7216. Also, resolution of the Williams Pocahontas Mine Safety Club, of War, W. Va., opposing the Davis-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7217. Also, resolution of the Price Hill Safety Club, of Price Hill, W. Va., opposing the Davis-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7218. Also, resolution of the Skelton Safety Club, of Skelton, W. Va., opposing the Davis-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7219. Also, resolution of the Cranberry Safety Club, of Cranberry, W. Va., opposing the Davis-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7220. Also, resolution of the Lochgelly Safety Club, of Lochgelly, W. Va., opposing the Davis-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7221. Also, resolution of the Summerlee Safety Club, of Summerlee, W. Va., opposing the Davis-Kelly coal bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7222. Also, resolution of the Sprague Safety Club, of Sprague, W. Va., opposing the Davis-Kelly coal bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7223. Also, resolution of the Alpha Pocahontas Coal Co. Safety Club, of Alpoca, W. Va., opposing the Davis-Kelly coal bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7224. Also, resolution of the Covel Safety Club, of Covel, W. Va., opposing the Davis-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7225. Also, resolution of the Oakwood Safety Club, of Carlisle, W. Va., opposing the Davis-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7226. Also, resolution of the Prudence and Harvey Safety Club, of Harvey, W. Va., opposing the Davis-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7227. Also, resolution of the Whipple Safety Club, of Whipple, W. Va., opposing the Davis-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7228. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of Vernon A. Brown Post, No. 438, Veterans of Foreign Wars, opposing payment of the foreign-war debt at the expense of the disabled veteran; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7229. Also, petition of New Jersey State Division of the American Association of University Women, opposing curtailment of appropriations for vocational education; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7230. By Mr. SWANSON: Petition of J. E. Brooks and others of Greenfield, Iowa, against House bill 8576, for the discontinuance of postal sale of contract-printed envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7231. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of H. Grady Jones and a number of other citizens of Haralson County, Ga., favoring the regulation of bus-and-truck transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7232. By Mr. WATSON: Resolution passed by the Mountain Arts Association of Pennsylvania, favoring the continuation of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917; to the Committee on Education.

7233. Also, resolution passed by the Philadelphia Board of Trade, concerning the status of sugar refining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7234. Also, resolution passed by the Port of Philadelphia Ocean Traffic Bureau, concerning the status of sugar refining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 1932

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

Almighty and Eternal God, whose will doth sway the destiny of the universe and of human life, before whose eyes nothing is covered or concealed; preserve us in our secret life from all idle reverie, from all impurity of thought, from moments of self-pity, pride, and petulance, and give to us the inner calm, the fine serenity of souls principled in faith and hope and love.

Touch Thou our lips with kindly wisdom, that with grace and clearest insight our words may rise on winged feet above confusion's wide expanse, clothing our thought with the rare bloom and fragrance of that knowledge which reveals the constant inflowing of God into the affairs of men. We ask it in the name and for the sake of Him who spake as never man spake, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of yesterday, when, on request of Mr. FESS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

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

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

CLAIMS OF INDIANS IN OREGON—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 89)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Senate:

I am returning herewith Senate bill 826, "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine claims of certain bands or tribes of Indians residing in the State of Oregon," without my approval.

The bill limits the claims which can be presented to those "arising under or growing out of any treaty, agreement, act of Congress, Executive order," and then throws the door wide open by adding "or otherwise." I can not assent to the proposition that the Government should be obligated after 75 years to defend a suit for unknown claims of such ancient origin and for persons long since dead not based upon any treaty, agreement, act of Congress, or Executive order.

