents of deceased veterans of the World War, and at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert the bill in the Record.

The bill is as follows:

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 201 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 472), be hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subdivision to read as follows:

"(8) Where any honorably discharged ex-service man who entered the service prior to November 11, 1918, and served 90 days or more during the World War dies of a disability not acquired in the service the following monthly allowances shall be paid:

"(a) If the deceased leaves a widow without means of support other than her daily labor and actual net income not exceeding \$250 per year who was his wife and living with him not less than five years next before his death or who married him prior to January 1, 1925, \$20;

"(b) If the deceased leaves a widow and one child without means of support other than her daily labor and actual net income not exceeding \$400 per year; \$26, with \$6 for each additional child;

"(c) If the deceased leaves no widow but one child, \$20, with \$6 for each additional child: *Provided*, That no child shall be permitted to draw this allowance who has an actual net income exceeding \$400 per year;

"(d) If the deceased leaves a dependent father or mother who has reached the age of 65 years, \$15, or both, \$20. Such allowance shall be payable whether the dependency of the father or mother, or both, arose before or arises after the death of the ex-service man;

"(e) The payment of allowance for a widow shall continue until her death or remarriage;

"(f) The payment of allowance to or for a child shall continue until such child reaches the age of 16 years or marries, or if such child be permanently incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect, then during such incapacity.

"(g) Whenever the allowance payable to or for the benefit of any person under the provisions of this subdivision is terminated by the happening of the contingency upon which it is limited, the allowance thereafter for the remaining beneficiary or beneficiaries, if any, shall be the amount which would have been payable to them if they had been the sole original beneficiaries;

"(h) As between the widow and the children not in her custody and as between children, the amount of allowance shall be apportioned as may be prescribed by regulations;

"(i) No allowance under this subdivision shall commence prior to the date of the passage of this amendatory act or the date of application therefor, and such application shall be in such form as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe."

Mr. RANKIN. This measure is one that should have been passed years ago. If what was called the Rankin bill a few years ago had become law, these widows and orphans and dependent parents would have automatically gone on the roll, but when that bill was vetoed and the disability allowance bill was passed the widows, orphans, and dependent parents were left out.

This bill is not exactly what we want. But under the circumstances it is the best we could get. In fact, there has

been a good deal of pressure brought to bear to take from the veterans at least a part of what they are now receiving; and, of course, those who assume that attitude as a rule are opposed to any additional relief.

Veterans are criticizing the "needs" clause in this bill. I am not responsible for that provision. It was inserted in the committee. When the bill comes to the floor of the House, an amendment will be offered to strike the "needs" clause out. So that criticism ought not to be used to keep the bill from coming to the House for final passage.

Some criticism—and in my opinion the most unjust and unreasonable criticism—has been made because of the fact that we propose to take care of the dependent parents of those veterans who have passed away.

John Thomas Taylor sent a letter out over the country asking veterans to write you to strike these dependent parents from the bill. That would be the most unjust, the most cruel, and the most inhuman step that Congress could take.

I am going to show you why. The bill provides that none of these aged parents are to go on the roll unless their soldier son is dead and they were actually dependent on him. It only provides the small pittance of \$15 a month for one and \$20 for two of these old people, who sent their son to defend the country in times of war and who in their helpless old age are unable to care for themselves as a result of his passing away.

The cost of this provision has been greatly exaggerated. Let me show you what it will cost. It will cost only about \$860,000 a year. It is limited to those above 65 years of age. Their average length of life will be less than seven years. They are rapidly passing away. They are dying faster than the veterans themselves. The cost of this provision will in all probability grow less with each passing year.

The gold-star mothers are for this provision of the bill. The World War mothers are for it. The rank and file of the American Legion are for it, and so are the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans of the World War.

You talk about the people who suffered in the World War. There was no suffering more intense than that of the aged father and mother who gave their son to the cause—that son upon whose manly shoulders they had hoped to lean for support and protection in their declining years, and who has now passed away, leaving them penniless in their infirm old age, and that in the midst of the greatest depression this country has ever seen.

The very least we can do is to give them the relief provided in this bill and help to drive from their doors the wolf of poverty in their declining years.

I hope that every Member of the House will sign the petition to bring this bill to the floor of the House for early consideration and that it will pass the House and the Senate by a unanimous vote. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest and a great deal of sympathy to the statement just made by my distinguished friend and colleague from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. The filing of a petition at the Clerk's desk, of which he gave notice, brings up in a concrete form some of the practical difficulties that confront the Committee on Rules in undertaking to bring out legislation for consideration of the House. I assure my friend from Mississippi and all Members of the House that there is no disposition whatever to refuse a rule for the consideration of this veterans' legislation. I think I am in position to assure him that such a rule will be granted at an early date. The delay in the measure—and I acquainted my friend from Mississippi with these facts before he made his statement—is because of the difficulties that are presented to the Committee on Rules as well as to the leadership of the House in the fact that there is now pending before the Committee on Rules a request from the Committee on Pen-

sions which sets up an entirely different measure of pensions for the veterans of the World War than that suggested by the bills sponsored by the gentleman from Mississippi. There is no real conflict between me and the gentleman from Mississippi or the Rules Committee on the major proposition of bringing in a rule for consideration of pension legislation. In the interest of orderly legislation we thought it advisable to see if it would not be possible before any action was taken to reconcile these two legislative measures. The Committee on Pensions has jurisdiction to bring out a pension bill. They have done so, affecting the payment of pensions to World War veterans and other veterans. My friend from Mississippi and his committee have reported out a bill dealing exclusively with World War veterans, so that in all fairness, in all reason, I do not think my friend from Mississippi has just cause for complaint because of the fact that the matter has been pending before our committee for a short time and we have not acted upon it. There is no disposition to throttle the consideration of his measure, and I feel justified in making this statement, because, of course, the filing of the petition to discharge the Committee on Rules is in its very nature a criticism of the committee or of its delay in that matter; and if Members of the House, in view of the facts that I have presented, feel justified in asking to discharge the committee, I shall not resent it. It would not offend the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. POUL. In view of the efforts that the Committee on Rules has been putting forth from day to day to reconcile the differences of these measures that have been mentioned here, does not the gentleman from Alabama think it is a little bit previous to attempt to club the Committee on Rules at this time?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would not like to answer that question in terms, because I do not want to get into a controversy with my good friend and colleague from Mississippi. He knows that I am in sympathy with bringing out a rule at an early date for the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Instead of my criticizing the Committee on Rules, it seems that I am being criticized by the Committee on Rules. I offered no criticism of the Committee on Rules, but the bill that the gentleman refers to, which is before the committee, carries with it more than three times the amount of the expenditure that this bill carries. Besides, in my honest opinion, the Pensions Committee had no right to infringe upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs by attempting to handle World War veterans' legislation. In addition, that bill covers widows of Spanish War veterans that the Veterans' Committee is precluded from handling, and in addition to that brings in Civil War widows. That brings several elements into the contest that I would prefer not to see mixed up in legislation on World War veterans' affairs.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, instead of trying to embarrass the Committee on Rules, if the gentleman will investigate it carefully, he will see that I am doing the Rules Committee a favor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am not impugning the motives of my friend from Mississippi, who will understand that, but the very statement he has made with reference to the conflict in the jurisdiction of these two bills and the difference in these bills illustrates the difficulty that is presented to the Committee on Rules. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GASQUE] is chairman of a committee of the House of equal dignity and standing to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and he has requested the Committee on Rules to give him a hearing, and it has been decided to give him a hearing to-morrow on his bill. The

Rules Committee wants to act with reasonable dispatch in these measures. There is a rather grave responsibility that rests upon that committee, particularly in a matter of this sort, where confusion will necessarily arise out of these two conflicting measures, unless they can be reconciled. I understand they can not. Therefore, if I may be permitted to speak what I think is the sentiment of the Committee on Rules, within a very few days we will bring out a rule that will throw this whole question squarely before the House of Representatives.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, that I may interrogate the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. GASQUE. The gentleman from Mississippi stated that the Committee on Pensions had overstepped its authority in bringing in a pension bill for World War veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. GASQUE. Is not the measure that the gentleman's committee has reported in reality a pension bill?

Mr. RANKIN. In reality they are all pension bills, whether you call them retirement pay, compensation, allowance, or pension.

Mr. GASQUE. Why did not the gentleman call it a pension in the case of his bill, and then it would naturally have come to the Committee on Pensions?

Mr. RANKIN. The World War Veterans' Legislation Committee has never referred to it as a pension. They have called it disability allowance and compensation.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman state how this could have been abolished?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Was my colleague here when I made my preliminary statement?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I undertook to explain to the membership that this delay was caused by reason of there appearing before our committee two bills from committees having somewhat concurrent jurisdiction on this question, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GASQUE] had not had an opportunity to appear before the Committee on Rules in support of his resolution. We thought it nothing but fair to wait until fair consideration could be given to the bill proposed by him, inasmuch as it involves identically, in part, the same subject matter as the bill presented by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. COX. And the Rules Committee threw out the suggestion to the gentleman that they collaborate on the separate bills and reach some agreement.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; but I stated that it was apparent that could not be done.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I care to say on the subject.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

RELIEF OF INDIANS IN DISTRESS

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to prefer a unanimous-consent request on behalf of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PEAVEY], who is unavoidably absent.

I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PEAVEY] be permitted to extend his remarks and to incorporate therein a resolution adopted by the House Committee on Indian Affairs.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEAVEY. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend remarks in the RECORD, granted on the request of Chairman HOWARD, of the Indian Affairs Committee of the House, last Saturday, I insert in the RECORD copy of the resolution referred to.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas due to crop failures, unemployment, recent blizzards, and the exhaustion of Indian tribal funds there now exists a state of acute and growing distress, amounting in thousands of cases to gradual starvation among Indians in at least 10 States, and not fewer than 125,000 in number; and

Whereas the facts are known to the Interior Department and Bureau of Indian Affairs through numerous letters and telegrams from the superintendents in the files of the Indian Office; and

Whereas it has been the policy of the administrative branch to withhold distress relief from these Indians administratively classed as nonwards, although the majority of such Indians are in fact still living in tribal relations, are still interested in tribal property, funds, or claims, or still subsisting under treaty relations with the Government, these Indians thus denied Federal aid numbering not fewer than 50,000; and

Whereas the American Red Cross is extending aid to these so-called nonward Indians in four States only (Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska), and in the total amount of only \$50,000 between this date and July 1, while the so-called nonward Indians in all other States, including Oklahoma, Wisconsin, Nevada, and California, are denied aid alike by the Red Cross and the Federal Government; and

Whereas for all the so-called ward Indians of the country the Bureau of Indian Affairs has now only \$95,000 for the distress relief for the balance of the fiscal year 1932, and is requesting only \$135,000 in addition, or a total of \$230,000 for not fewer than 75,000 so-called ward Indians in distress; and

Whereas the Indian tribes of the Southwest have already lost through starvation following a series of blizzards 200,000 or more of their sheep, and will lose during the month of March a greatly increased number unless feeding of the sheep can be provided at once, and the self-support of these tribes is dependent on their sheep; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture has under its control funds which could be made available for the feeding of sheep and livestock belonging to Indians and for the rehabilitation of Indian farmers, but is not in a position to take the initiative, and must wait on initiative from the Secretary of the Interior: Therefore be it

Resolved, First, that this committee declare its judgment that the denial of relief to the so-called nonward Indians in distress by the Federal Government is contrary to the body of statute laws affecting Indians and contrary to the declaration of the Supreme Court as to Federal responsibility toward the Indians, and, in addition, does not properly follow from any ruling from the Comptroller General of the United States, and this committee strongly holds to the opinion that the United States is bound by legal as well as moral obligations to help these so-called nonward Indians, numbering not fewer than 50,000. Such distress relief for so-called nonward Indians is provided in the bill H. R. 8498, pending before this committee, which bill proposes to make use of the local agencies of Government in the distribution of distress relief in line with the policy of the Secretary of the Interior, as embodied in the pending bill, H. R. 227, S. 3110, now pending before this committee.

Second. That it is the judgment of this committee that a total fund of \$230,000 for all so-called nonward Indians in distress in the whole country from this date until the end of the fiscal year is a totally inadequate sum, being \$5 for each Indian in distress.

Third. That it is the judgment of this committee that steps should be taken at once to make available to the Navajo, Apache, and Zuni Indians, and to any other Indians similarly situated, the funds under the control of the Department of Agriculture available for stock feed, and that the Department of the Interior should take steps without further delay to enlist the fullest cooperation of the Department of Agriculture.

HUBERT H. PEAVEY.

Adopted by the Indian Affairs Committee of the House by a unanimous vote, Wednesday, March 2, 1932.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution refers specifically to two classes of dependent Indians. The first article of the resolution provides for the relief of some 50,000 or more Indians known as nonward Indians. This includes Indians who have received their allotments and who, by the several acts of Congress and the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, have been turned loose in the various sections and communities of the counties in which they live, and who, due to their previous tribal character and ignorance of the white man's methods of making a living, are now destitute and are being supported by charity of the towns and counties where they reside.

This nonward Indian question is one of serious proportions to the towns and counties of the States having Indian residents. Most of these towns charge that by the Government's failure to provide for and maintain these Indians it has forced this liability upon the people of the towns and counties where the Indians live. By every rule of law and reason, it is a Federal liability that should be carried out by the Federal Government, but in fact and in practice it is now being carried by the taxpayers of the towns and counties mentioned.

The passage of H. R. 8498 would provide relief for these nonward Indians in the amount of 50 per cent of the amount so paid for the Indians by the several towns and counties affected. It affords relief not only to the Indians but to the taxpayers and officials of the towns and counties affected. Many of these towns and counties, due to the present eco-

nomie conditions, are themselves in serious financial straits. Most of their taxable land areas have gone delinquent in the past three or four years, and people living in many of these localities are themselves dependent upon their communities for aid and sustenance.

The second class of Indians affected in this resolution are known as ward Indians who for the most part live on the reservation and are under the direct control and authority of the Federal Government and who receive direct allotments or payments from the tribal funds. Many of these tribes of Indians, owing to the depleted state of their tribal funds, have no money or means with which to live and support their families. An appropriation of \$230,000 is provided for this class under the resolution.

The third article of the resolution provides or makes available to the Navajo and other Indians similarly situated funds that are already available to the Department of Agriculture for livestock, feed, and so forth. Mr. Speaker, more than 25 States of the Union are directly affected by this resolution.

In Wisconsin we have many tribes of Indians. I have three reservations in my congressional district—Bad River at Odanah, Lac du Flambeau, and Reserve—and in addition there are the abandoned Indians of Red Cliff at Bayfield, Wis., and the Lost Band of Chippewas at Webster. There are in addition many hundred scattered Indians. There are more than 100 towns in eight counties directly concerned with feeding and clothing these Indians. It is not Christian-like for the white man to permit his Indian neighbor to starve or freeze.

In closing I want to say that unless the funds specified in the three paragraphs of this resolution are made available that literally thousands of men, women, and children of more than one-quarter Indian blood will perish within the coming year. Starvation for themselves and starvation for the small amount of livestock that some of these Indians still possess is facing them at this time. I sincerely hope that Congress will act speedily in providing the emergency relief sought in this resolution.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I find there are so many gentlemen who are anxious to go on record either for or against the anti-injunction bill, mostly for it, and who can not be here to-morrow, that it would be better to take that up on Tuesday next, immediately after the reading of the Journal, under the rule. In order to expedite the business of the House and general debate on the independent offices appropriation bill, I desire to ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow, and that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Tuesday.

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, as I understand, all that will be laid before the House to-morrow will be general debate on the independent offices appropriation bill?

Mr. RAINEY. That is all. Of course, if general debate should be concluded, which does not seem likely, then we will proceed under the 5-minute rule on that bill, but there will be no vote on that bill to-morrow.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, with regard to the anti-injunction bill, there are some in the House who are against curtailing the present power and jurisdiction of our courts. Are we to be given a fair division of time in the discussion of that bill?

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman will have to take that up with others than myself.

Mr. BLANTON. But the rule does not provide that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is no rule yet actually drafted.

Mr. BLANTON. But I mean the rule that the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The idea of the Rules Committee is to give free debate on both sides.

Mr. BLANTON. And there will be equal division of time by those who are against as well as those who are for the measure?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is my understanding of the attitude of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the gentleman from Illinois proposes to allow the independent offices appropriation bill to have right of way after the present bill is finished?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOODRUM. Through to-morrow?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. And when will we have an opportunity to consider that bill again after to-morrow?

Mr. RAINEY. On Monday afternoon, if they get through with the Consent Calendar.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman will perceive that we start out on a bill such as the independent offices appropriation bill, which provides appropriations for 30 different governmental agencies, and which has some controversial subjects in it, and it is going to be very hard on the committee and on the House if we split it up. I wonder if the gentleman would ask unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday, so that we could go ahead with that bill and complete it on Wednesday or Thursday?

Mr. RAINEY. That would be impossible. Of course, there would be objection. Calendar Wednesday could not be dispensed with except by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman is assuming there would be objection. There may not be. Under the gentleman's proposal now we will not finish general debate on this appropriation bill to-morrow, and we will not get to it again until Thursday of next week. That is the effect of it.

Mr. RAINEY. It may be possible to consider it again on Monday.

Mr. WOODRUM. It is obvious that Monday is Consent Calendar, and Tuesday the anti-injunction bill will be considered, and Wednesday Calendar Wednesday, so that we will go from Saturday until next Thursday.

Mr. RAINEY. I would not care to propound such a request.

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

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BYRNS. 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. 9699) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, with Mr. HOWARD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the inland transportation of mail by aircraft, under contract as authorized by law, and for the incidental expenses thereof, including not to exceed \$30,000 for supervisory officials and clerks at air mail transfer points, and not to exceed \$41,780 for personal services in the District of Columbia and incidental and travel expenses, \$19,000,000.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: On page 57, line 25, strike out the sign and figures "\$19,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the sign and figures "\$20,000,000."

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am not fooling myself and I am sure I am not fooling any Member of this House when I say that the amendment I have offered has about as much chance to get the approval of the Appropriations Committee as a militant Chinaman would have on the streets of Tokyo.

However, I want to show you this picture. I want you to consider it because you are the custodians of the Treasury and you are the ones to decide it.

I have the greatest respect for the Appropriations Committee and they are doing fine work. I usually stand with them. I stand with them very often when it hurts; but when there is a good thing which they do not approve, I do not stand with them, and I submit this is a good thing. I want to ask your careful consideration of it for a few minutes.

If you are not familiar with this airplane map, I think it might be interesting to say that here is a very beautiful picture, a very fine picture. If you do not know about it, you would be surprised to see how much development there has been in the air mail service of this country. I think the Postmaster General has done a fine piece of work, but there are some missing links in this picture, and with \$19,000,000 this can not be completed. Year by year expenses are being reduced as the mail increases, and the Postmaster General says that within three years he thinks these lines can get along without any assistance or very little assistance.

It is very important to connect these missing links so as to bring this service up to as high a standard as possible, and with this additional \$1,000,000 I am sure that can be done. There are several connecting links that affect this entire situation. Here is one from Troy to Montreal and another from Richmond to Hampton Roads and from Washington to Hampton Roads. Here is one from Washington down to Nashville, through this great central portion of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee. Here is one from New Orleans to this point [indicating on map]. Here are two from the southern point of Florida connecting the West Indies. Here is one across the State of Texas. Here is one up in Washington to Victoria.

I am not going to discuss these other points because other gentlemen who are interested will do that. We have been before the Appropriations Committee and we have been before the Budget. I can not speak for either one of them but I do not believe that either one would seriously object if this were done.

At Hampton Roads we have a great population—400,000 people—and one of the greatest ports in the country. There are an average of 10 or 12 ships that come there every day, large ocean liners. They want to get their mail to all parts of the country. The bankers there tell me that they will be able to save \$200,000 a year by getting their paper to New York quickly, as can be done by air mail. Lights have been installed from Washington to Norfolk by the Department of Commerce. We have two air lines there, but no air mail. Ship captains come in every day and are amazed that there is no way of getting their mail out of Hampton Roads by air routes.

Here is an extension that should be made from Washington down through this large section, one of the largest sections on the map that is not touched. It reaches right into the city of Nashville, the home city of the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Of course, his hands are tied and he is not going to set a precedent, but I think we should take it out of his hands and establish it, and by doing that we would be performing a very graceful act for him. It would be a very graceful thing if we should establish a line into his home city.

Mr. STAFFORD. Even over his protest?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes; even over his protest, as the gentleman from Wisconsin suggests. I think it would be a very graceful thing to do for him.

Going back to this situation here at Hampton Roads, last year one of the reasons given for this additional \$2,000,000 was that this line was to be established. The city has gone ahead and established an airport. Two lines have come in there and there is tremendous traffic around that port. It is the second largest port in America. More coal, tobacco, and cotton are shipped out of that port than from any other port in the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I do not want to be selfish about it and there are other Members who will tell you about their problems. We are all interested in it. As I say, we have been before the Appropriations Committee and before the Budget. Last year one of the reasons for this additional \$2,000,000 was that this line was to be established. The committee was going to give them \$18,000,000, but the Post Office Department asked for \$20,000,000. One of the reasons given for this additional \$2,000,000 was that this route was to be established from Washington to Norfolk. As the result of that, as I say, lights were established all along the way and those lights are there now. Lights have been established by the Department of Commerce over the entire route.

Depending on that, the city established an airport, and two air lines are connecting Washington and Norfolk at this time—one the Ludington line coming here direct from Washington and the Eastern Air Transport coming from Richmond. It does not make any difference to us which one gets it, but we do want air mail service.