I want full justice for our Indian wards, and would have no objection to the presentation of claims arising under the treaties named in the bill, both ratified and unratified treaties. I am advised, however, that all funds promised to these Indians under the ratified treaties have been appropriated and paid, and that lands were set aside for, and occupied by, the Indians who were parties to the unratified treaties. I am further constrained to this action at a time when the Government can not assume additional and unknown burdens of expenditure.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 25, 1932.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message, with the accompanying enrolled bill, may be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against curtailment, as an economy measure, of benefits now received by disabled veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a letter signed by Francis A. McCann, executive secretary Washington section of the Baltimore Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies, Washington, D. C., favoring the appropriation of $600,000 for the relief of the unemployed in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a letter from Herbert J. Ollinger, of Cleveland, Ohio, submitting a plan for solution of the present unemployment difficulties, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a letter from Everett G. Glidden, of Schenectady, N. Y., submitting a plan to overcome the present economic depression, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate letters from L. E. McElroy, of Oklahoma City, Okla., relative to an alleged discrepancy in taxation in the present Federal revenue law as applied to property sold in Texas and property sold in Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Kansas (oil and gas leases, etc.), which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Northeast Suburban Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Washington, D. C., protesting against the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution to State conventions or legislatures and favoring the making of adequate appropriations for law enforcement and education in law observance, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a letter from Jane Anderson, of New York City, N. Y., inclosing a newspaper article, being a special to the New York Times under the date line "Briarcliff Manor, April 25," entitled "Doctor Buchman Offers World-Saving Plan; Prosperity Would Return if the Nation's Leaders Got in Touch with God," which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas presented petitions of members of Victor Ellig Post, No. 31, American Legion, and sundry citizens, all of Fort Smith, Ark., praying for the prompt passage of legislation for the payment of adjusted-compensation certificates (bonus) of World War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented telegrams in the nature of petitions signed by Jeff Davis and sundry other citizens, of El Dorado; by J. E. Berry and sundry other citizens, of Smackover; and the chamber of commerce and sundry citizens of Camden, all in the State of Arkansas, praying for the imposition of an excise duty on imported crude oil, asphalt, and gasoline in the pending tax bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KEAN presented memorials numerously signed by sundry citizens of Camden County, N. J., remonstrating against the passage of legislation to change existing laws relating to compensation, disability allowance, or pension in any manner designed to reduce the amount of such payments to the veterans of any war, their widows or dependents, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HALE presented numerous letters and communications in the nature of petitions from sundry citizens and organizations in the State of Maine, praying for the passage of the bill (H. R. 9891) to provide for the establishment of a system of pensions for railroad and transportation employees and for a railroad pension board, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented petitions of 45 citizens of the State of Massachusetts praying for the passage of the bill (H. R. 9891) to provide for the establishment of a system of pensions for railroad and transportation employees and for a railroad pension board, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the prompt passage of legislation providing immediate cash payment of adjusted-compensation certificates (bonus) of World War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from sundry citizens and postal employees of Ware, and memorials of 135 other citizens, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against reductions in the compensation or leave privileges of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a resolution adopted by the County Council of the American Legion Posts of Montgomery County, Md., protesting against the passage of the so-called omnibus economy bill, and particularly opposing reductions in appropriations for ex-service men, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Monumental Social Club, Democratic, second ward, and the One hundred and tenth Machine Gun Association (Inc.), both of Baltimore, Md., favoring the prompt passage of legislation providing for the payment of adjusted-compensation certificates (bonus) of World War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bellingham, Wash., praying for the passage of legislation known as the motor boat bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Yakima Valley Reclamation League, Yakima, Wash., indorsing the plan of Federal reclamation upon suitable projects and favoring the making of appropriation therefor, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Grays Harbor County, Wash., remonstrating against the imposition of a 10 per cent tax upon sales of jewelry, and favoring a general sales tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Enumclaw and vicinity, in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the imposition of a general sales tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution of the mayor and city commission of Centralia, Wash., favoring the imposition of adequate tariff duties on imports of lumber and products thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Seattle, Wash., remonstrating against the passage of legislation curtailing the benefits allowed to disabled war veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE presented letters and papers in the nature of memorials from the Garden City Lodge, No. 504, International Association of Machinists, of San Jose, by Charles N. Fletcher, secretary; Kern River Local, No. 19, International Association of Oil Field, Gas Well, and Refinery Workers of America, of Bakersfield, by E. B. Daniel, secretary; Southern Citrus Fruits Corporation (Ltd.) of Los Angeles, by C. H. Clay; Local Union No. 216, Sheet Metal Workers International Association, of Oakland, by F. E. Monsler, recording secretary; and sundry citizens and organizations, all in the State of California, remonstrating against reductions in the compensation of Federal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented letters in the nature of memorials from sundry citizens and business firms in the State of California, remonstrating against the 10 per cent tax on jewelry

in the pending tax bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented letters in the nature of memorials from sundry citizens and organizations in the State of California, remonstrating against the tax on matches in the pending tax bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented numerous letters in the nature of memorials from sundry citizens and organizations in the State of California, remonstrating against the proposed increase in the first-class postage rate, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented numerous letters in the nature of memorials from sundry citizens and organizations in the State of California, remonstrating against the imposition of a tax on sales of securities in the pending tax bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH presented letters and telegrams in the nature of petitions from sundry citizens and business organizations in the State of Maryland, favoring the imposition of a general manufacturers' sales tax, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of the United Veterans' Association (Inc.) of Baltimore, Md., praying for the passage of legislation providing for the payment in cash of adjusted-compensation certificates (bonus) of World War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a telegram from the Chamber of Commerce of Salisbury, Md., remonstrating against the imposition of a tax on ice cream, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of Swindell Bros., of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the imposition of a tax on toilet articles, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials and letters in the nature of memorials from sundry citizens and organizations in the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the proposed increase in first-class postage rates, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials and letters in the nature of memorials of sundry citizens and organizations in the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the imposition of taxes on automobiles, trucks, motor accessories, and gasoline, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland and the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, of Washington, D. C., praying for the retention of the proposed taxes on importations of oil and coal, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of Jackson Brandt, of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against reducing the appropriations for the Patent Office and favoring the retention of its present personnel, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented the petition of William I. Blake, of Washington, D. C., praying for the making of adequate appropriations for the Howard University, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented memorials and letters in the nature of memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against curtailing the appropriations for vocational education, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against reductions in salaries and the furlough of Federal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. COPELAND presented a petition of the Burroughs-Audubon Nature Club, of Rochester, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the establishment of a reservation for the protection of antelopes, which was referred to the Select Committee on Conservation of Wild Life and Natural Resources.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Rome, N. Y., favoring the construction of a new public building in that city, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the commission of public works in the city of Hudson, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation authorizing the starting of work not later than July 1, 1932, on the construction of the Hudson city post office, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Clinton Corners, N. Y., praying for an investigation of the motion-picture industry and the enactment of legislation prohibiting so-called block booking, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of New York praying for the enactment of legislation regulating bus and interstate truck transportation, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of four insurance companies of Glens Falls, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the so-called recapture clause of the transportation act of 1920, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the commission on international justice and good will of the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Federation of Churches, approving the general principle of the abolition of weapons of aggression as differentiated from those of defense, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution of the executive committee of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, of Washington, D. C., favoring the repeal of section 9 of the agricultural marketing act authorizing the creation and operation of stabilization corporations, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution adopted at Coatesville, Pa., by the jointe district council, American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Pennsylvania, favoring the upholding of the national defense act, as amended, remonstrating against further reductions of appropriations for the national defense, and favoring the building up of the Navy to the London treaty limits, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a resolution of the Common Council of the City of Troy, N. Y., favoring legalizing the manufacture of 4 per cent beer, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a resolution adopted at St. Regis Falls, N. Y., by the Franklin County Rural Letter Carriers' Association, opposing the recommendations of the President of the United States for the elimination of the maintenance of equipment of rural letter carriers, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of New York, praying drastic reductions in expenditures for the operation of the Federal Government, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented memorials of students and members of the faculties of several schools and universities in the State of New York, remonstrating against the suspension of Federal aid for vocational education, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of the State of New York, remonstrating against reductions in the compensation of Federal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a memorial of the Oswego (N. Y.) County American Legion, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the cash payment of adjusted-service certificates, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions of American Legion Post No. 79, of Massena, N. Y., the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., and Troop I, Post No. 665, American Legion, of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the cash payment of World War adjusted-

service certificates, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution of Troop I, Post No. 665, American Legion, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring a continuation of the 5-year insurance plan for World War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of New York, praying for the imposition of a tariff on fish oil, meals, and scrap, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Ogdensburg, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation imposing a duty on ground wood and wood pulp, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented numerous memorials of sundry citizens of the State of New York, remonstrating against the proposed excise taxes on automobiles, trucks, parts, gasoline, and lubricating oil, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, some days ago I communicated with Professor Taussig, of Harvard University, who is an outstanding economist, well known to the Members of this body, as to whether he approved or disapproved of the proposal for an enlarged public-works program to help revitalize trade and solve unemployment. I have his answer to that communication which I ask may be read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *April 27, 1932.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of April 20, and regret that my answer has been delayed by my absence from Cambridge. I am glad to see that you continue your work toward mending the depression by careful and discriminating expenditure on public works on the part of the Federal Government. I believe you are on the right track and hope you will succeed. Your own view as stated in the third paragraph of your letter (of which I assume you have kept a copy) seems to me well justified.

No one can be sure just how great an effect will be produced. I have no doubt that you will agree with me that this is not a panacea, but is an important step which may do considerable good, and may do good far beyond the immediate operations, for it is possible that this would help substantially toward giving the much-needed boost.

I can not pretend to be conversant with the extent of the preparations which the departments have made for carrying into effect the proposed construction. I take your word for it that adequate preparations have been made, and that there is reasonable assurance of a proper expenditure of the funds. I am quite in accord with you that the proper way of financing is the issue of long-term bonds. In short, I believe you are on sound ground.

If it would be of help to you to show to others this brief statement of my attitude you are entirely at liberty to do so.