The bankers have told me that they would save \$200,000 a year in getting their paper from Norfolk to New York where it is cleared.

You will notice that this entire coast line here [indicating] is not served with air mail, but is cut off entirely, and here at Hampton Roads we have one of the greatest ports in the United States. Frequently we have 18 or 20 ocean steamers a day coming in there from all parts of the world, and the postmaster told me a few days ago that they come in and express amazement that they can not get their mail and their invoices and other important papers to other parts of the country by air mail. The overhead cost on some of these ships is \$2,500 a day, and a delay of one day is tremendously important to them.

Mr. GARBER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GARBER. What is the distance of that route and what would be the approximate cost?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I am glad the gentleman has asked that question. The distance from Richmond to Norfolk is probably 60 miles and the cost would be something like \$70,000 a year. The distance from Washington to Norfolk is 120 miles and I think the cost would be \$150,000 a year, only a nominal sum.

I do not want to criticize the Post Office Department, but as I say, they secured this money last year and this is one of the reasons they gave for it. Frequently that is done. I know that other Members of the House have had a similar experience. The department gets the money for one purpose and then spends it for another.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. If the appropriation is increased, will the air route from Washington by way of Charlottesville and Roanoke and Bristol to Nashville be put in?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. My understanding is it would be, but I would not like to say definitely about that. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. LOVETTE] is going to speak about that in a few minutes and will tell the gentleman about that. I think the gentleman has some understanding about it, and I would rather that he advise the gentleman about that. However, I understand that is true.

So, as I have said, the money was appropriated for this purpose, and yet we have not the route, and now these lines are running and we need the establishment of this air mail route. The cost will be a very small matter.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Even if the gentleman's amendment should not prevail, will the \$19,000,000 provided for in this bill insure the continuance of every route now in existence in its full efficiency?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. With the \$19,000,000?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I understand it will, but it will not give them room for any extensions. It will barely keep the present routes going.

Mr. LANHAM. Is it absolutely certain it will do that?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I think it is. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Has the gentleman any authority for making that statement in so far as the route from Los Angeles to Salt Lake and Denver and in that western country is concerned; that is, that the arrangements that have been completed in the last 90 days are not going to be corrected if they get only the \$19,000,000?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I have not any authority to speak about that. I do not know about that.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Do not say it, then.

Mr. LARSEN. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LARSEN. My understanding is that the testimony of the Postmaster General before the subcommittee was to the effect that if the appropriation remained at \$19,000,000 this would necessitate the cutting down of 5 per cent of the amount that is now being paid to the transportation companies, and he said that, considering the fact he had just had a 10 per cent cut, he did not think it practicable or feasible, and that it ought not to be done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman will yield, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from Georgia, is it not doubtful that the \$19,000,000 provided for in this bill will be sufficient to enable the existing lines to run at full efficiency?

Mr. LARSEN. The Postmaster General said distinctly it would not enable him to do it; that he could not proceed with the \$19,000,000 in the way he should proceed, as I understood his testimony.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have one concluding statement to make, and I appreciate very much the time you have given me.

Let me call your attention to the fact that this is a decreasing expense. Every year the mail and passenger service is increasing so that the cost can be reduced more and more, and the Postmaster General states that in about three years most of these lines will be self-sustaining.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. The question has been raised here as to whether this \$19,000,000 will be sufficient to sustain the present service—

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. The Post Office Department wants \$20,000,000, and we want \$20,000,000, but they have been limited to \$19,000,000.

Mr. LUDLOW. I would like to clear up some misapprehension that may exist here. When Mr. Glover was before the committee, as a member of the subcommittee I asked him this question:

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Glover, under this \$19,000,000 appropriation you expect to be able to maintain the existing service, do you?

Mr. GLOVER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LUDLOW. And if there is any change at all, it will be in the frequency of service, curtailing of service?

Mr. GLOVER. If we have to curtail it at all, it would be in the frequency of the service.

His answer leaves no doubt whatever that \$19,000,000 will sustain all of the existing air mail routes during the next fiscal year, and there is even doubt as to whether in any single instance there will be any curtailment in the frequency of the service.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Under the guise of having insufficient funds, or for some other reason, the service from

Los Angeles to Denver by Salt Lake or by Albuquerque and thence easterly has been made such a service that it is absolutely useless as air mail service, and if that service is to be continued, it might just as well be cut out and any money saved in connection with cutting out that service might be used at some other place, unless they are going to correct the present service.

Mr. LUDLOW. From the statement of Mr. Glover, there need not be any misapprehension in the mind of any gentleman of the House that the existing service will be cut out. In these times of general distress we must pay some heed to the condition of the Treasury and to the interests of the overburdened taxpayers. Not a single air mail route in this country will be discontinued if this bill passes.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there are other Members who are interested in different sections of the country, and I am going to yield to them now. I appreciate very much the opportunity you have given me.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Will the gentleman kindly give the names of the cities proposed to be served by this extension and state whether or not they now have airports?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I will put that in the Record. I can not point it out on the map, as the print is too small.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes beyond the allotted time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I may say in the beginning of the remarks that I make on this matter that it has been my honor to serve as a member of the Post Office Committee of the House for the past several years, during which time the Watres bill, under which existing air mail is now carried, was reported out of that committee and passed by this Congress.

If there is anything in connection with the Watres bill that was intended to be emphasized it was to sell commercial aviation to the people of America.

Since the passage of that bill the Postmaster General has undertaken, I believe in a very splendid, efficient way, to put over that idea because of that legislation.

Now, what has happened in the last two or three years? Since the passage of the Watres bill aviation has taken great strides throughout America.

I have some statistics here which I desire to call to your attention. In 1930 there was a total of 21,353 air mail miles in America. In 1931 there were 26,553 air mail miles, or an increase of over 5,000 air line miles covered by the air mail.

There was an average daily schedule of 62,349 miles in 1930 and 95,121 miles in 1931, an increase, you will observe, of over 30,000 miles.

In 1930 there were 14,939,000 miles flown and last year 21,381,000 miles flown.

There has been a lot said here about the rates paid to these air mail contractors. In 1930 the average rate was 0.978 cents. In 1931 the rate had been reduced to 0.792. On January 1 of this year there was a further reduction of the rate to 0.66, as against 0.97 last year.

Here is another important thing about the air mail service. In 1926 there were only 5,782 passengers carried. In 1931, five years later, there were 469,981 air mail passengers.

I bring that out to impress upon the committee how this service has been sold to the American public as the result of the Watres bill passed by Congress three years ago—a comparison of 5,000 passengers in 1926 to over 469,000 in 1931.

Now, this map here has been brought in so that you may see the picture of our air mail service as it exists to-day. There is great room for air mail expansion in various sections of this country. I pay tribute to the Postmaster General for the interest that he has shown in his department for air mail expansion. He has done a good job.

You will find on this map existing air lines, but you can observe also that many extensions are still needed. The Postmaster General said in the hearings that within three or four years he hoped to see the air mail on a self-sustaining basis.

There is another significant thing about this air mail proposition. Air mail activity in America for the past 12 months has been about the only activity where there has been an increase. Take business concerns in all sections of the country, and you can not find an exception of that kind. Air mail and commercial aviation have increased.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. If we subsidize any business at the rate of \$10,000,000 a year, does not the gentleman think it would cause an increase? That is what I understand happened in the case of air mail.

Mr. McMILLAN. Oh, they have had a subsidy of \$20,000,000, if you call it a subsidy, but the gentleman overlooks the value of this service. That is the recommendation of the department this year, but the Budget has cut it to \$19,000,000.

Mr. BLAND. And is not the development of commercial aviation an important factor in national defense?

Mr. McMILLAN. It is one of the most important factors that I know for national defense.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I live at Peoria, Ill. We had an air mail there. It was taken away from us on account of our field. To-day every business man in Peoria is subscribing toward a fund of \$400,000, out of his own pocket, to build a new field and bring back the air mail, now that they see the loss they have sustained by losing it.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am very glad the gentleman has interrupted me to say what he has, because throughout America you will find municipalities in all sections of the country in anticipation of getting this service, offered through this Watres bill, subscribing to funds to build airports, even in these depressed times, and they are floating bond issues for that purpose. Down in my city we floated a bond issue for this purpose, and to-day we have one of the finest fields that can be found anywhere. In Savannah, Jacksonville, Atlanta, and in all of the cities all over the country you will find that similar action for aid development has been taken in anticipation of getting air service and air mail.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. McMILLAN. I am sorry I can not—I have only a few minutes.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I have only a few minutes.

Mr. YON. I want to advise the committee also that along this line where the triangle is not completed—

Mr. McMILLAN. If I have the time, I shall call attention to the matter in which the gentleman is interested. I said in the beginning of my remarks that there are various places on this map showing where connections or extensions should be made. Here is one here from the Northwest over to the west coast, comprising an area that ought to be supplied. Here is one down here that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Yon] is interested in. Why not have a line from Jacksonville to New Orleans? This Congress appropriated \$7,000,000 for the Pan American Airways that operates from Miami to South and Central America. This is a very important line because our trade under normal conditions with Central and South America amounts to \$2,000,000,000 a year. Why not have a connecting line from Jacksonville over New Orleans connecting with the Pacific coast? That is where the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Yon] is interested. Then look at this section through the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, where there are millions of people and a great many cities of importance, with no air mail. We can not hope to get any extension or expansion of this service unless we get

additional money. I hope you will support the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, a question has arisen as to whether \$19,000,000 would be sufficient to meet air mail demands. Reference was made to Mr. Glover's testimony. I call attention to the testimony of Postmaster General Brown and read from the hearings on page 286:

We have been obliged very recently to make what amounted to a 10 per cent cut in compensation to contractors. A number of them feel very much aggrieved by it and feel that it is making them do business at a loss, and undoubtedly it is in these winter months when it is pretty hard to operate anyhow.

There are a number of services that ought to be increased to take care of the business that we are building up. We are spending now at the rate of \$20,000,000 a year, and to get on a basis of \$19,000,000 a year we will have to make another 5 per cent cut on the average, for this takes one-twentieth of our money.

He has cut, effective on the 1st day of January, 10 per cent from these contractors, and he says that if he has to make out with \$19,000,000 it means he will have to reduce another 5 per cent. Let us see his testimony again. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WRIGHT], a member of the committee, asked him a question, which will be found on page 298.

With this \$19,000,000 appropriation can you carry out the program you had contemplated?

Mr. Brown said:

No; I can not.

In reply to a question asked by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY], page 298 of the hearings:

As a last proposition, for the record, I understand that you really need the \$20,000,000 to carry on effectively according to the policy of the department?

To which the Postmaster General replied:

That is correct. I would say at least \$20,000,000.

Again, when called on by Mr. ARNOLD to give an explanation as to what the Budget had in mind as to the matter, he said this, same page, 298:

I think Colonel Roop thought that if it did not turn out to be enough that we knew where to come for some more.

I called attention to this the other day. Under the provisions of the Watres Act, the Postmaster General could not create a deficit unless it was for an unforeseen emergency. This is not an unforeseen emergency. He knows exactly what the situation will be. He knows that \$19,000,000 is not sufficient to carry on. He desires carrying on legally and efficiently, and therefore asks for \$20,000,000.

There is another point I want to clear up. Somebody said you could operate a business with a subsidy of \$10,000,000; but there is no subsidy of \$10,000,000 in this. These are the facts: We appropriate \$20,000,000 for the operation. The only subsidy there could be would be represented by the difference between the revenue derived from the operation of the business and the cost of the business under the appropriation. What is it? It is not \$10,000,000. The revenue from the cancellation of air mail stamps and other stamps used for transmission of air mail is from \$12,000,000 to \$14,000,000 per year. The difference between that and the unexpended portion of the \$19,000,000 or \$20,000,000, or whatever it may be, would represent any subsidy that might be involved. In no event could it exceed five or six million. That is all there is to it. There is no \$10,000,000 subsidy or anywhere near it. If you propose to cut out all of the postal subsidy you would better see as to the ninety to ninety-five million deficit or subsidy in the Postal Department.

Do you know what this air mail service is? Do you stop to think? Do you realize what you are doing when you reduce the appropriation? We have invested at various points in America \$120,000,000 in airports. I think somebody asked the gentleman from Virginia something about

where the airports were located. I can not tell just where they are located, but I know that individuals and corporations, private individuals and municipal organizations have invested at least \$120,000,000 in the airports of this country. I got the figures from the Commerce Department yesterday. Now, whose money is this? It is your money, our neighbor's money—all private money invested in these airports, with the understanding and belief that we would make sufficient appropriation to keep up the air mail service. Now it is proposed to cut it down. It is proposed to hamper and hamstring the Postmaster General and the administration. It is proposed to cripple the airports in your own States, and to fail to furnish that service which we ought to have.

From Atlanta, Ga., to Charleston, S. C., is an air line. It is part of the system now, but there is no mail on it. The only thing they can do is to try to keep up that route. They can not likely keep it up without air mail contract and with passenger transportation alone. If you do not give them enough to operate what is now in existence, how do you expect any development?

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman has referred to the testimony of the Postmaster General. Permit me also to direct attention to the testimony of the Postmaster General on page 297:

Understand, we have just made a 10 per cent reduction effective the 1st of January. Now, to absorb this \$1,000,000 that the Budget cut off we will have to make another 5 per cent cut if we are to live within our \$19,000,000 in the next fiscal year. One cut has just been made and another is in sight.

Here the Postmaster General says that provision already is being made to bring the cost of the service within \$19,000,000, so that there will be no curtailment of this service at all by passing this bill.

That was the testimony of Mr. Glover.

Mr. LARSEN. But I did not say anything about Mr. Glover. I am talking about the Postmaster General, the man who is in charge of this air mail service, and not some underling official. I did not undertake to read what Mr. Glover had said. I said the Postmaster General, who is the man responsible for the work, and who is the man that made the statement to which I referred.

Mr. LUDLOW. But I am reading the testimony of the Postmaster General, who said that these two cuts could be made.

Mr. LARSEN. No. He said he could not carry on the present development in answer to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. And on page 319 they say the amount expended is \$16,942,000, leaving \$3,000,000 of the \$20,000,000 that has not been expended, in making this cut of 10 per cent and a threatened cut of 5 per cent more.

Mr. LARSEN. Yes; this still further reduces the amount of the alleged subsidy. Now, I want to call attention to some other things.

Mr. FISHBURNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. I yield.

Mr. FISHBURNE. The gentleman asked a few moments ago about a description of the airports on the proposed route from Washington to Chattanooga. I have here a list of the airports in all those cities if the gentleman desires to have them.

Mr. LARSEN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LANKFORD] said he would put that into the Record.

Now, I want to call attention to this fact. Down at Camp Benning in Georgia, near Columbus, Ga., is one of the greatest military training posts of the United States. There is no air line to Camp Benning or to Columbus. There is no service whatever. There should be; and we need a line across Columbus to Montgomery, Ala., to connect it up—the line from Chicago to New Orleans. There is one of the greatest military points in the South without any air facilities at all. How can we expect to develop anything unless we can get sufficient appropriations to do it?

Now, listen. In what were these pilots trained? Do you think they just run the ships? Not at all. Do you know what it involves? Here are some of the things. A pilot, if efficient, must learn the weather service. He must learn to translate and read the weather reports. He must know something as to radio. He has to learn the manipulation of radio instruments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARSEN. He must learn something of radio. He must learn to manipulate the machine and the keyboard, just as one learns the keyboard in telegraphy, as it were. Then he must learn the practical navigation of the ship. He must learn all of these things. They do not get that in the Regular Army, and in case of a national emergency where are we going to get such men as that? In case of foreign invasion or foreign enemy were to undertake to invade our country, what would they do first? Naturally the first thing they would do would be to destroy our air bases. They would go to these Army bases, if possible, and blow them up, and that would end it all; but with several thousand of these privately owned airports, manned by efficient men, how easily we could take our ships into these various ports, and they never could do any damage to our aircraft. Yet these privately owned airports, built up and maintained by cities, municipalities, and individuals, at no cost whatever to the Government, are to be destroyed and neglected and allowed to grow up in weeds because of a supposed economy. We are too stingy to put on \$1,000,000 in order to carry on work that is now in progress. It is an outrage, gentlemen, and you ought not to do it.

I want to call your attention to something else. You take our airships in the Army. They do not fly far enough to develop and find out the weak points in the engines. They never fly very much; in two years perhaps 1,000 hours; yet in commercial aviation the pilots get at least 100,000 hours in the air per year with one particular engine, so that they are able to develop the weak points in the engine and train flyers also. It is through this commercial aviation that we find weak points in our engines, and it is not through our Regular Army service.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman in his remarks make a brief statement with respect to these contractors and the amount of money they have had to invest in order to put over a proposition of this character, and is it fair to them to make this cut when they have spent so much in trying to put the thing over?

Mr. LARSEN. As a matter of fact, if it is not fair to those who own the municipal airports; it could not be fair to those gentlemen who have taken the contracts and expected to receive sufficient appropriations to carry on the service. When they have gotten the service half-way built up it is now proposed to cut them down.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. We are carrying in this bill \$19,000,000 for domestic air mail. That is the amount which was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. The Post Office Department asked for \$20,000,000. They presented that request to the Bureau of the Budget, but the Bureau of the Budget, after going over the matter very carefully, was of the opinion that this activity could be carried on without diminution on an appropriation of \$19,000,000. This \$19,000,000 is \$1,000,000 less than was appropriated in 1932.

Of course, gentlemen, it goes without saying that we are all intensely interested in our domestic air mail, but permit me to call your attention to the rapid growth and development of this service as shown by appropriations. In 1927 the first appropriation that was made for domestic air mail was but \$2,000,000, and since then it has reached the point where in 1932 we appropriated \$20,000,000. It is a great service of which we are all proud.

Now, my sympathy is with you gentlemen who are interested in getting new and additional air lines, but permit me to call your attention to this fact: That with this \$1,000,000 you seek to add by this amendment you have no assurance that you will get the lines you are particularly interested in. It will require far more than an additional million to put the contemplated new lines in service. Both the Postmaster General and the Second Assistant, who is in direct charge of this activity, tell us that they can maintain the present service at its present standard with the \$19,000,000 appropriation and make such readjustments as may be necessary in existing lines.

Let me call your attention to this further fact, that in January of this year, through some readjustments which were made by the Postmaster General and the air mail contractors under the certificate plan, \$1,240,000 was saved over the amounts that had previously been paid out on these contracts. We are told by the Postmaster General and by the Second Assistant Postmaster General that negotiations are under way for further reductions and that in the very near future it is entirely probable further reductions will be made. So if any of you gentlemen are of the opinion that this service can not be continued at its present standard with the \$19,000,000 carried in the bill, disabuse your minds of that idea at once.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARNOLD. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I want to ask the gentleman how much service can be figured in a million dollars or in any other amount of money when you change the air mail service to provide delivery of hundreds of pounds of air mail for a big metropolis every day to half past 6 or 7 o'clock in the evening instead of 2 o'clock.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD. Of course, that matter is an administrative one, and I can not answer the gentleman's question directly, but I know that this service has been developing year by year most satisfactorily from the standpoint of the air mail user. We have got to the place now where your committee felt that in view of the unfortunate economic situation throughout the country we could very well afford to mark time for one year and carry on this service for the fiscal year 1933 as it has been carried on during the fiscal year 1932; and these gentlemen who are so much concerned about getting additional air lines in their sections of the country can well bide their time for a year. This matter is only temporary, and when the Treasury gets in better shape further appropriations for expansion can be made.

Gentlemen, we are trying as far as we can to protect the Treasury of the United States without doing violence to the activities of the Federal Government. Here you have an opportunity to protect the Treasury to the extent of \$1,000,000 without doing violence to this wonderful activity in the Post Office Department.

Mr. SWING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARNOLD. I yield.

Mr. SWING. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to a situation which does not involve the establishment of a new line but which is a line that has already been established, but for which there is no money to operate it even though the Government, at the expense of the Department of Commerce, has already put the lights along the route and laid out the landing fields ready to operate. This air line is from Phoenix to San Diego, a part of the Southern Airmail Line.

Mr. ARNOLD. I can not yield further.

Mr. SWING. And I am informed by Mr. Glover that they can not operate it on the appropriation now proposed.

Mr. ARNOLD. That matter is in the hands of the Postmaster General, and they tell us that with the savings already made and those they have in immediate prospect

they can take care of readjustments on all lines where necessary.

Mr. SWING. He tells me he can not do that with the money now in the bill.

Mr. ARNOLD. They tell us they can, and if the gentleman will read the hearings carefully he will find they say they can do it.

Now, gentlemen, here is the situation: I am as much a friend of the air mail as any man in this House. In 1931 the cost of domestic air mail over and above receipts was something like \$11,000,000. Of course, it would be a nice thing to have this service extended. Of course, every community would like to have air mail, but the situation is such that we have been making such rapid progress in development along this line that it will certainly not hurt us to mark time for one year, so long as we keep up the present standard.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARNOLD. I yield.

Mr. MAAS. And it is only intended that this should be temporary anyway. It is not to set any precedent for the future?

Mr. ARNOLD. Absolutely not. It is not to set any precedent, and we are simply trying to protect the Treasury in such a way that this activity will not be interfered with, and yet we will save the \$1,000,000 that is sought to be tied on to this bill.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARNOLD. I yield.

Mr. GOSS. Do I understand correctly that we are appropriating more money for air mail in foreign countries this year and yet we are not willing to increase this appropriation \$1,000,000 for air mail in this country? Can the gentleman make that explanation to the House?

Mr. ARNOLD. The foreign air mail appropriation has not been increased. It probably would have been decreased had it not been for the fact that contracts were already in existence, and they are contracts under which the Government of the United States is obligated legally to pay. It was obligatory on us to appropriate the amounts necessary for the fulfillment of those contracts, otherwise the contractors would have gone into the Court of Claims, sued the Federal Government, and recovered judgment. The Government would have had no defense. Therefore we carry under the appropriation for foreign air mail service the same figure that was carried last year. This domestic air mail is costing us about \$11,000,000 a year as a direct subsidy to air transport companies. We should not increase that subsidy under these unfortunate financial conditions. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LOOFBOUROW. Mr. Chairman, it has been said here repeatedly that under the present appropriation of \$19,000,000 there will be no diminution of air mail service heretofore rendered, and that economies that were effected on January 1 of this year were made without hurting the service.

I want to call the attention of the committee to the line of the Western Air Express [indicating] that has operated between Los Angeles and Salt Lake City for seven years. It operated there 18 months as a passenger line before it had a mail contract. The owners put in \$400,000 before they secured a mail contract. For more than four and a half years they have operated under a mail contract, carrying mail once each way in the daytime and once each way at night.

On January 1 of this year the night service was suspended, with the result that patrons of the mails now get as quick service with a 2-cent stamp as they formerly did with a 5-cent stamp, and mail brought down from the North on the National Parks Line and from the Northwest on the Pasco Line that gets into Salt Lake City in the evening is sent from Salt Lake City to San Francisco and south to Los Angeles instead of going down directly by the former night mail to Los Angeles. This is one of the economies that re-

sulted in the saving of \$1,200,000 referred to by the member of the committee.

Mr. MAAS. Is that a lighted airway?

Mr. LOOFBOUROW. A lighted airway; yes. It has been lighted for three years. The emergency fields are there; the lights are installed, but they are now dark.

Mr. STAFFORD. The service is still there, but it goes by a different route.

Mr. LOOFBOUROW. Yes; the mail goes to San Francisco and then south to Los Angeles, and it takes approximately 10 hours longer than heretofore.

Mr. STAFFORD. You do not get the same service by the other route?

Mr. LOOFBOUROW. No. It takes about 10 hours longer.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is a striking demonstration of whether there has been any diminution.

Mr. LOOFBOUROW. Up to January 1 they carried about 1,500 pounds by night mail, and now it is less than 75 pounds in the daytime. It has not only affected the weight of the mail between these points, but it reaches points further east hours later than formerly.

Mail originating in Los Angeles is now delayed 6 hours into Denver, 7 hours into Omaha, 11 hours into Chicago, 9 hours into St. Paul and Minneapolis, 10 hours into Detroit, 13 hours into Cleveland, 8 hours into Buffalo, and 8 hours into Albany, N. Y. Westbound mail from these points for Los Angeles is now delayed from two to four hours. The economy mentioned by the member of the committee has caused this deterioration in service.

Now, I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that between Washington and New York City there are five trips each way each day carrying air mail, and that between Washington and Richmond, Va., there are four trips each way each day. There has been no diminution on these trips. Certainly, a readjustment in the distribution of money available for this service is needed.

This line from Salt Lake City to Los Angeles is what the railroads call a transfer track. It carries the mail from one transcontinental line to another, now only in the daytime, but the mail which accumulates in the afternoon must wait until the next morning.

Mr. HASTINGS. The mail leaves there in the daytime, in the morning?

Mr. LOOFBOUROW. Yes; at 9.30 a. m. from each terminal city. At that time in the morning there is no mail from that day's work. The great volume of mail is deposited in the afternoon, and that must be carried the greater distance by way of San Francisco or wait overnight.

They have not only taken away the service between these cities; the mails are also delayed in the same way that are brought down to Salt Lake City from the national parks line to Salt Lake City and from Pasco.

All this deterioration in service has resulted from the economy of January 1, mentioned by the member of the committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments advanced against the pending amendment by the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee, indicating that we should mark time. The whole trouble with the present economic distress and unemployment is that too many business institutions in the Nation have been marking time, cutting their operations costs to the bone, with a result that millions of our best citizens have been forced to mark time while unemployed and unable to get a job.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to briefly present my views with reference to the item in the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill for the inland transportation of mail by aircraft.

The appropriation for this item during the current fiscal year was \$20,000,000. While the Post Office Department's estimate to the Budget requested an appropriation for the next fiscal year of \$21,000,000, the Budget estimate as transmitted to the House provided for only \$19,000,000.

To these alleged economy experts in the House let me state that I have at no time heard complaint lodged against Postmaster General Brown because he was not practicing economy. In fact, all complaints with reference to economy in his department have been protests generally about the rigid economy which he had been practicing.

The original contract air mail law was passed seven years ago. During that brief period, under the able guidance of the Post Office Department pursuant to authority and appropriations voted to it by Congress, our domestic contract air mail system has come into existence and has developed until it is second to none in the world. I do feel that our commercial air transportation system is of such vital importance to our economic welfare, as well as to our national defense, that the appropriations for such service even in times like these should not be curtailed.

I, for one, take great pleasure in expressing the hope that the full amount requested by the Post Office Department for our domestic air mail service will be recommended by the Budget in the near future and appropriated by Congress.

There are several new air mail routes which would then be made possible. One of these is the route from Milwaukee, Wis., across Lake Michigan to Grand Rapids and Detroit.

In testifying before the Appropriations Committee, Assistant Postmaster General Glover referred to this route as one of those that would be provided with air mail service if \$20,000,000 were available. On page 324 of the hearings he is quoted as stating, "that is a very fine service and a wonderful passenger service"; and again on page 330 he says "there is a tremendous demand for that service up there; there is a lot of time saved, and a great many passengers are using it."

This operation was inaugurated by the Kohler Aviation Co. in September of 1929. For two and one-half years they have been flying across Lake Michigan, winter and summer, with amphibian planes, without a single injury to passengers, personnel, or cargo. From the beginning their schedules have called for six crossings of Lake Michigan on week days and four on Sunday. The regularity and dependability of their service has been such that it is now commonly referred to as "the bridge that spans Lake Michigan." They have pioneered in the development of air express service, and last month carried over 19,000 pounds. They have carried about 12,000 passengers and have enabled the business men of Wisconsin and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan to save much valuable business time in traveling back and forth across the lake.

One can appreciate the importance of this service when you realize that the Michigan and Wisconsin shores are 6½ hours apart by boat, 8½ hours by train, and 45 minutes by plane.

This is the only operator who has conducted an all-year-round operation with amphibian planes over open water in northern latitudes. This operation is more than a year older than any other operation which has been conducted without an air mail contract.

I sincerely trust the funds will be made available to put air mail on this line, thereby not only according the operators a well-merited recognition but also providing the business men of the communities along their route with an air mail service which they urgently need and have frequently requested.

The present unnatural procedure of taking air mail around the lake by way of Chicago would be discontinued, and there would be created an important link in the direct mail service from the East through Milwaukee and into the Northwest.

The Milwaukee Association of Commerce, whose members include some of the largest taxpayers in the Nation, is heart and soul behind the proposed air mail service over Lake Michigan.

If we approach the consideration and advisability of voting for the pending amendment, carrying an additional million dollars for air mail service, from a national-defense standpoint alone, I believe we can justify our position in its favor. We know, particularly those of us who have seen planes in

actual operation during a great conflict between nations, the importance that aviation will play in the future defense of our beloved country. The Committee on Naval Affairs of this Congress, after mature consideration, have favorably acted on a bill providing for almost a billion dollars to build ships for the purpose of national defense. Why, then, quibble over this million dollars of the taxpayers' money which will add so much to our national defense as well as improve the air mail service. Preceding speakers have called to your attention in detail how all of these airports and flyers made possible as a result of the Federal Government appropriation for air mail service will strengthen the arms of our Nation if we are forced into a future war. If my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, desires to make up some of the million dollars carried in this amendment, he can do so in the regular Navy Department appropriation bill.

The Navy Department educates almost twice as many future officers in the United States Naval Academy as the Army educates in the United States Military Academy, although the Army officer personnel is larger than the Navy.

The Navy star-chamber performance of selection for promotion and placing on the retired list Naval Academy graduates who have not been selected should be discontinued, not only in the interest of fair play but in the interest of economy. The American taxpayers should not be compelled to pay for the training of so many midshipmen only to have them placed on the retired list in the prime of their lives at an annual cost of \$2,500 for each one during their entire life because a few admirals in a star-chamber proceeding did not select them for promotion. At a future date I shall at length present facts and figures showing that economy can be had in this respect without injury to our national defense.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the pending amendment will pass, if only from a national-defense standpoint. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LANKFORD].

I am in complete sympathy with the President, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Appropriations Committee in their laudable efforts to reduce the expenses of the Government to the end that the Budget may be balanced. Of course, this is of vital importance. I yield to none of my colleagues in my interest and advocacy of the strictest possible economy in the administration of our governmental machinery. In view of the critical condition of the Treasury, I believe every item of expense should be closely scrutinized and reduced to the minimum consistent with the proper and efficient administration of governmental functions. I am of the opinion, however, that even economy can be carried to extremes. A close-fisted, cheese-paring, parsimonious policy in providing funds for our governmental activities that results in the crippling of the service is, in my opinion, very poor economy. Efficient service should be taken into account in our labors and desires to bring Uncle Sam's expenses within the limits of his income.

Mr. Chairman, I think it will be conceded that there is no more popular or progressive branch of the Postal Service than the air mail. Every day it is growing in public favor and, in my opinion, it is destined to soon become the most important as well as the most beneficial service of the great Post Office Department.

I confess that, in addition to the general interest that I have in the air mail service, I have what might be considered a personal and selfish interest in this amendment. There is a section of country stretching approximately 750 miles west of Washington City that does not enjoy the direct benefits of air mail. It is the largest area east of the Mississippi River that does not participate in this great blessing.

My congressional district is a small part of that vast area. Some of the most patriotic and public-spirited people of the United States reside in that territory. Besides this score or more of progressive cities that will receive direct benefit from an air mail line that would bisect that area running from Washington City to Nashville, Tenn., hundreds of towns, hamlets, and communities, and at least 5,000,000 people would be benefited. Undoubtedly there are a number of other projects of perhaps equal merit in other sections of the country.

Air mail, while comparatively in its infancy, has already grown into a very large activity or industry, if you please. Showing the growth of the domestic air service during the last fiscal year, Mr. Glover, Second Assistant Postmaster General, has furnished me the following data:

	Fiscal year	
	1930	1931
Length of routes.....miles.....	21,353	26,553
Average daily scheduled.....do.....	62,349	95,121
Miles flown.....	14,939,466	21,381,852
Pounds carried.....	7,719,698	8,579,422
Average rate paid per mile.....cents.....	97.8	79.2

The average rate paid per mile in the month of December, 1931, was 66 cents.

The increase in passengers carried since 1926 is particularly interesting. In 1926 there were 5,782 passengers carried, as against 469,981 in 1931.

Mr. Chairman, let us not be too niggard in our treatment of this very important infant industry. Let us not starve it to death or stunt its growth by withholding the necessary appropriation for its proper and deserved nourishment. I am in favor of economy, but I am opposed to an economy that will cripple or retard a great public service such as the air mail.

The department estimate for this service is \$21,000,000. Let us "split the difference," to use horse-jockey parlance, and increase the appropriation to \$20,000,000, in order that the department may make some highly desirable improvements and extensions, and in order that this very popular and important public service may not actually suffer. [Applauded.]

Mr. LOVETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise for only one purpose in connection with this discussion. I also live in this "lost continent" you see on this map. When I first came to Congress and became interested in the air mail I inquired about the service and procured a map. It is a map just like this air mail map you have before you now. I wondered why this great territory west of Washington, referred to by Mr. TAYLOR, was left out. I still wonder why. I am not criticizing anyone. I think the air mail system of the United States has developed wonderfully fast. I think the Postmaster General has been very diligent and efficient in the establishment of this great system, but I can not understand why it is that when you mail a letter at Washington for San Diego, Calif., or anywhere in the great Southwest, you have to carry it 250 miles farther than it ought to be carried; or when a passenger takes a plane in the city of Washington to go anywhere in the great Southwest you either carry him up to the Great Lakes, down to Columbus, Ohio, Cincinnati, Louisville, and into Nashville and on into the West, if he should be going that way, or bring him around by the Atlantic seaboard almost to the Gulf Coast, at Atlanta, and then start him to the West. It is approximately 850 miles from Washington around to Nashville either way you go. It is less than 650 miles right down the Shenandoah Valley to Nashville. Let me tell you what is in the Shenandoah Valley, if you do not already know it. There is Charlottesville with an airport; Roanoke with an airport; Bristol, Tenn.-Va., with one of the best airports in the country; Johnson City, Kingsport, Greeneville, and Knoxville, Tenn., and then to Nashville or Chattanooga, as the case may be. This line will traverse the most beautiful valleys in all of the eastern section of our

country, beginning with the Shenandoah Valley, then going on down into the East Tennessee Valley to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, where the Government and the people are spending millions of money, and which is one of the beauty spots of the United States. The cities along this route, such as Charlottesville, Roanoke, Bristol, Johnson City, Kingsport, Greeneville, and Knoxville, and many other smaller cities, are thriving, growing cities. There are from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 good American citizens who live in this section of the country who have been deprived of the air mail since its institution. I can see no good reason why they should not have it. I have taken it up with the Post Office Department. I went to the Post Office Department, and they advised me that they did not have the money and that unless the appropriation fixed by the committee was raised they could not put it in.

I called their attention to the fact that we had been overlooked; that in the development of this great air mail system we had been left out. I called their attention to the fact that it was not good business or good economy to send mail from Washington first to the Great Lakes on the north, then back to Nashville, mail that was destined to go to the Southwest. I called their attention to the fact that it was not good business or good economy to send mail from Washington, via Richmond, down through the Carolinas, skirting the Atlantic seaboard, and almost to the Gulf coast at Atlanta, an additional distance of from 200 to 250 miles in reaching the Southwest, when a direct line from Washington, by Charlottesville, Roanoke, Bristol, Johnson City, Greeneville, Kingsport, Knoxville, and Nashville, would save fully three hours in time, aside from the additional expense of flying this extra distance, and the same is true as to passengers who go from Washington to the Southwest.

I called their attention to the fact that we had been overlooked in the establishment of air mail lines. If you will observe on the map before you, the space indicates where there are no air lines, and it is by far much larger than any space in the United States east of the Mississippi River not covered by air mail. In other words, each State or each section apparently is fully covered by air mail lines, and in some instances parallel lines, and our territory has been left out. Some one has fallen asleep at the switch.

I am not criticizing anyone, not even my distinguished predecessor who was here while these lines were being set up. I could not attribute it to his neglect. A Representative in Congress, Mr. RANSLEY, from the great State of Pennsylvania last year pronounced a eulogy on him and mailed 20,000 copies into my district under his frank as a campaign document, in which he said he was comparable to Abraham Lincoln, who is my political patron saint.

There must be something wrong, or some misunderstanding somewhere, for if there had been one as great as Abraham Lincoln, or even nearly as great as that great statesman, representing my district, I am sure that the Post Office Department, or even the Congress, in laying out the air mail system of this country could not have built rings around him, as is shown by the air mail lines on this map.

This neglect of my section of the country is wrong and ought to be cured in some way. In view of the advice from the Post Office Department that this line can not be built without an additional appropriation, I feel that the great need for it, together with the benefit that it will be to the system, demands that the appropriation be increased for this purpose. They have practically assured us that if the appropriation is increased they will be able to make this great improvement in the service. It is not only for the benefit of the people of our section of the country, but will be a great benefit to the people of the Nation, especially in establishing a shorter and more direct line from the Capital to the great Southwest. For that reason I hope that the amendment will pass.

I do not yield to any man in the House in my interest in the Budget, or in balancing the Budget; I believe in balancing the Budget; I believe in economy; I believe we ought to hold the expenses down. I try to do that with every vote I cast.

The proposed line that I am describing is good business and good economy, and will not only benefit a large section of the country that is entitled to it, but will enhance the efficiency of the system, as it is now already constituted, by making a shorter route from the Capital of the Nation to the great Southwest.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, my desire is to call attention to the entire lack of transcontinental air service in a part of the country that has not as yet been referred to in any detail.

It will be seen by this map that at the present time an air mail route reaches only into North Dakota from Chicago and the Twin Cities, but that there is a great stretch to the west that comprises approximately a thousand miles, reaching out to some of the greatest western cities, without any direct east and west air mail service.

The necessity for the increase of appropriation provided for in this pending amendment is due partly to the total lack of that service, and to the fact that without such an increase that service can not be provided.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. If this amendment is adopted and \$20,000,000 is made available, will that insure the inauguration of that particular route?

Mr. LEAVITT. The situation is that without it we certainly can not get the route, and with it we have great hope that we can.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the general case for the air mail service has been so well made that there is no necessity that I take the further time of the House in that direction. I only wish to call attention on the map to this great missing gap in the east and west air mail system as it now exists and to the fact that without an increase in funds that lack can not be supplied.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. I yield.

Mr. McMILLAN. Last year's increase in poundage for air mail shows approximately a million pounds over the year 1930.

Mr. LEAVITT. That is undoubtedly true.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. I yield.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I wish to call attention to the fact that they are cooperating in Canada in a transcontinental line, while they neglect the northwestern part of the United States.

Mr. LEAVITT. Indeed. The east and west line I refer to would go through Montana, would complete the line through North Dakota, the entire distance across Montana, northern Idaho, and the northern part of the State of Washington to Seattle. In addition there is need for an extension of what is now known as the national parks line, northward from Great Falls to Havre and into Canada, and for a line to Denver by way of Billings. I am active for those developments, but I am referring now particularly to the great missing part of the national system of east and west air mail lines known as the northern route, because that lack is plainly before you on this map.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time in order to give opportunity to another who desires to speak on this matter and who would otherwise be excluded by expiration of the agreed period of debate.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out, it will be noticed on the map that the country is pretty well serviced by air mail, with one exception. One gap is left which, from a commercial and military standpoint, is one of the most important in the country. Each of the great transcontinental railroads is paralleled with an air line, with the exception of the northern part of the country, where there are four transcontinental railroads and not one air line. The policy of following trade territories requires that this gap be completed with air service, especially as we have these great distances out there which need air services even

more than many of the congested sections of the country where distances are short.

I feel the next logical development is to extend the air service into Montana, which will eventually be extended to the coast.

Now, just a word from a military standpoint. One of the great benefits from and purposes of an air mail subsidy is to build up national defense. From a defense standpoint one of the most vulnerable parts of the country would be our northwestern section. When the Army undertook to move the fighting squadrons of its planes, a year or so ago in the winter, from their base at Selfridge Field, Mich., across the continent, they had a great deal of difficulty in this part of the country because of lack of ground facilities. The movement was a fizzle. It was no reflection on the Army Air Corps nor the pilots. They could not move those planes with any sort of expedition, because there were no ground facilities. There was no trouble about actual flying. It is of vital importance that we have all ground facilities for easy and quick movement of our planes from east to west, over this route, if they are needed.

Now, I understand the necessity for economy and I think all of us do, but we have just passed a bill calling for some \$132,000,000 to build new roads. I believe we can well afford to appropriate one more million dollars, which is what the department itself requests, to complete the air picture of our traffic systems, and close the remaining gaps. Certainly it is unwise and unfair to leave one important section of the country, a great inland empire, if you please, without the same advantages and protection afforded to all the other parts of the Nation.

Some of the so-called feeder lines could certainly be deferred a while until the great natural trade channels are taken care of. The normal, long-established trade routes of the Northwest flow east and west. The whole trade territory of the Northwest has been built along these lines, until it is now so well accepted that any departure from this policy can only be artificial and tend to disturb and disrupt the whole area.

I wish to call the attention of the committee to the urgent necessity of extending the air mail facilities from the Twin Cities out into Montana at once, because of the very tendency to a departure from the normal trade routes inaugurated by the Post Office Department in recently granting an extension that will have the effect of interfering with the natural flow of trade and commerce of our trade territory and divert it to another channel.

A few weeks ago an extension to a mid-continent transcontinental air line was put into operation from Omaha, Nebr., to Watertown, S. Dak. This artificially cuts across a trade channel, and would tend to tap and divert established trade out of its normal east-west flow to a north-south traffic, inasmuch as it provides the only air service in that section. That is a trade abortion and an unwarranted trade invasion, because it does not follow natural development; it only upsets existing trade relations and tends to break down the whole plan.

Such an extension would be logical and should come, but only after the northern east-west air traffic is adequately established.

It is hardly a good plan to build the feeder lines before the main line itself is established.

But because this has already been done, as I have indicated, it is doubly important in order to prevent permanent injuring to the future development of this area, that an east-west extension be granted from the twin cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis out through one of the Dakotas into Montana, probably Helena, and this done at once.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back any remaining time I may have.

Mr. FISHBURNE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I simply rise to accentuate what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. LOVETTE] has said about the importance of a line from Washington to Chattanooga or Nashville, right through the middle of this vast territory of 168,000 square miles shown on the map we have before us.

I represent a district which includes the great Shenandoah Valley and there are more than 2,000,000 people who would be accommodated by this line. It would run from Washington by Charlottesville, Lynchburg, Roanoke, Bristol, Johnson City, and Nashville, and at all of those places are now established airports, and short feeder lines could connect with Winchester and Harrisonburg. The territory it goes through is peculiar in this, that it is filled with universities, colleges, and schools. There are 15,000 students who would be accommodated by that air line, and it has been found that schools and universities use the air mail to a great extent. The business men throughout this territory are clamoring for this service.

I have in my hand a very elaborate abstract and survey of this proposed route, and I would be very glad if every Member of the House could see it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is anyone in this House who has any more personal interest in the development of aviation than I have. I have been with it since its very birth in this country.

Gentlemen, I want to say in all frankness that the \$1,000,000 that you suggest here would not commence to give you all the lines you want. You would be fighting among yourselves after the \$1,000,000 was granted.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. At least give us a chance to fight over it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. All right. Had it not been for the unfortunate development out West on the Century Lines I believe the appropriations would have been reduced even more than they were.

My interest in supporting the committee to-day is that I do not want to be a party to the killing of the goose that laid the golden egg. No one can properly say the United States Government is starving aviation. With the \$19,000,000 appropriated in this bill and the establishment and maintenance of lighted airways, weather service, scientific and technical aid, as well as the appropriations made for the Army and the Navy for equipment, which gives the industry an opportunity to live at this time, we have been most generous. Within 10 years from now I will say that 90 per cent of the mail will be carried by air. It can not be stopped. But we can not, as I see the present conditions and the differences of opinion existing, do any more this year. What I would suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee, the distinguished chairman of the committee, as well as to the legislative committee, is that provision should be made whereby air mail may be transported on a poundage basis between any two given points without a subsidized postal contract. When I say without a subsidy I mean a postal contract under the special law establishing the subsidy system.

I believe we have arrived at the time when it is up to aviation to show what it can do, and it can do that by carrying the mail between points on a poundage basis. Of course, I assume absolute fairness to all reputable companies on the part of the Post Office Department. On the other hand, the pioneer companies can not and must not be destroyed.

Now, gentlemen, when I say that within 10 years we will carry all the mail by air I am absolutely convinced of that. You will find that we appropriate for railroad transportation \$115,000,000. That is a decrease of \$12,000,000, but that decrease is due to the falling off of business. Now, the increase for aviation must be reflected in a decrease in the cost of railway transportation. That is how aviation can get more appropriations for transportation of mail.

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. ARNOLD. It appears in the hearings that the decrease in the amount provided for the carrying of mail by the railroads was due to the fact that so many of the short-line railroads are being taken off and they have to supplement that service by trucks and busses.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I understand. The point I am trying to develop is this: As aviation grows, without artificial stim-

ulation, it must come from that amount. The more mail transported by air the less by rail. The less by rail the more money for aviation. I have confidence in the success of aviation as a means of transportation for mail.

At this very moment there is a bill before the Post Office Committee on which hearings are being held, and there exists a difference of opinion as to what is the proper rate to be paid to these companies. Let us go along this year with this appropriation. Next year, I hope, all existing doubt and differences will be removed. Let present operating companies take heed; we expect our pilots to be kept on a high professional level and properly paid.

It is encouraging to note the great interest in aviation as expressed on this floor to-day. Indeed, a big change of attitude of former years. This new industry is certain of its future.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to draw your attention to the western part of the United States also. I have listened to this debate attentively, and it is difficult to determine whether to support the amendment or not. But in the light of what has been said, I am inclined to support the amendment, because when the Post Office Department changed the air mail service from Los Angeles to Denver by way of Salt Lake City it resulted in the delivery of air mail at Denver at about 6.30 in the evening—too late for any business on the date of delivery. Officials of the post office said that by so doing they were going to save money. But if there is to be any saving of money made by delivering business mail at 6.30 in the evening, I do not know how it can be done. I am told that the quantity of air mail has decreased from 1,500 pounds per day to 50 or 60 pounds per day on this delivery. Of course it would be so.

Now, another subject: Gentlemen from the Northwestern States have been telling you about this area in here [indicating on map]. Here is the area across from Mexico to Canada. We have been trying to obtain air mail service through this area by way of Denver, Cheyenne, Casper, Sheridan, and Billings. Air mail service has not yet been established, and the Government regrets that it has not enough funds available for this new service. Of course, you can tell by this map that this additional routing is coming and that it is necessary. Whether it is intended to be included in this year's program I do not know. Maybe it can be postponed. Perhaps it ought to be postponed; but you can see by looking at this map that the open spaces between the ends of these routes are going to be brought together and closed up some day—north and south and east and west, making through air mail transportation.

I know something of the business and mail possibilities of air service between Denver and Billings, and I do not hesitate to represent that the net amount of money which may be called subsidy which might be paid in connection with the establishment of such a line would be far less than amounts which I have been told have been paid upon even less mileage in connection with some lines.

I submit to you who are talking about the amount of money involved that you know full well how much money the Post Office Department has had to establish air mail service. You know what the department asked for in this bill and what was approved in the Budget. If the change in the Los Angeles-Denver air mail and the refusal to establish a Denver-Billings line was a part of a plan to induce some of us to come on the floor of this House and badger the committee to give the Post Office a million dollars more for air mail, and if they need it, I want to help them get it. But if the plan is simply to have some of us make a play here to ask for some more money, then I am not interested in such a play.

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. ARNOLD. We do not know what this million dollars in figures may be used for—increasing night lines or for increased frequency on existing lines.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD] will realize that when you change the schedule

for delivery of air mail so that what formerly amounted to 1,500 pounds of air mail began to arrive at Denver, Colo., from the West at 6.30 o'clock in the evening, it did not take long for the business people who were sending mail that way to learn about the change in delivery and to begin sending their mail under 2-cent postage. For the 2-cent letters would be delivered the next morning, and so would the air mail.

In other words, delivery at 6.30 in the evening practically cuts off 24 hours of the air mail service. So air mail that theretofore was delivered after a 2 o'clock airplane arrival reached the banks and business houses in time to be a part of that day's business. The Post Office Department has stated that the quantity of mail now carried is insufficient to reestablish the old service, which included some night flying. Of course it is, and the revenue is the difference between that collected from stamps on hundreds of pounds and the amount collected on tens of pounds.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN. And that reduction has a corresponding effect on the reduction of revenue?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Absolutely. It cuts the revenue right straight out.

Mr. McMILLAN. And that applies to all sections where that situation exists?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Yes; 50 or 60 pounds of mail is simply curiosity mail by people who merely want to put a 5-cent stamp on a letter so as to have it marked and transported as air mail. That is not the business that will build up air mail delivery.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out the very evident lack of a completed air mail system through the northwest part of the United States.

The map itself indicates that this section of the country is simply waiting for a line, as indicated by my pointer here. [Indicating.] This stub, this stub, and this stub would be connected, and at the same time you get your north-and-south connections at three different places here.

This is one of the great perishable commodity producing sections of the entire United States. They have occasion to pass their mail back and forth in the shortest time possible, and they have often been handicapped by the time required.

Here is a great section not served at all. The mail that comes down from Alaska would be picked up there [indicating] and brought at once directly across to the central part of the United States.

So we hope we may succeed in getting the connection across here that we have been trying to get for the past several years. It would serve the Dakotas, Minnesota, Montana, a part of Wyoming, Idaho, Washington, and many of the various connections to which I have referred, and would also serve Alaska and the mail that comes from across the Pacific.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] has the correct idea. The gentleman has been a friend of the air service, and it has been brought out in this discussion that the air service now, from the standpoint of carrying passengers, is largely able to care for itself, and that the Government ought not to be called upon to subsidize further this part of our mail service.

It has been brought out that 1,000,000 additional pounds of mail was carried in this way last year, but it has also been brought out that it cost the taxpayers of this country approximately \$18,000,000 to secure and carry this additional 1,000,000 pounds of mail. So there is \$18 a pound for each additional pound of mail that you are carrying.

We are coming to a time in this country when we have got to slow down. You talk about national defense here. I think the greatest question of national defense is defending the Treasury of the United States, and I think the people back home realize that this is the greatest question before the Congress to-day. If you want national defense, defend the Treasury, because if you bankrupt the Treasury of the

United States and utterly destroy our credit, how are you going to defend this country in case of war or in case of invasion?

So here is one place where you can cut out money, and instead of adding \$1,000,000 you can cut out \$10,000,000 by adopting my amendment, because the hearings show that the air mail can be carried for one-half the amount it is being carried for now. This is the evidence in the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, I have just received the information from the Committee on Public Buildings that no more contracts for the erection of post-office buildings anywhere in the United States would be let for this year. I want to say that I heartily indorse the economy program which the House has instituted, and it is my wish that we might economize in every one of these appropriation bills; but why economize so rigidly in one of the needed branches of the mail service by refusing to continue the erection of post-office buildings where they are actually needed and denying an opportunity for the employment of much of the unemployed labor, and then allow this increase in expenditures of tax money to further subsidize an already oversubsidized air transport company engaged in the carrying of air mail? To my mind this is a wanton waste of the tax money of our people and should be stopped. I am, therefore, opposed to this amendment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 57, line 25, strike out the figures "\$19,000,000" and insert the figures "\$10,000,000."

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I think the very best answer that could be made to those who have advocated the increase of this appropriation is the map now before you. I think if you will look at that map, gentlemen, and see the wonderful progress in putting in air mail lines that has been made during the past four years, you will agree with me that the Government has been going at a pretty rapid pace in the establishment of air routes.

I am a friend of the air mail service. For several years the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THATCHER] and I, on the committee, have been standing for every reasonable appropriation if it would help the air service.

But after all, gentlemen, the \$19,000,000 is in accordance with the request of the Budget for the continuance of the service for the next year, and \$11,000,000 of that, in round figures, represents nothing more or less than a plain subsidy in the interest of the service.

There is such a thing as loading down the service, and I want to say to those who favor the air mail service that if you increase too fast, if you proceed too rapidly, if you make it too great a burden on the people of the country, you will find that you have done the air mail service an injury rather than a benefit.

There is not one of you gentlemen who have spoken in favor of a million-dollar increase who knows that you will get a route if the amendment is adopted. There are a number of applications throughout the country, and I suspect that most of those who made speeches in the interest of the million-dollar increase, if granted, will be sadly disappointed when the time comes to allocate the million dollars extra.

We have granted the Budget estimate. We have not diminished it a dollar. That is all the Budget asked for, and Mr. Glover, as the gentleman from Indiana said a while ago, said that the \$19,000,000 would be sufficient to carry on the present service during the year.

Mr. LOOFBOUROW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. LOOFBOUROW. Then how does the gentleman explain the situation between Salt Lake and Los Angeles, where the night flying has been taken off as a matter of economy?

Mr. BYRNS. I do not know. The gentleman can get that information from the Post Office Department. I will say that the hearings disclose that \$19,000,000 will be sufficient

to carry on the present service. It was suggested that it might prevent greater frequency on some of the routes, or some night flying, which might possibly be put on during the year.

But, gentlemen, can not that wait one year; can not we postpone for one year the further establishment of these routes? Can not we, in the interest of the taxpayers of this country during this great depression, postpone for one year the further proposed lines? The present lines are now taking \$19,000,000 to carry on. We are not going to deprive anybody now getting the service.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I call the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee to the fact that Richmond County and Augusta, Ga., with a population of 75,000 people, are now a portion of my district, and that they are deeply interested in the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes; and the State of Georgia. If we should appropriate the extra million dollars, it will not be sufficient to satisfy the gentleman from Washington, the gentleman from Tennessee, the gentleman from South Carolina, the gentleman from Virginia, and the gentleman from Georgia, who are advocating this extension. Somebody is going to be disappointed. Let us not disappoint anyone, but simply go ahead and provide this service as the Budget has asked us to do, and hold down these appropriations within the limits of the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. All time has expired.

The question first comes on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, let us have the Lankford amendment again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the Lankford amendment.

There was no objection; and the Clerk again reported the Lankford amendment.

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

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 75, noes 70.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia and Mr. BYRNS to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 74, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For miscellaneous equipment and supplies, including the purchase and repair of furniture, package boxes, posts, trucks, baskets, satchels, straps, letter-box paint, baling machines, perforating machines, duplicating machines, printing presses, directories, cleaning supplies, and the manufacture, repair, and exchange of equipment, the erection and painting of letter-box equipment, and for the purchase and repair of presses and dies for use in the manufacture of letter boxes; for postmarking, rating, money-order stamps, and electrotype plates and repairs to same; metal, rubber, and combination type, dates and figures, type holders, ink pads for canceling and stamping purposes, and for the purchase, exchange, and repair of typewriting machines, envelope-opening machines, and computing machines, copying presses, numbering machines, time recorders, letter balances, scales (exclusive of dormant or built-in platform scales in Federal buildings), test weights, and miscellaneous articles purchased and furnished directly to the Postal Service, including complete equipment and furniture for post offices in leased quarters; for miscellaneous expenses in the preparation and publication of post-route maps and rural-delivery maps or blue prints, including tracing for photolithographic reproduction; for other expenditures necessary and incidental to post offices of the first, second, and third classes, and offices of the fourth class having or to have rural-delivery service, and for letter boxes, \$1,700,000; and the Postmaster General may authorize the sale to the public of post-route maps and rural-delivery maps or blue prints at the cost of printing and 10 per cent thereof added; of this amount \$1,500 may be expended in the purchase of atlases and geographical and technical works: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of furniture and complete equipment for third-

class post offices except miscellaneous equipment of the general character furnished such offices during the fiscal year 1931.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order upon the paragraph to inquire of the chairman of the committee as to the need for the last proviso whereby you restrict the use of furniture to third-class post offices in some respects.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation for last year was \$300,000 for the purchase of furniture in third-class offices. It was stated in the hearings that with that \$300,000 they had supplied 200 offices. The plan was to continue to supply third-class offices upon the theory that it would cost less money in the long run, and that they would complete the job in the next 20 years. There are some 9,000 third-class offices. Gentlemen can see just how long it would take to supply them at the rate of 200 a year, and it would cost eventually \$15,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was it the purpose of the department to supplant the old equipment and furniture in third-class offices and replace them with Government-owned equipment?

Mr. BYRNS. Eventually, yes. The postmasters, as the gentleman knows, supply the furniture now, but it was the purpose of the Government to supply it in the manner and at the rate that I have indicated.

Mr. STAFFORD. And it is the thought of the committee to abandon the policy that was initiated last year?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes; and the proviso was put in for that purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not intended to destroy the right of third-class postmasters to furnish their own equipment if they see fit.

Mr. BYRNS. Not at all.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. In the last Congress the Post Office Committee had a proposal to allow these third-class postmasters to have 50 per cent of the actual amount collected for box rent through their own equipment. The department assured us that we should not pass such a bill, because they would have \$300,000 on the yearly appropriation bills to put Government-owned equipment in these third-class offices. Now, this appropriation is not carried.

Mr. BYRNS. Of course, the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress were not a party to any agreement that might have been made by the Post Office Department, but here we had a situation of \$300,000 being appropriated. It had supplied only 200 third-class offices. That leaves 8,800 not yet supplied. It was in effect an increase of salary for 200, but what about the 8,800 third-class postmasters that would not get it, and some who would not get it for 20 years, and before the end of the 20 years Congress would find itself appropriating money to supply new furniture for the offices being supplied now. I think it was wholly impracticable, if such an agreement was made.

Mr. STAFFORD. What was the motive that prompted the committee to launch into this policy when a bare statement of it shows it to be of an extravagant character?

Mr. BYRNS. I am speaking for the committee as constituted at the present time.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the gentleman was on the Committee on Appropriations last year. Was it with the idea of giving more employment at the expense of the Government for the benefit of the third-class postmasters?

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] has given the only reason that could have prompted it.

Mr. STAFFORD. What could have been the reason except that of taking Government money and putting it in the hands of third-class postmasters for the purchase of furniture? I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

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

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. FOSS. Does this prevent the department from supplying furniture in new buildings for third-class offices?

Mr. BYRNS. This has no relation to the new buildings.

Mr. FOSS. Under the third-class offices—I mean, of course, leased buildings.

Mr. BYRNS. This is in rented buildings. Under the present arrangement the third-class postmasters are under the necessity of supplying most of the furniture.

Mr. FOSS. A great many of our third-class offices are housed in very poor quarters, and they have very poor fixtures, and when we move into a new building, under lease, it has been the policy of the department to furnish new furniture for those offices. Will this prevent the department from continuing to do this?

Mr. BYRNS. Not with reference to the third-class post offices. It has never been the policy, except for the last year, and they furnished 200 last year, but I submit if we have 9,000 offices and furnish 200 per year, it will be a long time before some of them will get their new furniture. If we are going to do it for any, we ought to do it for all, and it would require ten or fifteen million dollars to do it.

Mr. FOSS. Of course, the gentleman knows that the third-class postmaster, receiving a salary of \$1,400, can not afford to pay a thousand or twelve hundred dollars for new fixtures.

Mr. BYRNS. That may be true.

Mr. FOSS. And then the Government takes the box rents.

Mr. BYRNS. But if he is not getting enough money, I would rather vote him a direct salary rather than to give him these perquisites in the way of furniture. In other words, it would be better to let the country know what he is getting in the way of salary rather than to be supplementing his salary by these perquisites.

Mr. FOSS. I agree with the gentleman absolutely. We should take over all of the third-class equipment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, one of the few remaining subjects before this House in which the country is interested is the question of taxes. Emergency reconstruction legislation has been completed. Further tariff legislation has been definitely shelved. Most of the supply bills are now under way. A vote on prohibition is assured and will be taken within the next week or two. Only the question of taxation remains. But the question of taxes presents an unusually difficult problem this year. We are faced by the greatest peace-time deficit in the history of the Nation. The Treasury reports a deficit of approximately \$2,000,000,000. One billion two hundred and forty million dollars additional revenue must be raised to balance the Budget.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. With pleasure.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I did not understand whether the gentleman said the tariff question had been settled.

Mr. CANNON. Has been definitely shelved for this session.

Mr. Chairman, we must raise an unprecedented sum in taxes for the coming fiscal year. And the question is who is going to pay it. Is it to be paid by the wealth of the country—by those who have it to pay? Or is it to be saddled on the masses of the people—those who even now are reducing their standard of living to the irreducible minimum? Is it to be paid from the impounded surplus of those who are hoarding vast resources? Or is it to be paid from the daily pittance of the toiler?

In other words, does the House propose to raise this vast sum from income taxes, surtaxes, estate taxes, excess-profit taxes, corporation taxes—taxes which have heretofore been utilized for that purpose—or do we propose to change our policy of taxation and raise it by a sales tax—a tax levied

on the citizen regardless of his income or his ability to pay? That is the question in which the country is interested this morning.

Mr. GARBER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. GARBER. Why not raise some of it by a tax on the importation of crude oil and refined products?

Mr. CANNON. That is a very interesting query.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. And why not raise about five hundred million by a tax on good, wholesome beer?

Mr. CANNON. And that likewise is a very interesting query.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. There is no such animal.

Mr. CANNON. The House has not suffered from lack of advice as to the method by which this money should be raised. Metropolitan newspapers, owned and controlled by entrenched wealth, have urged a sales tax ever since the close of the war. Secretaries of the Treasury possessed of vast fortunes have recommended a sales tax in season and out of season. Corporations which profiteered unmercifully and international bankers who helped bring on the present depression by forcing worthless foreign bonds on our investors are clamoring for a sales tax. The corridors of the Capitol are crowded with lobbyists representing big business importuning Members and committees in behalf of a sales tax.

Why all this clamor for a sales tax? The explanation is very simple. They want to lift the burden of government from the great incomes to the wage earner, the farmer, the small tradesman, the masses of the people. They want to shift the weight of taxation from the rich to the poor. And they know they can do it with a sales tax.

What is a sales tax? A sales tax is the most iniquitous, most reprehensible, most unconscionable device for plundering the people ever devised since the days of Captain Kidd. [Applause.] It is a nuisance tax in the worst form. It is a daily toll exacted from the wages of labor, the unrequited sweat of the farmer, and the meager fee of the tradesman. It taxes every purchase. It adds to the cost of every necessity from a tractor to a match. It increases the price of the swaddling clothes of the infant, the wedding gown of the bride, the weeds of the widow, and the simple habiliments of the aged. It taxes the primer in the school, the almanac in the farm kitchen, the magazine in the barber shop, and the Bible in the church. It takes shoes from children's feet; it drives the rain through the shattered roof of the tenement; it snatches healing medicaments from the fevered brow of pain; and it denies the bier of the veteran the tribute of the flag beneath which he served. From poverty and penury and toil it takes its inevitable and relentless toll in order that wealth and power and profiteers may go untaxed. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON. 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. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the sales tax—sometimes designated as a manufacturer's tax—is in direct violation of the fundamental law of taxation as laid down by every economist since Adam Smith. Adam Smith, in his *Wealth of Nations*, wrote it in this form:

The subjects of every State ought to contribute to the support of the Government in proportion to the revenue which they, respectively, enjoy under its protection.

And that law is cited and reaffirmed by every authority on taxation from John Stuart Mill to the present day. It is the basic principle of taxation—that every man should be taxed in proportion to his ability to pay and not in proportion to what he consumes. Under the sales tax the rich man pays no higher tax than the poor man.

When Mr. Mellon, with an income of thousands of dollars a day, buys a lead pencil or a bottle of quinine or a package of cigarettes he pays no more tax on them than the work-

ingman, whose income is a wage of \$1 a day. The housewife buying a paper of pins or a cake of soap or a can of baking powder pays the same tax on them for the support of the Government whether she lives in a hovel or a mansion. They are not paying in proportion to their ability to pay. They are not paying in proportion to the service rendered them by the Government.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Ability, coupled with the benefit derived from government.

Mr. CANNON. Ability, coupled with the benefit derived from government. Yes.

Let us illustrate the operation of the sales tax. One of your neighbors has a number of children. The wealthiest man in your neighborhood has none. When school opens your neighbor must pay taxes on school books for every child. The man of wealth pays none. Your neighbor must pay taxes on shoes and clothing for his children and himself. The rich man pays only on his own. No wonder the rich man wants a sales tax. No wonder Wall Street wants a sales tax. It transfers taxes to the consumer. It saves them from an income tax.

Let us see how a sales tax would work in the abstract. According to official statistics, 65 per cent of the people of the United States receive only $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the total income paid to the people of the United States and 35 per cent of the people of the United States receive $95\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the income of the people of the United States. Under an income tax the 35 per cent would pay taxes on $95\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the income and the 65 per cent would only pay on the $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. But under a sales tax the 65 per cent of the people who receive $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the income pay 65 per cent of the cost of supporting the Government and the 35 per cent of the people who receive $95\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the income pay only 35 per cent of the expense of supporting the Government. Of course, the 35 per cent are very much in favor of a sales tax and very much opposed to an income tax.

Let us go further and estimate the amounts which would be paid by the rich and the poor, respectively, under a sales tax. Here it is: For every 1 per cent sales tax or manufacturers' tax levied by the Government, all the people of the United States with incomes of less than \$1,800 a year would pay into the Treasury \$100,000,000 a year. The people of the United States whose incomes amounted to more than \$100,000 a year each, would pay into the Treasury only \$10,000,000 a year. If the sales tax was 2 per cent, the poor would pay into the Treasury \$200,000,000 and the rich would pay \$20,000,000. If the tax was $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, as rumor to-day suggests will be offered in the House, the men receiving less than \$1,800 a year would pay in \$225,000,000 and men receiving from \$100,000 to \$500,000 annual income would pay in only \$22,500,000. The smaller your income the larger the burden the sales tax places on you. The larger your income the smaller proportionately is the amount of your tax. The sales tax saddles the burden of government directly on the people least able to bear it. It places the weight of taxation on those who derive the least benefit and protection from the Government. It is a tax on the poor. It is a tax on the farm. It is a tax on labor. It is a tax on childhood. It is a tax on civilization. It will reduce the attendance of our schools. It will deny the educational advantages of the motion picture. It will curtail the revenues of the church itself.

But let us take up another objectionable feature of the sales tax—the collection of the tax. It is to be collected from the manufacturer. Of course, the manufacturer will not pay the tax himself. He will pass it on. And he will have three options—

First, he can pass it on to the consumer by simply adding the tax to the selling price.

Second, he can pass it on to the producer of his raw material. The packer can deduct the tax from the price he pays the farmer for livestock. The spinner can pass it on to the grower of cotton. The miller can take it out of the price of grain. The shoemaker can deduct it from the price he pays for hides.

Or, third, he can take it out of the price of labor. He can deduct it from the wages he pays his workmen. As a matter of fact, they will probably take it out of all three. They will increase the price of their product, decrease the price paid for raw material, and lower wages.

No one will suffer more from the adoption of the sales tax than labor. It will increase the cost of the necessities of life; it will curtail employment; and it will reduce the wage scale. But his employer is a warm advocate of the sales tax. It gives him a profit from three sources. It saves him from paying a surtax on his income. He escapes further corporation taxes. And he pays no higher tax on what he consumes himself than his poorest paid employee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a sales tax is particularly inopportune at this time. We are in the trough of the greatest business depression in the economic history of the world. We are just beginning to beat back against the tide. Any influence which serves to check recovery is a national menace, and that is precisely what the sales tax does. It slows up business. It retards industry. It defers the return of the country to normal conditions. It acts as a brake on returning prosperity.

A sales tax becomes immediately a cost of production. The tax has to be added to the cost. It increases the price of the commodity. And it is another immutable principle of economic law that when you increase price you decrease demand. It is axiomatic that the higher the price of a commodity the less people buy. And the less they buy the less the factory produces. And the less the factory produces the less the demand for raw material and labor.

When you place a tax on a commodity you not only slow down production at the factory but you take away the farmer's market and you deprive more men of a job and turn more unemployed out to walk the streets. The whole current of commerce is checked, the reconstruction measures passed by Congress are neutralized, and the country sinks hopelessly back into the jaws of the depression.

It was just such a system of taxation that fomented the French Revolution. The aristocracy was subject only to consumption duties. Wealth went untaxed. The nobles with vast landed estates paid no higher tax for the support of the Government on what they consumed than did the poorest subjects of the King. Louis dismissed every minister who sought to equalize the burden and tax the nobles in proportion to their ability to pay. And the revolution followed.

I have no doubt that many Members were reminded of that when they read in this morning's papers the account of the uprising of the people in the capital of the State of Kentucky against an administration which sought to impose upon the people of the Commonwealth a sales tax similar to that proposed for the consideration of this Congress. We will never have a revolution in America. We passed that stage of political development long ago. But the people of the various constituencies represented in this House will register their disapproval in a manner no less effective if it is ever attempted. Such a tax is indefensible, inequitable, uneconomic, undemocratic, unwise, unfair, and un-American. And there are Members on both sides of the aisle who will never support any measure which carries it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not know whether this is the beginning of a discussion on matters foreign to the bill or not, but we want to get through with the consideration of this bill. We have another appropriation bill that will be taken up just as soon as this one is disposed of, and these gentlemen can all get ample time in general debate. There are gentlemen here who are waiting the disposition of this bill. I am not going

to object to the request of the gentleman from Kansas, but I shall object to other speeches being made unless they are pertinent to the pending bill. I feel we have got to get through with the consideration of this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in defense of the Democratic Ways and Means Committee that, I understand, is about to bring in a bill providing for a manufacturers' tax. I came to Congress about 13 years ago, at which time we were burdened with all kinds of general sales taxes, which were termed "nuisance taxes." I voted to repeal them, and commencing with the tax on soda water and going down the line all nuisance taxes were at last repealed.

We then commenced to raise the exemption on the people of the country until we only required heads of families with incomes above \$3,500 per year to pay taxes on their incomes. We thus exempted 95 per cent of the people from the payment of income taxes. We now have found that incomes have fallen off so that we are not collecting enough money to run the Government. Where are we going to get this money?

I am in favor of a manufacturers' tax, and I want to tell you why. I went to Canada about eight years ago to study their tax system. They had just repealed their nuisance or general sales taxes and had placed on their statute books instead a manufacturers' tax. I first went to the tax commission to ask them how it worked, and they said, "Fine; we are collecting this tax throughout the Dominion of Canada with 30 men." I then went to the manufacturers and said, "How do you like it?" They said, "Fine; we pass it on," just as my friend from Missouri has said. I then went to the jobbers and I asked how they liked it, and they said, "We like it"; I asked why, and they replied, "Because we are not eternally troubled with a lot of government tax collectors coming in here and quarreling with us and going over our books." I said, "Do you pass it all on?" and they said, "We can not," and they took down their invoices and showed me where there was added, when they paid their wholesale bills, one cent and a half tax. When I asked, "How do you pay it?" and they said, "We charge it up just like we do our rent, our salaries, and insurance, as overhead expense." I asked, "Do you not add a little more profit to your goods?" and they replied, "Why, of course, if we can, but can not always do so. We can not add so small a tax on notions or on overalls or shoes and hundreds of such goods that sell for but a few dollars. Competition prevents our doing so. We have to absorb much of such a tax, but," they said, "we would prefer doing so to being annoyed and bothered with tax collectors, making reports, and so forth."

Then I went down and asked the man on the street, "How do you like this tax?" and he said, "What tax?" I said "The manufacturers' tax"; and he said, "Oh, we have no such tax; we repealed our sale taxes"; but I said, "You have a manufacturers' tax"; and he said, "Oh, no; we do not."

I went with a Member of this House into a store to buy a suit of clothes and we said to the salesman, "How do you like the manufacturers' tax?" and he said, "We have no such tax"; and we had to go to the manager of the store before we found anyone who knew that they had any such tax; and he said, "Yes; we do have a tax, but it is not the old general sales tax; it is a manufacturers' tax. We like it."

Now, my friends, the Democratic Ways and Means Committee, I understand, is proposing a 2-cent manufacturers' tax. How is this going to hurt the man in the street? The things that he buys will either have no tax placed on them; or, if they do, it will be so small that he will neither feel nor know it. It will be only those who buy in large quantities who will know anything about this tax.

If they put a 2-cent tax upon manufactured goods, it will raise a large amount of revenue and the men who spend the most money will pay the most tax.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFER. How would this manufacturers' sales tax affect your independent oil producers whom the gentleman has been talking about for some months? Does the gentleman think it will help them get out of their present deplorable situation?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Yes. If you put a tax on the importation of foreign oil, they will be greatly helped.

Mr. SCHAFFER. By levying a 2 per cent tax on their refined oil at the refinery?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Yes; if you will put a tax on the importation of foreign oil.

Mr. SCHAFFER. I asked about domestic oil, which is refined in domestic refineries.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I refuse to yield any further. I am making this speech. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SCHAFFER. The gentleman can not answer that, can he?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Yes. If you will put a tax on gasoline and keep foreign gasoline from being imported into this country, the men in this country who are producing American gasoline will be willing to pay a manufacturers' tax.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Are they willing to pay it now?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Sure, they will if you shut out the importation of oil.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Oh, if and but.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For vehicle allowance, the hiring of drivers, the rental of vehicles, and the purchase and exchange and maintenance, including stable and garage facilities, of wagons or automobiles for, and the operation of, screen-wagon and city delivery and collection service, \$16,500,000: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, in his disbursement of this appropriation, apply a part thereof to the leasing of quarters for the housing of Government-owned automobiles at a reasonable annual rental for a term not exceeding 10 years: *Provided further*, That this appropriation is available for the maintenance of the Government-owned post-office garage at Washington, D. C., including such changes and additions to the mechanical equipment as, in the opinion of the Postmaster General, may be necessary: *Provided further*, That the Postmaster General, during the fiscal year 1933, may purchase and maintain from the appropriation "Vehicle service" such tractors and trailer trucks as may be required in the operation of the screen-wagon and city delivery and collection service: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for maintenance or repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for use in connection with the administrative work of the Post Office Department in the District of Columbia.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I want to ask the chairman whether the hearings disclose any testimony as to what is proposed by the department for operating the screen-wagon service by means of tractors and trailing trucks?

Mr. BYRNS. They only use them in certain places.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am seeking information—the use of tractors and trailing trucks seems to be an innovation in the postal operations.

Mr. BYRNS. I do not know that the hearings go into the particulars, but they only use them around docks, and probably in some of the larger post offices. The language has been carried in the bill for about three years.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not purposed to have them operate generally through city streets?

Mr. BYRNS. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw my reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. No appropriation under the Treasury or Post Office Departments available during the fiscal year 1932 and/or 1933 shall be used after the date of the approval of this act (1) to increase the compensation of any position within the grade to which such position has been allocated under the classification act of 1923, as amended, (2) to increase the compensation of any position in the

field service the pay of which is adjustable to correspond so far as may be practicable to the rates established by such act as amended for the departmental service in the District of Columbia, (3) to increase the compensation of any position under such act through reallocation, (4) to increase the compensation of any person in any grade under such act through advancement to another position in the same grade or to a position in a higher grade at a rate in excess of the minimum rate of such higher grade unless such minimum rate would require an actual reduction in compensation, or (5) to increase the compensation of any other position in the Federal Government under the Treasury or the Post Office Departments other than commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and commissioned officers, commissioned warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Coast Guard: *Provided*, That no additional credits for service shall be allowed to any commissioned officer in the Public Health Service or to any commissioned officer, commissioned warrant officer, or civilian instructor in the Coast Guard for purposes of base or period pay, or for longevity pay before July 1, 1933; any increase of base or period pay for length of service, or longevity pay, which would have been authorized under existing law before that date, shall become effective July 1, 1933, and not earlier, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act: *Provided further*, That so much of the act of May 29, 1928, as amended by the act of December 12, 1930 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 19, sec. 6a), as provides automatic increases in salary to clerks in the field service of the Customs Service, and so much of the acts of May 14, 1930 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 3, sec. 61), and July 1, 1930 (46 Stat. 839), as provide automatic increases in salary to privates of the White House police force, and so much of existing laws as provide automatic promotions for length of service to employees of the Postal Service, shall not be operative during the period between the date of the approval of this act and July 1, 1933: *Provided, however*, That this section shall not apply to postmasters or postal employees whose compensation is fixed, or from time to time adjusted, upon the basis of the postal receipts or other variable factor of business of their respective offices or to carriers in the rural mail delivery service whose compensation is fixed upon the basis of the length of their respective routes: *Provided further*, That from the date of this act to and including June 30, 1933, payment for personal services made in accordance herewith shall constitute payment in full for such services. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by the operation of this section shall not be used for any other purposes, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury, and a report of the amounts so impounded for the period between the date of the approval of this act and October 31, 1932, shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next regular session.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, line 18, strike out the words "commissioned warrant" and insert "chief warrant and warrant."

Mr. BYRNS. That is merely to clarify the language.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That will not preclude my offering a motion to strike out the section.

Mr. BYRNS. No; that is a perfecting amendment.

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the entire section.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I have a perfecting amendment which takes preference.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized to offer an amendment.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, line 9, strike out the words "Act through reallocation."

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I will just take a minute in explanation of the amendment. Among the restrictions in the fixing of salaries of the civil-service employees governed by this appropriation bill is included this class: It prohibits any use of the appropriation by increasing the compensation of any person in any grade under such act through reallocation, but the only reason for reallocating an employee is when in the original allocation it was found to be a mistake or error.

Now, a person who has a certain set of duties to perform is classified in the first instance by the head of the department in the appropriate service and grade in that service, and he is limited to that range of salary. If it is alleged that an error has been made and he has been allocated to the wrong grade, the allocation is reviewed by the Personnel Classification Board. If an error has been made it is cor-

rected. A person who is getting a salary through error and mistake, and it is attempted to do justice to him by correction of that error, ought not to be penalized; and the matter is of such small moment it would not make any appreciable difference in the pay roll. I think in the interest of simple justice this provision ought to be eliminated.

Mr. GARBER. And the correction referred to is the reallocation referred to in the bill.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, the departments have had since 1923 to take care of these errors if they have been made, and to which my friend from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] refers. It seems to me that is a long enough time to make adjustments. The gentleman says it amounts to very little. It cost about \$1,000,000 last year. The facts are that when employees in the department here in Washington fail to get an increase, they bring all the influence they can upon the Personnel Classification Board to get a reallocation in order to get an increase. This simply means that for the year 1933 we are going to stop that practice and not increase the salary of anyone. This is identically the same provision that has been carried in four appropriation bills that have already passed this House, and certainly we do not want to discriminate in favor of one class of employees and against another. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

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

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Of course, what the gentleman says in respect to the opportunity since 1923 to correct errors and mistakes applies to those employees who were in the service in 1923, but from 1923 to 1932 many each year have entered the service under new appointments, and errors and mistakes in their initial allocation may have occurred.

Mr. BYRNS. In what I said I was not referring to any particular employee. I was talking about the position itself. They have had nine years in which to make these adjustments, not with reference to any particular individual, but with reference to these various positions. It seems to me under those circumstances that this language ought to be carried in this bill. If you do not carry it here, you are not doing what you did in the other appropriation bills, and this is in line with what you have done as to all of the other employees of the Government without the slightest protest. Why make an exception? Let us be fair with all.

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BEEDY: Page 66, line 12, after the word "force," strike out the balance of the line and also lines 13, 14, 15, and all of 16 preceding the word "provided."

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, this is the provision which has gone into all of these appropriation bills, and which, though consistent with the policy adopted by the committee, was not even suggested by the Bureau of the Budget. The gentleman from Tennessee, as he addressed the committee on the amendment just offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, said that the committee did not want to put itself in the position of discriminating against one class of employees and in favoring another.

Mr. BYRNS. Is not that what the gentleman is just now trying to do?

Mr. BEEDY. I do not think so. If he is, he does not know it.

Mr. BYRNS. We acted similarly in the case of employees in the State Department, so far as the Foreign Service is concerned. It has automatic promotions under the law. We acted in accordance with this in reference to the Coast and Geodetic Survey and also with reference to the Immi-

gration Service. So my friend, who says he does not want to be inconsistent, and I am very certain he does not, certainly will be by this amendment, for he will discriminate in favor of the postal employees against these other classes of employees.

Mr. BEEDY. Did not the Senate throw these other provisions out when it came to consider them?

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman will remember that it was said on the floor of the Senate that those amendments were stricken out without prejudice. That was said by the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee. If the gentleman's amendment be adopted, then the gentleman is in the attitude of letting this go over there, and then if the other bills should carry this provision it would be impossible for the conferees to do in this bill what they do in the others.

Mr. BEEDY. I do not see how the Senate could have done otherwise than it did. I understand the provision which my amendment strikes out applies to the employees in the Postal Service who are getting between \$1,700 and \$2,000 a year. As I understand it, it does not affect anybody else. I am glad the gentleman exempted a class of postal employees that ought not to be affected by this, namely, rural carriers and others.

It may not be pleasing to the State Department, but I do not look on the employees in the State Department as being entitled to their automatic increases in salary quite as I do in the case of employees in the Postal Department whom this cut affects, namely, the men who carry the mail through the storms as well as in fair weather, and who stand on the substitute list for years realizing little or nothing in wages, but looking forward to the day when they may receive a permanent appointment and their automatic increases, which in part make up for their meager earnings as substitutes. State Department employees do not have to serve on any substitute list. This provision, expressing the policy of the committee, may be good economy, but I submit to the chairman that in this class of employees, when you take into consideration the fact that men give the best part of their lives getting in line for this service, waiting for years for the time when they will receive their automatic increases of \$100 or so, only to find themselves disappointed, I say very frankly that it is a question in my mind whether the depletion of morale and incident inefficiency that follows from discouragement does not more than offset all the money that is saved.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. I yield.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I agree with the gentleman's idea, but the gentleman's amendment goes further than he intended, I believe.

Mr. BEEDY. Well, the amendment may not be accepted, but at least I have gained the opportunity to get my views before the committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. But the amendment should end with the word "service," instead of going on to line 15.

Mr. BEEDY. Now, may I ask the gentleman from Tennessee how much this provision in the bill saves?

Mr. BYRNS. This provision alone will save \$1,250,000 in the year 1933, and I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that it is only a temporary expedient. It is only limited to 1933. I do not believe there is a postal employee in the United States Government who would not be willing to forego any increase in salary in these times, when we read in the papers that the bishops and others in the Episcopal Church have agreed to voluntary cuts, and when we read that the Presbyterian missions have reduced their salaries for some time. I do not think there is an employee of the Postal Service who would not be willing to forego the \$100 increase in salary for the year 1933 in the interest of the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] offers a substitute amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. MEAD for the amendment offered by Mr. BEEDY: Page 66, line 12, after the word "force" strike out the comma and the rest of the language thereafter down to and including the comma after the word "service" in line 14.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered has in mind safeguarding automatic increases provided by law, as it applies to the laborers in the Postal Service whose salaries range from \$1,500 to \$1,600. It also applies to the carriers in the village delivery service, whose salaries range from \$1,150 to \$1,250 per year. And it also applies to clerks and carriers in post offices of the first and second class—those men who begin with an initial salary of \$1,700 and receive automatic promotions up to \$2,100.

In my judgment, we should adopt this amendment, for these employees are the poorest paid in the Postal Service. They command your sympathy, for their meager incomes hardly enable them to live as employees of this great Government should live. These men are the underpaid employees of the Post Office Department. They have been until recently reporting for years as substitutes in the Postal Service, and during that period of time, ranging from 4 to 8 and 9 years, received compensation only for the actual time they were employed, with no allowance or credit for reporting.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARE. Does this apply only to the substitutes?

Mr. MEAD. This applies to those men who in the last three or four years were substitutes and have recently received regular appointments.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They are the lowest-paid men in the Postal Service that the gentleman is trying to help, are they not?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; the gentleman is correct. They are the lowest-paid employees in the Postal Service, and I believe we are deviating from a proper program of economy when we set out to exempt higher-salaried employees in this and other branches of the Government, and apply with undue severity our economy program on these, the lowest-paid men in the service. These men do the manual labor, they have the hardest jobs and do the worst kind of work under most unfavorable conditions, until such time as seniority will permit them to secure a better assignment.

Mr. BEEDY. The gentleman's amendment covers precisely the same class of employees which my amendment covered, except that it does not make the error my amendment did, of including language that was not necessary. Is that not the fact?

Mr. MEAD. Yes. It covers the same class of employees.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HARE. Does this apply to substitutes also, who have not obtained regular employment?

Mr. MEAD. No. It will not cover them until such time as they secure a regular assignment. If, however, within the next 16 months they receive a regular assignment, it will then protect and cover them.

Mr. TIERNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TIERNEY. Do I understand there is any change in the existing situation, that the highest-paid man in the service, who has been working for 10 years, a carrier or clerk, will be raised anyway under the present amendment?

Mr. MEAD. No. They will not be raised. This will not apply to them at all. This only applies to the newer employees of the department, the apprentices of the department.

Mr. TIERNEY. So if we leave it just as it is, there is no raise coming to the man who has been in the service for 10 years in any event?

Mr. MEAD. No. None whatever. This only covers a small percentage of the men in the service.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. It covers those men who, when they were appointed, received the appointment with the understanding that they would be given the automatic increases as provided by existing law until they reached the maximum salary paid such employees of the Postal Service.

Mr. MEAD. The gentleman is correct. Mr. Chairman, I think economy is essential and we ought to be very careful in the expenditure of public money, still I believe that when we try to reduce the salaries of our underpaid workers, those whose salaries will not permit them to live according to American standards, we are not economizing; we are retarding prosperity by further reducing the consuming power of our people. We are bringing about just the opposite effect we aim to bring about when by appropriating money for public work we seek to increase the buying power of our people and then we reduce the wages of those who barely receive a subsistence wage.

Until the American worker has the power to buy the products of the American farms and markets we will have no prosperity in these United States. Wages is but the power to buy. Let us not reduce this power in such meritorious cases as is the case we are considering. I hope the amendment prevails.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Post Office Committee [Mr. MEAD] has well shown what, to my mind, is the distinct difference between the postal employees covered in his amendment and the employees covered in other appropriation bills with which we have already dealt. There is no inconsistency in adopting this amendment as far as the other department bills are concerned, and for this reason the Post Office Department has an entirely different system of employment than any other department. It is built on substitutes, or apprentices, who are the foundation element in the Postal Service. There are about 20,000 men in the substitute service getting a basic pay of 65 cents an hour for whatever work they actually perform. That pay in many cases, of course, is tragically low, when considered as yearly compensation.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HARE. But I understood from the chairman of the committee a few moments ago that this does not apply to substitutes. I am anxious to know whether it does apply to them.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I am going to show how it directly applies. Ordinarily a substitute post-office clerk or letter carrier would make, I should say, \$80 a month, on the basis of 65 cents an hour; but the reduction in the volume of mail has been such that now many of them are getting only a few dollars, and I think the average in the entire substitute service is around \$35 a month at the present time. These men for years have been trying their best to get along on any kind of an emergency basis so that they might get regular employment and get into this automatic promotion line of \$100 a year until they have reached the maximum of \$2,100 a year.

The committee has been considerate in putting in a helping clause for substitutes on the next page of this bill. It provides that where there is eight hours of substitute service necessary daily the substitute must be appointed a regular employee. I hope that will be clarified so it will be made sure that when there is use for 44 hours' substitute service each week a substitute employee will get a regular appointment.

Mr. BYRNS. I have no objection to any amendment which will make that certain.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That is a step in advance for which the committee deserves a great deal of credit,

but it does not affect this provision for these automatic grades. Twelve thousand substitutes have been appointed to regular positions and they are now getting these lower-grade salaries of \$1,700, \$1,800, and \$1,900. We have enacted a law providing that they shall only get certain increases and then they are through ordinarily for all time to come. That has meant that when a man goes into this service he knows just what he will get in the future.

Mr. McLEOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. McLEOD. Is it not a fact that all of these employees are merely postal carriers and not clerks?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No; they are clerks and carriers and also railway postal clerks.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not true that these men who render substitute service give a great deal of time to the study of postal matters during the time they are not at work?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is correct. They must report every day, and if they do not get anything to do they study distribution schemes. Our committee had a delegation of substitutes appear before it the other day, and we are trying to do something for them, but we find it difficult to work out any definite schedules of pay.

Mr. WHITE. The men who would be affected by this law are men who have just gotten out of this service.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes; and they have endured five or six years of very low pay. I hope the members of the committee will realize the difference between this service and Government service where a man goes in at the regular rate of pay the first day he goes on the job. There is a difference between an employee with that fixed compensation and one who waits five or six years before he even receives the pay of the lowest grade. Surely he should not be deprived of the small increase under the automatic promotions. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what my friends have against some of these other services. This provision applies to the Customs Service, and the men engaged in that service are certainly entitled to the same consideration as postal clerks.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. But the Customs Service does not have a substitute service for five years.

Mr. BYRNS. This does not have the slightest reference to the substitute service. Gentlemen, do not be misled by that sort of an argument. This would not apply to the substitute service, for the substitutes are not on the permanent roll. The gentleman just said that the average salary of a substitute is about \$35 or \$40 a month. He says when they are appointed to a \$1,700 job it would apply after they had served a year; but do you not believe that a substitute who has served, as he says, four and five years, and in my home city for even longer, at \$35 and \$40 a month, on the average, would be entirely willing to wait for one year, in 1933 for an increase after an appointment to a position at \$1,700 a year?

This is the plain proposition before you. Here is a provision which applies to the Customs Service and it applies to the White House police, and yet the gentleman offers an amendment here and undertakes to correct the amendment of the gentleman from Maine by excepting the Postal Service, but he does not offer to make the same exception for these other employees. The law applies to the Customs Service and the White House police, just as it does to post-office employees. Why make favorites of the postal employee in preference to the others? Let us be fair, let us be square about this. You know what is the matter and I know what is the matter. It is because of the influence back home that these gentlemen are undertaking to make an exception of the Postal Service. What position are you going to be in when you go back home and face your constituents with the fact that you stood firm and fast upon no increases for 1933 with reference to every employee of this Government who is entitled to his automatic increase under the

law, but when it came to the Postal Service you yielded and made an exception of him. I say, gentlemen, let us be fair.

You voted this provision in in the State Department bill and neither the gentleman from Maine nor the gentleman from New York nor the gentleman from Pennsylvania rose to say anything about the automatic increases there. You voted this provision in in the Commerce Department bill and not one of these gentlemen rose to protest because we were striking out the automatic increases. That same provision applies to the immigration inspector in the Labor Department, and still not one of these gentlemen rose to his feet and said it was unfair not to give them these automatic increases.

Mr. BEEDY. Will the gentleman yield, since the gentleman makes specific reference to me?

Mr. BYRNS. Not now; I will yield in a minute.

But when we come to the postal clerks back home you are going to say to the country as representatives of the taxpayer, as men who are here to protect the Treasury, as men who next week are going to vote a tax upon practically everything that they and the entire people have to buy and nearly everything that they wear and nearly everything that they eat, that we made an exception of this class of employees and increased their salaries and paid no attention to the others.

Gentlemen, we have taken our stand, and the House has been commended all over this country for its efforts to effect economy. Why, I have just read a magnificent editorial in the New York Times which was published this morning which gave fulsome praise to the entire House for the economies that they had put into effect. Now, are we coming to the point, because we have postal clerks, if you please, back home and because they vote, that we are going to put ourselves in the position before the country of breaking our splendid record?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three more minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman ought to have 5 minutes, and I think if he speaks 10 minutes we will pass the amendment.

Mr. BYRNS. Well, I never expect to influence the gentleman from Wisconsin by any appeal to his reason. [Laughter.]

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS. These Customs Service people and the immigration inspectors do not vote. The immigration inspectors are serving up on the border, and they do not vote because they are away on their duties, and nobody raised his voice, nobody was heard to say a word as to their automatic increases when we passed the bill the other day.

Now, why the distinction? It does not take a Solomon to tell you why this effort is being made to cut out this provision.

I am a friend of the Postal Service. You can go down to my home and every postal employee will tell you that I am his friend.

I want to tell you that the postal employees in my section of the country and from the great district from which I come are as anxious to conserve public money as any other class of citizens. They do not want to be made an exception. They are willing to give up this automatic increase of \$100 for one year—no more—when farmers and when business men and when other classes of citizens are losing money in their business. They will get the same salary in 1933 that they got in 1932. Why should we make an exception of this class of employees and increase their salaries when we have taken a positive stand with reference to these other bills that we are not going to increase anybody's salary in the year 1933? Gentlemen, I do not believe you are going to do it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee, I am sure, wants to be fair with the Members of the House who have decided views on this question.

Mr. BYRNS. May I say that so far as I know the gentleman from New York is the only Member of the House who has raised his voice against this provision.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Oh, no. These gentlemen around me have been here voting with me. The gentleman from Tennessee knows that we had this provision in the Department of Agriculture bill, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK]; also other gentlemen, including Messrs. MEAD, OLIVER, SWING, BOYLAN, HOGG, McCORMACK—why, I can mention several scores of Members who voted for my amendment when I offered it on the Interior, Agriculture, State, and other department appropriation bills. There are a number of gentlemen on both sides of the aisle who voted with me when I made the motion to strike out the provision from the agricultural bill, and we were sustained in our judgment by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BYRNS. There is no such provision as this in the agricultural bill, because there are no automatic increases.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. But I am going to move to strike out the entire section. Why, the gentleman is in error. Subsections 1, 2, 3, and 4 are exactly as they were in the agricultural appropriation bill or in the Interior Department bill. The Senate committee has stricken it out. The gentleman says the Senate struck it out without prejudice. That is all any committee can do. Then the Interior Department appropriation bill came along, and then the State, Labor, and Commerce Departments bill came along, and I have consistently taken the floor and moved to strike this provision from the bill, because it is unfair, unjust, and unnecessary. You ought not to take away the hope of promotion from these employees, because it will imperil the morale.

You have provided for the Coast Guard and the Public Health Service, all contained in this bill. I am going to move to strike out the entire section. I have done it before, and shall continue to do it until the obnoxious provision is out of the bill. I am sure the gentlemen of the House have realized the purpose of the gentleman from Tennessee, and they are ready to vote on it, and the other body is going to sustain us in this, I am sure. I repeat what I have said so many times, that there is a decided organized movement in this country to reduce wages in industry and commerce, and the hope is to have the Government do the same as a justification to the exploiters of the wage earners.

The gentleman from Tennessee stated that would save only \$635,000—that is all—out of a total expenditure of over \$800,000,000. I submit that it is not only unwise because of our commitment, bad as to policy, and detrimental to our wage system, but it is going back on our word to maintain existing law. The automatic promotion in salary is part of our governmental system, and affects several services. If a \$2,100 man dies, the place may not be filled. Others will not be moved up, and there will be general stagnation. Let that feeling of hopelessness prevail and it will demoralize any service. Yes; and if Congress then goes through with such a plan, it will be another drive for another reduction of wages throughout the country. Not only skilled and unskilled labor are being driven down, but the white-collar class is being so cut in wages as to make life almost unbearable. We must discourage this policy and not encourage it.

Mr. MEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. Does not the gentleman see the fairness of my position?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Let me say the gentleman has presented his views in a very forceful way before the Committee on Appropriations and again here to-day, and the gentleman's argument here is unanswerable.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the automatic increase in the Post Office Department is the only one where the men have to work

four or five years before they receive a permanent appointment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course, the Army and Navy and the Public Health Service—the first few years are pretty hard in those services as well.

Mr. TIERNEY. Is not it a fact that by an automatic cut they saved something like half a million dollars last year?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The only way to save the postal employees is to cut out the entire section. Unless we do, it will be an argument to put the postal employees back in the section. Yes; I am for treating all alike—but treating them all fairly and justly and not eliminate automatic or earned promotions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And if sections 4 and 5 are adopted, will it not mean that the men in the substitute list will be making only \$6 or \$7 a week, with no chance to move up?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes. It is starvation wages, especially in our city. I serve notice on the committee now that immediately after this is voted on I shall move to strike out the entire section.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee enjoins it upon us that we be fair. The gentleman from Tennessee has had a great deal more experience in this body than I; but as I have been standing here waiting for order to be restored so that we could go on with the debate, I have been trying to think when I ever saw any Member on this floor try to do anything that I thought was unfair. I do not recall such an instance. We are all fair. We are all trying to do our duty as we see it. There is, to be sure, a question of fairness involved here, but it is from the other angle. There is an element of justice to postal employees with which we should be concerned. The gentleman says why did not the gentleman from Maine and the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise and cry out against the curtailment of these salaries for men in the case of the Coast Guard, the State Department, and the White House policemen? That is a different proposition entirely. I have supported the gentleman from Tennessee, and I shall support anybody in this House on a consistent and justifiable policy of economy, because it is absolutely necessary. There is no argument about that. When the gentleman from Tennessee brought in the bill that cut out the appraisers and the surveyors of ports I supported him, although two of the finest citizens in the State of Maine who are holding these positions at the port of Portland are to be the losers. Those gentlemen were fine enough not to lie down on me and ask me to come in here and argue against the curtailment. While I know these men at Portland, Me., have done work that is really for the best interest of the Customs Service, yet I know that their offices can be dispensed with. So I sat silent and cooperated with the gentleman. It was no pleasant task, but I faced the music.

When you come to discuss men in the State Department and the White House policemen and men in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, let me say that their situation is not comparable to that of postal employees to be affected by this proposed cut.

Let us get under the surface of things. Every member of the Postal Service who has stayed on the substitute list ever since we have had the classification act was content to accept his \$25 or \$35 a month, because he kept looking ahead for the day when, after he was put on the permanent list, he was going to get an automatic increase. That was in his view to be a part of his pay that he looked forward to as compensating him for the hardships and underpay that he put up with while on the substitute list. We had

made, as it were, a special contract with these postal employees, and I submit it is not keeping faith to stand here under the plea of economy and let this provision stay in the bill. If we are going to be fair to these men and meet at least the moral obligation we owe them, here is the place and now is the time to stop this kind of cutting of salaries.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I understand also that this bill carries an increased appropriation of a million dollars and a half for foreign mail service because we have a contract with certain merchant marine operators.

Mr. BEEDY. Oh, in discussing the possibilities of economy I always hesitate to be too meticulous and to avoid that which is personal. I am taunted with not having risen here and lifted my voice against this provision in other bills.

I might call attention to the fact that when this House just a few days ago was appropriating \$120,000,000 for road building—and the States have gone unjustifiably into debt throughout this country to build roads—I noticed the gentleman from Tennessee did not rise to lift his voice in the interest of economy and ask his side of the House not to make that appropriation. We are all fair, but it is a question of judgment in these problems. I will not condemn the gentleman from Tennessee for his stand on the \$120,000,000 which did not have the recommendation of the Budget. He thought he was right. I think I am right now in the stand that I take. I hope the gentleman does not criticize me or impugn my motives.

Mr. BYRNS. Oh, I hope the gentleman will not get down to personalities. I think it is rather unfortunate that the gentleman puts himself in that attitude.

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

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN [Mr. DELANEY]. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEAD. I have submitted an amendment. I understand that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BEEDY] has an amendment and that Mr. LAGUARDIA will later offer another amendment. I am wondering whether we could not get a vote on my amendment now and devote the rest of the time allotted by the committee to a discussion of other amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may withdraw his amendment and offer a perfecting amendment.

Mr. MEAD. And have it voted on right now?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. I withdraw my substitute amendment and offer it as a perfecting amendment and ask for a vote.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of saving time I withdraw my amendment, so that we may have a clean-cut vote on the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment of the gentleman from New York and the amendment of the gentleman from Maine will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment now as a perfecting amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEAD: Page 66, line 12, after the word "force" strike out the comma and the rest of the language thereafter down to and including the comma after the word "service" in line 14.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BYRNS) there were—ayes 73, noes 27.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed Mr. BYRNS and Mr. MEAD as tellers.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported there were—ayes 88, noes 41.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the entire section. Time is limited and I have already made my statement. I shall not consume any time.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LA GUARDIA: Page 64, beginning with line 23, strike out all of section 4 down to and including line 7 on page 67.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate my friend from New York, Mr. MEAD, for the victory that is now his. I think the amendment which the gentleman proposed was one of the most humane that could be proposed in an hour of economy. The ax of economy is a cruel ax. It knows no brother. If we wield that ax without discrimination or without humanity we are going to cause suffering in ranks that we want to aid.

The postal employee who is a substitute is really one of the unemployed. The charity of New York City is extended to him because he can not get enough from the little wage he receives as a substitute to sustain him and his family. Everywhere he seeks additional work, and yet in the morning he must go and report for his substitute's job, to be given an hour or two hours a day, with the mere pittance that he derives from that, or else he is dismissed from the list of substitutes. If we deprive him of an opportunity to get into the service after many years of that mere begging at the door of the Federal Government, hoping for a permanent job, we do what seems to me a cruel thing.

I do not question the fairness of my dear friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. No man in Congress has the affection and admiration of his fellows for his fairness, in a higher degree or in a more deserving degree than has the gentleman from Tennessee, but I say to him that he hardly knows conditions that prevail in the great cities, such as New York City. Those men have not appealed to me to sustain this bill. They have appealed to me to sustain the motion made by the gentleman from New York, Mr. MEAD, and the motion made by the gentleman from New York, Mr. LA GUARDIA. They have asked me to see that the whole scheme of putting the Government into a straitjacket on this proposition be stricken out, because the economies are not sufficient to justify them, in view of the humanities.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] is as fair a man as I know in the Congress, and yet his judgment can be mistaken. I do not believe that the Government should take the lead in salary decreases. The whole world of private industry is awaiting the leadership of the Government in salary deductions in order that they may destroy the American standard of living, and say, "We are but following the footsteps of the National Government."

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I yield.

Mr. BOYLAN. If this bill prevails, with the language that is in it, would it not be a clear violation of contract on the part of the Government?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I think it would be a violation of a moral agreement which led these men into service. Every man seeks a job and every man seeks promotion in due course. He seeks enough wage to give an opportunity to put something aside for his old age. We propose to destroy by the bill a promotion in due course, and once you take that from the scheme of things you take away the power that leads up to and gives life to the whole service, and you put into it a deadening thing which destroys the morale.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I yield.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman be kind enough to call attention to the fact that we have provided for just a fraction of the employees in the amendment just adopted,

and the amendment now before the committee would take care of the entire situation?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Yes. I agree with the gentleman, and I am glad he has taken such splendid leadership in a movement which I so heartily advocate.

Mr. STEWART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Would not the same principle apply to some of these employees in the department?

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Yes; it would. I do not think we save enough to justify us in destroying what we do destroy by the pending bill. You can take the heart out of the service by these petty reductions, which mean so much to them and so little in economy. So when you are balancing your books you have not done a lot for the Government when you have destroyed the spirit and the initiative of the whole service and when you have deprived men of the hope that they had that they would get a little more money if they gave good, loyal, 100 per cent service.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, this Congress has tried about every known method for improving the psychology of the country, recognizing the fact that psychology has more to do with the present depression and its continuance than any other single factor; yet to-day, here and now, in this section it is proposed to do exactly the opposite of what the President of the United States has repeatedly urged private business not to do, and that is to change from the normal course and to adopt an abnormal course in relation to employment, which is bound to react unfavorably, not only upon the employees of the Federal Government but likewise upon the entire public.

I say if it is right for the President to urge private industry not to discharge, not to cut down, and not to lay off its employees, but to go on in a normal way, then it is important that the Government itself, the biggest employer in the whole country, should set an example by treating its employees in a normal manner.

In normal years it is recognized that Government employees are notoriously underpaid, and if during these periods of depression their compensation seems to be slightly better, it is only a temporary advantage and will last for only a short time. However, even in normal times, there is not a single Government employee I know of who has ever been able to save anything out of his salary. Every bit of it goes as fast as he can get it.

We urge the country to go on normally; we want to re-establish normal psychology, normal living, normal buying, and normal investments, yet we ourselves are the first to upset normal conduct.

Life itself must go on, depression or no depression. Year after year children are born into the families of these Federal employees, and where there are already children they keep growing up as the years go by, bringing always an added cost for the purchase of shoes, for the purchase of clothes, for the purchase of food, and for their education. So there is an absolute need for these occasional increases in the pay of the employees.

This rule of automatic increases was adopted after mature thought. It has a sound basis for its existence in the law. It was adopted for the purpose of stimulating the efficiency of the service which the employees render the United States Government. To take it away from them will put discouragement and despair in the hearts of every one of them. It will break the morale of the Government employees. It will destroy the incentive to do their best work. In the long run this policy will not prove an economy. I warn that the few dollars and cents that will be saved by refusing them the normal increases we have promised for long and faithful service will cost the United States Government more than it saves by reason of inefficient and indifferent service that is bound to follow. Let us keep our promise to them and carry out the contract we made to give them from time to time these small increases which they have earned and which they so badly need. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with this amendment. I am for economy, and I am for balancing the Budget, but I do not believe this means economy in the long run. [Applause.]

I agree with the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OLIVER] that if you want to practice real economy and at the same time be honest and consistent, let us begin at the top rather than at the bottom. [Applause.] Let us start in by reducing salaries from the President down, if that be necessary, including our own, rather than picking out the very lowest paid of the Government employees.

I do not subscribe to the statements made by some gentlemen that there was a direct contractual obligation entered into between the Government and these postal and customs employees. I do not say that, but I do say there is a moral obligation; that these men went into the Government service with the law as it then existed and were told, "After you have served a certain time there shall be an automatic increase of \$100 per year." Those men having been told that, I do not think this is the time to destroy individual initiative and ambition by putting them in a position where they will not be as enthusiastic or as efficient as they otherwise might be. Uncle Sam should always deal in good faith with his employees.

My position has been such during the last four or five years that I have had more or less dealings with postal employees and customs officers. In my city of El Paso there are a great many Government employees, many of them being engaged in the Customs Service. Those customs men are serving along the wild Mexican border. I could not count on the fingers of my two hands the men in the Customs Service who have been killed in the last five years. No braver men live, and they take their lives in their hands every day. I happen to know men who have quit better-paid employment, which they feared might be more or less temporary, in order to seek what they regarded as permanent employment, as well as an employment that promised some hope of promotion.

I do not think we should pick out men drawing \$1,700 or \$1,800 as the ones who are to be reduced or have no promotion. I know that many of these men have families of four or five children, and I do not think we should take away from them the \$100 to which they are entitled after struggling for it for five years or more. If we want to reduce let us begin with salaries in the high brackets. We should not single out these men who are entitled to this \$100 merely because we want to economize. They are entitled to it, both in law and equity, and I do not believe this is the proper place to begin the so-called program of economy.

I am not only loyal to the committee, but I stand here for absolute economy, and I believe my record will so show. I think, however, that under all the circumstances, those men in the Postal Service who day in and day out, in the rain or in the sunshine, bring to us our mail, whether it be from business friends or from loved ones, should be given that which has been promised to them. In effect, we entered into a solemn compact with them that after a certain number of years of service they would be increased by this \$100 per year. The Senate struck this provision from the bill, and now we should do the same. Most of these men have families, draw about \$1,700 per year, and are the lowest-paid men in Government service. They worked about two or three years as substitutes at \$50 per month. Let us be just before we are economical; and if we have to do any salary cutting, let us start in with the big boys. [Applause.]

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, before I came to Washington last fall I had an interview with a very wealthy man who said to me, "This depression must mean one thing to the American people. It must mean that wages be forced down to where they should be."

A few years ago there was a well-known man who was reported to have said, "A man was worth a dollar a day from

his shoulders down, but he is worth as much above his shoulders as he is able to collect."

I do not subscribe to any such false philosophy. I will vote to reduce my salary and your salary as well as the salaries of all higher-paid Government employees. The Record will show that I am for every economy. But, Mr. Chairman, I shall never subscribe to any legislation which tends to liquidate this depression on the wages of the men and women who toil for their bread. [Applause.]

This depression was brought on, in part, by people who were seeking profits that they did not earn. We should not turn to the wages of men and women who toil for the comforts of life in order to find a way out of the trouble we are in.

I am for this amendment. [Applause.]

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be very brief. I just want to say that I have a great deal of affection and respect for my colleague [Mr. BYRNS], but I am sorry I can not go along with him on this matter.

I think, as so many of the gentlemen have so well said here to-day, that this is a wrong way to economize. I believe in economy, but not to the extent of creating human misery. I happen to have a number of letters from the wives of some of these employees who would be affected by the provision in this bill, and I think if you gentlemen could read the letters I have received you would understand that we would really be doing a very great injustice to a great number of faithful employees in putting through such a provision. Perhaps some of you have received these letters, but being a woman, I think women write a little more intimately, perhaps, to a woman Representative, and I know that my heart has been touched by the appeals that have been made to me. I want to say further that I am entirely in agreement with my friend [Mr. LA GUARDIA] in this regard and hope that his amendment shall prevail. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I have no more interest in this amendment than any other Member on the floor of this House. I made a solemn pledge to myself when I came here in December that I was going to do what I could to stand by the President of the United States in his effort to balance the Budget [applause], and I can stand here to-day and say I have worked day and night, and the other gentlemen upon the Committee on Appropriations of which I am a member have done the same thing, in an effort to hold down the appropriations.

I have no personal interest in this question. There is not a man in the Nashville post office who is not my personal friend, and, certainly, I do not want to see any man there or elsewhere injured in any degree; but I say to you gentlemen in this period of time when the farmers—and you will notice that most of those who are supporting this amendment do not come from the country—when the farmers of this country find it impossible to make enough to pay the cost of production upon their farms—

Mr. MAY. Or taxes.

Mr. BYRNS. Or even, as the gentleman from Kentucky suggests, the taxes which they have to pay, when business men are failing and banks are failing, when the deficit has reached the point that this Committee on Ways and Means has been sitting for weeks and weeks in an effort to find something they can tax in order to balance the Budget, when you are going to come in here next week and impose a tax upon practically everything that the postal clerks and everybody else wears and eats, it is no time to increase salaries.

Now, gentlemen have talked about this as if it were a reduction of salary. It does not reduce anybody's salary. It simply provides that for the year 1933 nobody shall receive an increase.

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

Mr. BYRNS. Yes, briefly.

Mr. MAY. In view of the numerous appropriations made by this Congress for the past 10 years and the present condition of the Treasury of the United States, I would like to know if the gentleman could give the House a modern, up-

to-date definition of the meaning of the phrase "funds not otherwise appropriated" at the beginning of this act?

Mr. BYRNS. If we keep up at this rate, the time is coming when there will not be any funds to appropriate.

I was much disappointed a while ago. This is no more to me than it is to you. I do not impugn the motives of any gentleman who votes against me on any proposition. He may be right and I may be wrong. I look at all such matters as having two sides, but this House has uniformly stood for every proposition looking to economy. You have voted exactly this language, as the gentleman from New York knows, in every appropriation bill that you have passed.

Are you going to vote it out of this? If so, why? Why are you going to make fish of one and fowl of another? Remember, this means no reduction in salary, it only applies, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] said, to comparatively few—those who graduate from substitutes into the \$1,700 class. I do not know whether they would get it in the first year's salary, but, if so, it would only amount to \$100 increase. Why can not this be delayed for just one year?

I want to tell you that I have more confidence in the patriotism and loyalty of the postal clerks of this country than some of the gentlemen here seem to have, when they say that the adoption of this policy will break the morale of the postal clerks. I do not believe it for a moment. I want to tell you that the postal clerks of this country are loyal, they are patriotic, they are not going to ask you to make an exception of them when you have applied this provision to the other services in the Government. They do not ask you to make a distinction in their favor.

Gentlemen, I appeal to you. You have passed this measure in other bills. It was put into the other bills, and nobody opposed it except the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. There were others who voted with me.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes; but nobody except the gentleman from New York raised his voice in opposition, and it was exactly the same provision.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by several Members), there were 72 ayes and 60 noes.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. BYRNS and Mr. LA GUARDIA as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 74 ayes and 65 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. No appropriation under the Treasury or Post Office Departments available during the fiscal years 1932 and/or 1933 shall be used after the date of the approval of this act to pay the compensation of an incumbent appointed to any position under the Federal Government which is vacant on the date of the approval of this act or to any such position which may become vacant after such date: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply (1) to absolutely essential positions the filling of which may be approved in writing by the President of the United States, (2) to the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Coast Guard, or (3) to temporary, emergency, seasonal, or cooperative positions: *Provided*, That when any vacancy is caused by the retirement, removal, resignation, or death of a postal employee in a position the duties of which make it necessary to assign permanently a substitute for an 8-hour daily period, or when it is necessary permanently to utilize a substitute on an auxiliary route for eight hours daily, then the Postmaster General shall so advise the President and request written authorization to fill such vacancies by the appointment of additional regular employees. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by the operation of this section shall not be used for any other purposes but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury, and a report of all such vacancies, the number thereof filled, and the amounts unexpended, for the period between the date of the approval of this act and October 31, 1932, shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next regular session.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 67, line 20, after the word "*Provided*," strike out all of the remainder of the line down to and including the word "employees" on line 3, page 68, and insert in lieu thereof the

following: "That when any vacancy is caused by the retirement, removal, resignation, or death of a postal employee in a position the duties of which make necessary the use of approximately 44 hours' substitute service per week, or when it is necessary permanently to utilize substitute service on an auxiliary route for approximately 8 hours daily, then the Postmaster General shall so advise the President and request written authorization to fill such vacancy by the appointment of additional regular employees."

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I have no power to speak for the committee, but, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD]. He is seeking to do the same thing that we seek to do, and if his amendment clarifies the matter I am happy to have it adopted.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used for purchasing any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle (except busses, station wagons, and ambulances) at a cost, delivered and completely equipped for operation, in excess of \$750, including the value of a vehicle exchanged where exchange is involved; nor shall any money appropriated herein be used for maintaining, driving, or operating any Government-owned motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle not used exclusively for official purposes; and "official purposes" shall not include the transportation of officers and employees between their domiciles and places of employment except in cases of officers and employees engaged in field work the character of whose duties makes such transportation necessary and then only when the same is approved by the head of the department. This section shall not apply to any motor vehicle for official use of the Secretary of the Treasury or the Postmaster General.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goss: Page 68, line 15, after the word "delivered," insert the following: "f. o. b. factory."

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, this is the same section that has been in all of the bills, and I offer this amendment because it has been said on the floor of the House that it would not be possible to buy a Ford, a Chevrolet, or a Plymouth automobile in the far Western States for \$750, delivered and completely equipped. There is no intention upon my part to raise the price beyond a reasonable freight allowance from the factories. I think the committee intended to put this amount at \$750 so that it would count out the higher priced cars. I ask the chairman of the committee whether he is agreeable to accepting this amendment. The freight allowance would not be over \$200, and it would allow the cheaper cars to be purchased anywhere in the United States.

Mr. BYRNS. Would not the gentleman be willing to allow this matter to be passed and have it go to the Senate and then be taken up in conference, as will be done with the other provisions respecting automobiles in other bills, so that it can be arranged with some degree of uniformity? If gentlemen want to have a hodgepodge of their appropriation bills, and if they want to change one when they do not change another, of course, I can not prevent it.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman give his cooperation in conference?

Mr. BYRNS. Certainly it will be given every consideration, though I will not promise the gentleman that I will agree to a raise.

Mr. GOSS. If the gentleman will not agree to a raise so that we can get the automobile delivered, then I shall insist upon my amendment.

Mr. BYRNS. The attitude of the committee is that we want to take care of the Treasury. We are looking to the interest of the taxpayers and of the Treasury rather than to the interest of the automobile manufacturers.

Mr. GOSS. Does the gentleman want to have motor-cycles used for this purpose?

Mr. BYRNS. I assure the gentleman that the service will not be interfered with, it will not be disturbed in the slightest, but we will not have the spectacle of Government employees riding in handsomer cars than nine-tenths of the Members of Congress, at the expense of the Government.

Mr. GOSS. The gentleman should know that the amendment providing \$750, f. o. b. factory, would not allow of any expensive cars.

Mr. BYRNS. But we are trying to perfect this provision and all automobile provisions, in order to cut out some of the Packards and Cadillacs that are being used at the expense of the Government.

Mr. GOSS. I agree with the gentleman. I simply make the price f. o. b. at the factory.

Mr. HART. Does not that apply to any other car?

Mr. GOSS. Yes; but the price of \$750 is the delivered price, including the whole car, freight, and equipment. All my amendment proposes to do is to make the price \$750 f. o. b. factory.

Mr. HART. That would be too high for the lower priced cars.

Mr. GOSS. Oh, no. The argument has been made that out West they could not buy automobiles for that price.

Mr. BYRNS. Why not let these matters be threshed out in conference, so that we can have some uniformity with reference to these appropriations.

Mr. GOSS. I would be willing, but the gentleman will not give his assurance that he would go to even \$750.

Mr. BYRNS. I am not going to give the gentleman any assurance in advance. I think the gentleman may trust me to do the reasonable thing; but I say this to the gentleman and to the members of the committee, that as a member of the conference committee I am not going to stand for a proposition which means that the Government has to pay a dollar more than is necessary for any car needed by Government employees.

Mr. GOSS. I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. GOSS. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. The gentleman's amendment proposes to make sure the statement given to the House that in the consideration of a like amendment in a former appropriation bill that was to the effect that the freight expense would be taken out of the contingent fund.

Mr. GOSS. That is correct.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read the bill down to and including line 15, on page 69.

Mr. BYRNS. 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. HOWARD, 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. 9699) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe the present status of so-called automatic promotion in the Postal Service should remain as is and not be cut down as proposed in lines 13 and 14, page 66, of H. R. 9699, appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments.

It is well to first call attention to the fact that under the present law no promotions for carriers and clerks and substitutes carry any more than the present top salary of \$2,150 a year. It requires 10 years' service to reach this pay, and the existing law does not allow for any further advance.

The situation as to substitute carriers is, they are working for 65 cents an hour, or approximately \$1,350 a year. If they work steadily into position of juniors in the service at around \$1,700 or \$1,800 a year they obtain \$100 a year advancement until they reach the \$2,150 class and there stop.

The system of graduated increase up to a limit has been in force under a well-worked-out system in the Post Office Department for many years. It would disrupt this system if it were now changed.

We must keep in mind that there have already been substantial cuts and savings in the Postal Service. For example, over one-half million dollars has been saved in the cutting of around 5,000 salaries of postmasters and supervisors, whose pay is proportional to the volume of business passing through the office; this volume is decreased on account of the depression. There has been also a large saving through the recent policy of the Post Office Department in being rather slow in making promotions and using a substitute wherever possible.

We should keep in mind that from 1912 to 1925 the clerks, carriers, and substitutes, numbering perhaps over 150,000 in the United States, received no increase in pay. The highest pay during that period was approximately \$1,200 a year. Many of these men are men of families, all American citizens; many are struggling under debts incurred in endeavoring to sustain themselves under lower pay and until they reach the ultimate goal now set.

I know of no harder working branch of the Government service than the carriers and clerks. There is no sinecure or soft berth connected with their work.

I do not believe there is any public support calling for such change in the system and the public at large will surely lose in a service that is so necessary; and of all services in the United States this ought to be kept up to a high effective plane.

May I read a letter received this morning from Mr. George H. Pfeil, president, branch 35, United National Association Post Office Clerks, calling attention to one post office in Connecticut where there are 15 clerks substituting, working at 65 cents an hour, doing the work of a \$1,700 or \$2,100 a year man, many of them for five or six years without promotion.

I believe the existing law should be left as is, especially having in mind that there is no provision for promotion for the man who has been 10 years in the service and that the other promotions are not really promotions in the sense but are really a graduated form of pay which the clerks, carriers, and substitutes have been led to believe would be a permanent system and one that they could build on for their future.

Many other avenues for cuts in various interlocking departments at Washington, and obsolete systems could be looked into to save money, instead of penalizing our hard-working effective postal employees in the lower grades.

UNITED NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS,
New Haven, Conn., February 29, 1932.

HON. WILLIAM L. TIERNEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In justice to the 15 clerks out of 175 on the rolls of the New Haven (Conn.) Post Office who are due for the automatic promotion of \$100 during the fiscal year 1933, may we respectfully beg you to oppose any change in the present law which would suspend the promotions for a year or more.

It is our understanding that the Treasury and Post Office supply bill will contain the proviso recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, suspending all promotions for the next fiscal year.

Owing to the financial condition of the Treasury at the present time, we can readily appreciate the necessity of strict economy and the withholding of promotions to the supervisory positions and to grades above the automatic grades. However, we do feel that an injustice will be done the employees in the automatic grade if this provision were adopted. In some instances these employees have served as substitutes for five or six years, under adverse working conditions, before being appointed regular employees, with the expectation of regular promotion when appointed.

We trust that you will give the matter your usual sincere consideration and will be able to give your valuable support to sustaining the present law, allowing these employees the promotions which they have earned.

With the kindest regards, I am, respectfully,

GEORGE H. PFEIL,
President Branch 35, United National
Association of Post Office Clerks.

TEMPORARY RELIEF OF WATER USERS ON IRRIGATION PROJECTS

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Rules, presented the following privileged report for the consideration of the bill (S. 3706) for the temporary relief of water users on irrigation projects constructed and operated under the

reclamation law, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 165

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 3706, a bill "for the temporary relief of water users on irrigation projects constructed and operated under the reclamation law."

That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

AMENDMENT OF JUDICIAL CODE AND LIMITATION OF COURTS OF EQUITY

Mr. O'CONNOR, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5315) to amend the judicial code and to define limitation of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 166

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 5315, a bill "To amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes."

That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and to be equally divided between those favoring the bill and those opposing it, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to section 5 offered by Mr. MEAD, of New York, meets with my approval. Legislation of this kind is badly needed to correct a situation confronting the substitutes in the Brooklyn and other post offices in the country. The substitutes in my home city of Brooklyn have been forced into the army of unemployed. There are two reasons for this: First, a falling off in postal revenues; and, secondly, the restrictive employment policies of the Post Office Department. Very unfortunately, the Postmaster General and the First Assistant Postmaster General, at a time when there is so much unemployment in our country, are endeavoring to take work away from post-office substitutes by instituting petty economies, such as the lengthening of the working hours of the regular clerks. This can be done under a technical interpretation of the 8-hour law. This law provided that the 8-hour service of regular clerks and carriers must be performed within 10 hours. Ordinarily it is performed within 9 hours. But Mr. Coleman, the First Assistant Postmaster General, has instructed postmasters to lengthen the hours to 8 within 10, which operates to rob the substitutes of work opportunities.

In other words, the regular clerks are required to work longer hours, and in so doing they take away employment chances for the substitutes. I wish to call the attention of the House to a communication I have been informed was sent by First Assistant Postmaster General Coleman under date of November 5, to all postmasters, instructing them to reduce substitute service by lengthening the tours of regulars to 8 within 10 hours:

You are directed to immediately reorganize your forces and reduce substitute service to the minimum. You are authorized to make such changes in the assignments and tours of clerks and

carriers as will enable you to render good service to the public, with as little auxiliary assistance as possible. Full advantage is to be taken of the 8-in-10-hour law.

BROOKLYN SUBSTITUTES

So acute is the unemployment situation among the Brooklyn substitutes that they have made public appeals for support to obtain corrective legislation. They are seeking enactment of bills sponsored by three members of the House Post Office Committee, namely, Representatives KELLY, HOGG, and SWEENEY. The public appeal of the Brooklyn substitutes reads:

These bills would guarantee to substitutes 30 hours of work a week, a sick leave, and a vacation with pay. Substitute postal clerks have suffered severely from present economic conditions. In the past they were appointed to the regular force after a brief trial period. To-day they must substitute indefinitely, with little hope of such appointment.

Most of them are married men and have several who are dependent upon them for support from the very inadequate remuneration they receive. Enactment into law of the relief measures depends upon favorable public sentiment and interest.

Petitions in behalf of the Brooklyn substitutes signed by thousands of citizens of my city have been sent to the House Post Office Committee.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MURPHY, at the request of Mr. CABLE, on account of sickness.

To Mr. WOLFENDEN, for the balance of the week, at the request of Mr. BRUMM, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 278. An act for the relief of Charles Parshall, Fort Peck Indian allottee, of the Fort Peck Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 290. An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital; to the Committee on the Library.

S. 1030. An act for the relief of John A. Pearce; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2058. An act for the relief of William C. Rives; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2570. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of Joseph E. Bourrie Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2655. An act providing for waiver of prosecution by indictment in certain criminal proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2827. An act to amend the act known as the "Perishable agricultural commodities act, 1930," approved June 10, 1930; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3447. An act for the relief of John Stratis; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3506. An act authorizing the selection of a site and the erection thereon of a suitable monument indicating the historical significance of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal; to the Committee on the Library.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 307. An act to approve act No. 256 of the session laws of 1931 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the districts of North Kona and South Kona, on the island and county of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 5, 1932, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. RAINEY submitted the following list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, March 5, 1932, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
(10 a. m.)

Bills relating to short sales of securities (H. R. 4, H. R. 4604, H. R. 4632, H. R. 4639).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

468. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the facts in the claim of Thomas F. Olsen, Postmaster at De Kalb, Ill., for credit on account of public funds and property lost in the burglary of the post office on February 10, 1931; to the Committee on Claims.

469. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedules of miscellaneous tax forms in the files of the Bureau of Internal Revenue which are not needed in the transactions of public business and have no permanent value; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BANKHEAD: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 165. A resolution providing for the consideration of S. 3706, an act for the temporary relief of water users on irrigation projects constructed and operated under the reclamation law; without amendment (Rept. No. 690). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 166. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5315, a bill to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 691). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 9388. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to extend or renew the contracts of employment of the attorneys employed to represent the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota in litigation arising in the Court of Claims under the act of May 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 555); with amendment (Rept. No. 684). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLACK: Committee on Claims. S. 901. An act for the relief of Warren J. Clear; without amendment (Rept. No. 685). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2650. A bill for the relief of George H. Holman; without amendment (Rept. No. 686). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DRANE: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 7385. A bill for the relief of Sidney Joseph Kent; without amendment (Rept. No. 687). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GAMBRILL: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 5786. A bill for the relief of Essie Finger; with amendment (Rept. No. 688). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 860. An act for the relief of William Girard Joseph Bennett; without amendment (Rept. No. 689). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9982) granting a pension to Mary Tompkins; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8937) granting a pension to Richard O'Hearn; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 10147) relative to assumption of risks of employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10148) to amend the act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroad to their employees in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 10149) to provide additional revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 10150) to provide that the existing law covering the age limit for appointment in the Supply Corps of the United States Navy shall not be applicable in the case of officers transferred to the Supply Corps from the line of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOKE: A bill (H. R. 10151) to provide additional revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 10152) to empower assignee of inventor of file divisional, continuation, renewal, or reissue application; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SIROVICH: A bill (H. R. 10153) to limit the life of a patent to a term commencing with the date of the application; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. RICH: A bill (H. R. 10154) permitting single signature in patent applications and validating joint patent for sole invention; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 10155) to abolish the statute permitting renewal of patent applications; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. KELLY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10156) to limit inventors to priority of two years before filing applications for patent; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DIES: A bill (H. R. 10157) to expedite prosecution of patent applications pending more than three years; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 10158) to remove certain burdens on interstate commerce in agricultural commodities by providing means of limiting the amount of short future trading which may be done in such commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BALDRIGE: A bill (H. R. 10159) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near O'Hern Street, South Omaha, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 10160) to make illegal and provide penalties for transporting kidnaped persons in interstate or foreign commerce, and schemes to use the mails in kidnaping cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 10161) amending the act of May 25, 1918, with reference to employing farmers in the Indian Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: Resolution (H. Res. 165) providing for the consideration of S. 3706, an act for the temporary relief of water users on irrigation projects constructed and operated under the reclamation law; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: Resolution (H. Res. 166) providing for the consideration of H. R. 5315, a bill to amend the Judicial Code, and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McSWAIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 322) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prevent profiteering during war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BEAM: A bill (H. R. 10162) for the relief of John Toner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 10163) granting an increase of pension to Jennie E. Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10164) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10165) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Goshorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 10166) authorizing adjustment of the claim of Frank Spector; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10167) authorizing adjustment of the claim of J. G. Shelton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10168) authorizing adjustment of the claim of the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10169) authorizing adjustment of the claim of the Adelpia Bank & Trust Co., of Philadelphia; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10170) authorizing adjustment of the claim of Joseph T. Ryerson & Son (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10171) authorizing adjustment of the claim of Lewis Semler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10172) authorizing adjustment of the claim of Schutte & Koerting Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10173) authorizing adjustment of the claim of the Van Camp Sea Food Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10174) authorizing adjustment of the claims of Orem Wheatley, Kenneth Blaine, and Joseph R. Ball; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10175) authorizing adjustment of the claim of B. F. Hart; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10176) authorizing adjustment of the claim of Kenneth Carpenter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10177) authorizing adjustment of the claim of the Wilnot Castle Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10178) for the relief of William C. Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 10179) granting an increase of pension to Indiana Hess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10180) for the relief of the Tevis Motor Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOKE: A bill (H. R. 10181) for the relief of Squaw Island Freight Terminal Co. (Inc.), of Buffalo, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 10182) for the relief of M. Brown and S. H. Brown for losses sustained on schooner *Ninnetta M. Porcella*; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 10183) granting a pension to Florence H. Surman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 10184) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Cowan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAINES: A bill (H. R. 10185) for the relief of George G. Slonaker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10186) granting a pension to Hosea F. Dearth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEMP: A bill (H. R. 10187) for the relief of Stephen O. Fuqua; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 10188) granting a pension to Rebecca Barnard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 10189) for the relief of Joseph H. Coleman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10190) to pay an annuity to Frances Agramonte, the widow of Dr. Aristides Agramonte, member of the yellow fever commission; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 10191) for the relief of Joseph Leroy Everett; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10192) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 10193) for the relief of William Sherman Paisley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. OWEN: A bill (H. R. 10194) granting a pension to Emma Grennan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 10195) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 10196) granting an increase of pension to Mary Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10197) for the relief of the Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railroad Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10198) granting a pension to Mary C. Lytle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TURPIN: A bill (H. R. 10199) for the relief of Edward Earle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. YON: A bill (H. R. 10200) for the relief of Wade H. Cobb; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3601. By Mr. ADKINS: Petition of citizens of Charleston, Ill., requesting the cash payment of the adjusted-compensation (bonus) certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3602. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of residents of the seventh congressional district of California, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance, and Senate bill 1202 and House bill 8092, providing for closing barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3603. Also, petition of residents of Stanislaus County, Calif., opposing repeal, modification, or resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3604. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of Mrs. J. W. Kippax and 36 other residents of East Providence, R. I., opposing the repeal, resubmission, or any modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3605. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of veterans and citizens of Wyoming, in favor of immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3606. Also, petition of veterans and citizens of Ohio, favoring immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3607. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of L. O. Gagwin and 15 others, of Kasoag, N. Y., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1202 and House bill 8092, providing for the closing of barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3608. Also, petition of F. C. Ostrander and 16 other citizens of Copenhagen, N. Y., urging against modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3609. By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of 125 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ilion, N. Y., favoring the maintenance and enforcement of the eighteenth amendment, and opposing the resubmission of the question through a repeal amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3610. Also, petition of Group No. 2579 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States, favoring the setting

aside of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3611. By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Resolutions of members of the Montana State branch of the National Woman's Party, calling on Congress to submit immediately to the States for ratification the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States: Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3612. Also, resolution submitted by Helen E. Shull, of the Montana State branch of the National Woman's Party, urging submission of the equal-rights amendment to the States for ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3613. By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of Vrest Octon and certain other voters of Brattleboro, Vt., urging resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to the States by referendum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3614. By Mr. GOSS: Petition of Group No. 1008 of the Polish National Alliance of Ansonia, Conn., asking that on the 11th day of October of each year a proclamation be issued by the President for the observation of the day as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3615. By Mr. HALL of Mississippi: Petition of 50 members of the Missionary Society of the First Methodist Church and 20 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Laurel, Miss., urging support and maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and opposing the repeal, resubmission, or any modification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3616. By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: Petition of Ables-Rayburn Post, No. 118, Ravenswood, W. Va., requesting that the World War veterans' adjusted-service certificates be paid in full without deduction of any interest due on loans already made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3617. By Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia: Petition of members of the Baptist Bible Class of Naylor, Ga., opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3618. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of William S. Hill, Katherine E. Meisel, Mrs. S. N. Donaldson, and George R. Erler, of Baltimore, Md., urging passage of House bill 7230; to the Committee on Pensions.

3619. Also, petition of Medical and Chirurgical Faculty, Baltimore, Md., opposing Senate bill 572 and House bill 4739; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3620. Also, petition of the Young Women's Christian Association and Elisabeth Gilman, of Baltimore, Md., urging passage Costigan-La Follette bill (S. 3045); to the Committee on Labor.

3621. Also, petition of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Baltimore, Md., urging passage of Senate bill 2263; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3622. Also, petition of police department, Baltimore, Md., urging passage House bill 4537 and Senate bill 1525; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3623. Also, petition of Baltimore & Philadelphia Steamboat Co., Baltimore, Md., urging passage Senate bill 2793; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3624. Also, petition of Baltimore Association of Commerce, Baltimore, Md., urging unemployment relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3625. Also, petition of the Builders' Exchange and the Baltimore Brick Co., Baltimore, Md., urging passage House bill 6187; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

3626. Also, petition of Baltimore Building Trades Council, Baltimore, Md., urging passage of Senate bill 124 and House bill 8332, 5-day week bill; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3627. Also, petition of Baltimore Association of Commerce, urging passage House bill 8681, merchant airship act of 1932; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3628. Also, petition of Hires Turner Glass Co. and the Novelty Steam Boiler Workers Co., Baltimore, Md., urging passage of House bill 4680; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

3629. Also, petition of Robert Marshall and Esther Allison Brown, of Baltimore, Md., urging passage of House bill 7926; to the Committee on Labor.

3630. Also, petition of Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Md., urging passage of Senate bill 3037; to the Committee on Labor.

3631. Also, petition of Mount Clare Local Federation and the Builders' Exchange of Baltimore, Md., urging passage of Senate bill 935 and House bill 9315; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3632. Also, petition of J. Harry Wagner, of Baltimore, Md., protesting reduction in National Guard appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3633. Also, petition of Maryland Lumber Co., urging passage of the home loan discount bank bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3634. Also, petition of Sterrett Operating Service, Washington, D. C., protesting increased taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3635. Also, petition of Baltimore Federation of Labor, urging passage of Senate bill 935; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3636. Also, petition of the American Journal of Physiology, Baltimore, Md., urging passage of House bill 8765; to the Committee on Labor.

3637. Also, petition of William H. Masson, urging passage of Senate bill 2350 and House bill 6707; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3638. Also, petition of Mrs. S. Tagart Steele, Edward S. Hyde, Elizabeth Crummer, Minna D. Starr, Dr. E. Huber, and the Maryland State Game and Fish Protective Association, all of Baltimore, Md., and Capt. W. H. Munter, of Boston, Mass., urging passage of bill for Everglades National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

3639. Also, petition of Ida C. Lloyd and others, of Baltimore, Md., indorsing the present prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3640. Also, petition of Real Estate Board of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., urging passage of House Joint Resolution 245 to retain the Post Graduate School of the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3641. Also, petition of Edward Unduth, Joseph Gentile, William A. Harrison, Ernest H. Kiefer, Samuel S. Feinstein, James J. Hepner, John Miller, Harry M. Becker, Raymond Quinn, Timothy C. McKinzie, United Veterans' Association (Inc.), and Edward Doll, all of Baltimore, Md., and E. J. Dore, National Soldiers' Home, Virginia, urging passage of House bill 1, cash payment bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3642. Also, petition of Baltimore Association of Commerce, protesting against House bill 4648; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3643. Also, petition of Elmer Lee Price, George A. Jackson, Roy E. Waltz, John E. Bopp, John J. Reardon, Frank Persiani, and Andrew J. Reilly, all of Baltimore, and Alexander Johnson, of Dundalk, Md., urging passage of House bill 1, cash payment bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3644. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of Frank L. Gibson and 319 other signers, of Gueydan, La., indorsing immediate payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3645. Also, petition of J. W. May and 119 other citizens and veterans of Soperton, Ga., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3646. Also, petition of Oscar Marcus and 139 other citizens and veterans of Savannah, Ga., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3647. Also, petition of Alton H. Harvey and 139 other citizens and veterans of Thomaston, Ga., urging immediate cash

payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3648. Also, petition of Allen T. Short and 36 other citizens and veterans of Whitewright, Tex., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3649. Also, petition of F. W. Barkley and 59 other citizens and veterans of Belton, Tex., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3650. Also, petition of Mrs. William Mulrine and 84 other citizens of Chester, Pa., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3651. Also, petition of Augustine Lattang and 36 other citizens and veterans of Norristown, Pa., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3652. Also, petition of H. M. Read and 136 other citizens and veterans of York, Thomasville, Bridgeton, Hanover, Glen Rock, Wellsville, Felton, Wrightsville, Shrewsbury, and Lewisburg, Pa., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3653. Also, petition of W. T. Hawkins and 55 other citizens and veterans of Monroe City, Ind., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3654. Also, petition of Elijah O. Ricks and 24 other citizens and veterans of Washington, Ind., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3655. Also, petition of John A. Anlutner and 29 other citizens and veterans of Sandborn, Ind., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3656. Also, petition of John Arzly and 55 other citizens and veterans of Bruceville, Ind., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3657. Also, petition of Bennie J. Wills and 83 other citizens and veterans of Milledgeville, Ga., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3658. Also, petition of T. C. Poole and 139 other citizens and veterans of Americus, Ga., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3659. Also, petition of P. A. Smith and nine other citizens and veterans of Newnan, Ga., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3660. Also, petition of Clyde Morris and 24 other citizens and veterans of Whitesburg, Ga., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3661. Also, petition of Andrew J. Daniel and 49 other citizens and veterans of Franklin, Ga., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3662. Also, petition of John Munn and 89 other citizens and veterans of Ashburn, Ga., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3663. Also, petition of George Traylor and 139 other citizens and veterans of La Grange, Ga., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3664. Also, petition of Maywood Post, No. 223, of Maywood, Calif., urging passage of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3665. Also, resolution of Revere City Council, Revere, Mass., submitted by Albert J. Brown, city clerk, indorsing immediate payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3666. Also, petition of American Legion Post, No. 261; Ladies Auxiliary of said post; Lions Club; Chamber of Commerce; Board of Trustees of Independent Schools; the Diversity Club; the Literary Club; the Board of Aldermen; Parent Teachers' Association; and 81 individual taxpayers of Winters, Tex., signed by officers of said organizations and said taxpayers, urging immediate payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3667. Also, resolution of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post No. 797, Port Arthur, Tex., submitted by M. D. Carter, adjutant of said post, indorsing full payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3668. Also, resolution of American Legion Post, No. 70, Arcadia, La., submitted by D. D. Pointer, adjutant of said post, indorsing payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3669. Also, resolution of American Legion Post, No. 398, Whitesboro, Tex., submitted by G. W. Hodges, adjutant of said post, indorsing immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3670. Also, resolution of Disabled American Veterans of World War, Chapter No. 1, Memphis, Tenn., submitted by M. A. Ingram, adjutant of said chapter, urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3671. Also, petition of Porter Hoyt Griffith and 116 other ex-service men of Walker County, Ga., urging immediate payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3672. Also, resolution of the Disabled American Veterans, Chapter No. 1, Tacoma, Wash., submitted by Charles O. Merritt, commander of said chapter, urging immediate payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3673. Also, resolution of American Legion Post, No. 372, Blackduck, Minn., submitted by George W. Angell, commander, and George W. Bloomquist, adjutant of said post, indorsing immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3674. Also, petition of E. L. Ross and 63 other voters of Chunky, Miss., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3675. Also, resolution of the Disabled American Veterans, Chapter No. 25, Greenfield, Ohio, submitted by John G. Rooks, commander, and other officers of said chapter, urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3676. Also, resolution of the Disabled American Veterans, Chapter No. 1, Reno, Nev., submitted by W. H. Cougars and Orrin W. Davie, officers of said chapter, indorsing immediate payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3677. Also, resolution of the Disabled American Veterans, Chapter No. 22, Marion, Ohio, submitted by committee of said chapter, indorsing immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3678. Also, resolution of the Disabled American Veterans, Chapter No. 15, Greensboro, N. C., submitted by Walter V. Joyce, J. S. Burton, and J. R. Collins, officers of said chapter, indorsing immediate full payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3679. Also, resolution of American Legion Post, No. 43, Fort Lyon, Colo., submitted by Walter J. McDonald and T. G. Roberts, officers of said post, urging immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3680. Also, petition of American Legion Post, No. 678, New York, N. Y., submitted by William F. Beck, of said post, urging immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3681. Also, resolution of the Disabled American Veterans, Chapter No. 18, Chillicothe, Ohio, submitted by George E.

Brown, commander, and Earl A. Hatfield, adjutant of said post, indorsing immediate full payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3682. Also, resolution of the Disabled American Veterans, Chapter No. 1, Memphis, Tenn., submitted by H. J. Coburn and M. A. Ingram, officers of said post, urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3683. Also, resolution of citizens and ex-service men of Tacoma and Pierce County, Wash., submitted by Neil H. Kime, of the Tacoma Disabled American Veterans' chapter, urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3684. Also, resolution of American Legion Post, No. 381, Robert Lee, Tex., submitted by J. L. Roy Knight and F. C. Clark, of said post, indorsing immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3685. Also, petition of George J. Georgeacopoulos and 54 other disabled veterans of National Military Home, West Los Angeles, Calif., urging immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3686. Also, resolution of American Legion Post, No. 474, St. Paul, Minn., submitted by Fred P. Lancette, adjutant of said post, urging immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3687. Also, petition of H. A. Sellars and 179 other citizens and veterans of Panama City, Fla., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3688. Also, petition of H. R. Whitehead and 55 other citizens of Tampa, Sulphur Springs, and Lutz, Fla., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3689. Also, petition of Claude M. Mullinax and 55 other citizens and veterans of Van Alstyne, Tex., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3690. Also, petition of R. A. Smith and 154 other citizens and veterans of Howe, Tex., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3691. Also, petition of Walter Johnson and 55 other citizens and veterans of Holland, Tex., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3692. Also, petition of Moses D. Sewell and 65 other citizens and veterans of Mart, Tex., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3693. Also, petition of Jim L. May and 99 other citizens and veterans of Dennison, Tex., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3694. Also, petition B. B. Thompson and 71 other citizens and veterans of Sherman, Tex., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3695. Also, petition of E. R. Williams and 254 other citizens and veterans of Legion and Kerrville, Tex., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3696. Also, petition of Robert C. Steger and 13 other veterans of Palmer, Tex., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3697. Also, petition of J. Wheeler and 41 other citizens and veterans of Holidaysburg, Pa., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3698. Also, petition of Clifford Jones and 89 other citizens and veterans of Philadelphia, Pa., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3699. Also, petition of W. D. Harman and 195 other citizens and veterans of Altoona, Pa., urging immediate cash

payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3700. Also, petition of Earl Black and 55 other citizens and veterans of New Castle, Pa., urging immediate cash payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3701. By Mr. REID of Illinois: Petition of 102 residents of Elgin, Ill., urging the maintenance of the eighteenth amendment and its enforcement, and protesting against the resubmission of the same to the States for a referendum vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3702. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of O. W. Cutting, 60 Cedar Street, New York City, favoring the establishment of the Everglades National Park in Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

3703. Also, petition of Brooklyn Federation of Churches (Inc.), Brooklyn, N. Y., stating the results of a referendum on the 8-point peace program for the Far East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3704. Also, petition of Clara H. Cunningham, Washington, D. C., favoring an amendment to section 210 of the World War veterans' act; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

3705. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of Minnesota Federation of Architectural and Engineering Societies, urging enactment of House bill 6187; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

3706. Also, petition of Stephen Post, No. 390, Stephen, Minn., urging full cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3707. Also, petition from the chairman of the legislative committee American Hospital Association of St. Paul, Minn., protesting proposed tax on hospitals, and also any tax on electric current, gas bills, oil, and telephones as burdensome to hospital operation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3708. By Mr. SHOTT: Petition of Luther Patterson Post, No. 36, American Legion, Kimball, W. Va., asking Congress for the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates without interest charges on amounts already borrowed on said certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3709. By Mr. SHREVE: Resolution of 60 members of the West Millcreek Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Erie; 50 members of the Albion Woman's Christian Temperance Union; 300 members of the Tenth Street Methodist congregation, of Erie; 75 members of the Titusville Woman's Christian Temperance Union; and 100 members of the Lillian Stevens Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Erie, all of the State of Pennsylvania, opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or by State legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3710. By Mr. STALKER: Petition of residents of Horseheads and Beaver Dams, N. Y., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3711. Also, petition of residents of Oswego, N. Y., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3712. Also, petition of residents of R. F. D. No. 5, Corning, N. Y., urging the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3713. Also, petition of residents of Elmira, N. Y., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3714. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the Twenty-ninth Division Association (Inc.), asking for the payment in full of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3715. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petitions of John R. McClannahan, 1016 Chess Street, and George W. Hellen, 420 Park Avenue, Monongahela; Elliott Underwood, box 331, West Brownsville; and Ross Richardson, box 505, McDonald, all of the State of Pennsylvania, supporting legislation providing for the payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

3716. Also, petition of Peter Profili, American Theater, Vestaburg, Pa., suggesting certain amendments to the Vestal bill on patents and copyrights; to the Committee on Patents.

3717. Also, petition of W. J. Mellega, W. N. Flower, E. F. Reese, J. W. Shaw, and Jacob Miller, jr., urging favorable action on the soldiers' bonus bill; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

3718. By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of Free Methodist Church, Loveland, Colo., protesting against submitting the eighteenth amendment to the States for a referendum vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3719. Also, petition of American War Mothers, Chapter No. 7, Loveland, Colo., protesting against submitting eighteenth amendment to the States for a ratification vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3720. By Mr. WEST: Petition of 23 members of the Railway Mail Association Auxiliary, Fifteenth Division, Crestline Branch, protesting against any plan or bill suggesting a reduction in salaries of railway postal clerks and other Government employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, MARCH 5, 1932

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Our Father, we thank Thee for that love which measures itself by suffering for the poor and needy and heartbroken. Go forth, O love divine, and make Thy disclosures by which men are redeemed from the lower spheres of human life. O break upon them in the fullness of Thy power until it shall incite them to things beautiful and holy. Save us from the bondage and proscription which are of the sinful levels of society. Lead us upward in the spiritual and intellectual life in which unbounded faith, hope, and love bestow their choicest blessings. O God, stand behind every weeping soul; be not far away from every distressed orphan; be near every oppressed widow in the hour of her trial, and remember all Thy children of weakness and want. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 110) authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BYRNS. 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. 9699) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, with Mr. HOWARD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULMER: Page 69, line 6, after the word "act," insert the following: "or appropriations hereafter made."

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I note with a great deal of interest that the language contained in section 7 is

practically identical with that contained in a bill which I introduced in the earlier part of the session, H. R. 5612.

I will state for the information of the committee that the bill introduced by me has already been reported by the Post Office Committee and is now pending on the calendar. I may state also that I have a favorable report from the Post Office Department on this legislation. The adoption of this amendment will accomplish what I seek to accomplish under my bill.

This legislation also meets with the approval of the President of the United States, according to a statement made by him some time ago. I would like to have the Clerk read this statement, which was issued some time in January.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the statement.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

It would be of substantial advantage to American manufacturers and purchasers if Congress should authorize all departments and executive establishments uniformly to give preference in purchase of supplies to goods of domestic origin, and I suggest the enactment of legislation providing that in advertising for proposals for supplies heads of departments shall require bidders to certify whether the articles proposed to be furnished are of domestic or foreign growth, production, or manufacture, and shall (if in their judgment the excess of cost is not unreasonable) purchase or contract for the delivery of articles of the growth, production, or manufacture of the United States, notwithstanding that articles of foreign origin may be offered at a lower price.

Mr. FULMER. This same type of legislation was passed some two years ago for the War and Navy Departments. At that time in requesting bids on matches they had a lower price submitted by foreign countries, and they had to give their orders for matches which were imported rather than use those made in this country.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I would like to state to the gentleman that I think this is a good amendment. As a matter of fact, a number of us, including the gentleman from South Carolina, had this matter up with the Post Office Department last summer. As I recall, they stated they would use cotton twine, but for some reason they backed up on the proposition.

Mr. FULMER. The reason the department decided to use jute twine is that under the present law the department is forced to accept the lowest bid, regardless of where the product is grown or manufactured. Mr. Brown, the Postmaster General, told me that if my bill had been the law at that time he would have used cotton twine, even though the price was some higher than jute.

Mr. JONES. As a matter of fact, it would make very little difference in the cost.

Mr. FULMER. That is right, especially at this time, when cotton is so cheap.

Mr. JONES. What they are now using is a jute product made in India, thus giving preference to foreign products over the domestic cotton twine which is made in this country.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The language of the amendment offered by the gentleman is the same as that which was included in his bill before the Post Office Committee.

Mr. FULMER. The amendment will accomplish what I proposed to accomplish with my bill that the gentleman refers to. I understand that the Post Office Department is now faced with buying foreign gasoline because it had to accept the lowest bid.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I would like to have the amendment again reported. There was some confusion in the Chamber, and many of us did not hear it.

Mr. FULMER. May I state before that is done that I have had this matter up with several members of the Ap-