Very truly yours,

F. W. TAUSSIG.

The Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

TAX ON LIFE-INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, there is a wide difference of opinion over the tax to be levied in the revenue bill upon life-insurance companies. Various rate proposals have been made, and the effect that some of these proposals would have upon the various groups of life-insurance companies is striking. In view of these contentions, I ask that a letter written by the chairman of the Federal tax committee of the Association of Life Insurance Presidents, which I send to the desk, may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

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

THE ASSOCIATION OF LIFE INSURANCE PRESIDENTS,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1932.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The majority opinion of the Finance Committee in the action taken on Wednesday with respect to life-insurance taxes leaves the companies operating on a 3 per cent reserve basis in a most unbearable position.

It so greatly increases their taxable income as against that of the 3½ per cent companies that it becomes a major factor, adding materially, as it must, to the cost of the insurance of the 7,700,000 policyholders of seventeen 3 per cent companies—a very considerable element in every State of the Union.

On any basis of comparison—assets, insurance in force, total income, payments to policyholders—the 3 per cent companies are now paying larger Federal taxes than the 3½ per cent companies, and if the action taken should become final their payments would be so increased as to create a most inequitable situation.

Under the action taken 54 companies, representing 91.1 per cent of the assets of all United States companies, would fare as follows:

Thirty-seven 3½ per cent companies, with $8,567,735,450 assets, would have their taxes increased $5,526,535.60, or 117.6 per cent.

Seventeen 3 per cent companies, with $7,619,081,585 assets, would have their taxes increased $8,330,688.29, or 180.2 per cent.

This letter is put on your desk this morning to assist you in bringing about a rehearing, if you can see your way clear to do so before the opportunity is passed.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES LEE LOOMIS,
Chairman Federal Tax Committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. COOLIDGE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1594) for the relief of Albert Gonzales, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 619) thereon.

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

H. R. 208. An act to authorize transfer of the abandoned Indian-school site and building at Zeba, Mich., to the L'Anse Band of Lake Superior Indians (Rept. No. 620); and

S. 4372. An act for the relief of John E. Click (Rept. No. 621).

Mr. FRAZIER also (for Mr. WHEELER), from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4143) for the relief of the Sherburne Mercantile Co., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 622) thereon.

He also (for Mr. WHEELER), from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8031) to provide for expenses of the Crow Indian Tribal Council and authorized delegates of the tribe, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 623) thereon.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. WATERMAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on the 28th instant that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3095) for the relief of J. J. Bradshaw and Addie C. Bradshaw.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 4528) for the relief of Donald E. Snyder; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 4529) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Lynn Stephenson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

A bill (S. 4530) for the relief of Aileen Random Weber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 4531) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 4532) for the relief of Joseph A. Gleason; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4533) granting a pension to John W. Cullum; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 4534) to provide, in the interests of public health, comfort, morals, safety, and welfare for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in the alleys of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 4535) to consolidate the personnel activities of the United States Government, to provide for the appoint-

ment of an administrator, and a Board of Civil Service Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4536) to amend the agricultural marketing act, approved June 15, 1929; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 4537) granting an increase of pension to Louise Essenmaker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 4538) granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear the case of David A. Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

REVENUE AND TAXATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. HAYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 10236, the revenue and taxation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed:

On page 259, line 24, add after the word "debt" the following: "Nor to deeds which have been executed and deposited in escrow prior to the effective date of this act."

PROPOSED REPEAL OF EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT—EDITORIAL BY OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial released on yesterday, which is to be printed on May 4, 1932, in the Nation, which is edited by Oswald Garrison Villard, formerly a very strong advocate of prohibition, but who now believes that the eighteenth amendment should be repealed.

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

REPEAL THE EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT—THE NATION CELEBRATED LIBERAL JOURNAL EDITED BY OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, DECLARES PROHIBITION A FAILURE THAT CAN ONLY BE RIGHTED BY REPEAL

The Nation has been slow to come to the belief that the repeal of the eighteenth amendment is inevitable and necessary. It is now firmly of the opinion that every effort should be made to remove this issue from the arena of immediate politics by reverting to the condition which existed prior to the adoption of the amendment. While never for a moment, as our readers are well aware, in favor of legislating goodness into people, we have been among those who felt that prohibition, in its first years, bestowed untold benefits upon the working classes and contributed a great deal to the postwar prosperity of the American people by depriving the brewers and distillers of their share of the purchasing power of the Nation and turning it into other and better channels. For this and other reasons we have clung to the hope that there would be a genuine and honest attempt to enforce prohibition and that after it was no longer smart to violate the laws conditions would steadily improve. Here and there we do see signs of improvement, but on the whole, as the years have slipped by, conditions have steadily grown worse, so far as the violation of the law is concerned. The Nation, therefore, is compelled to join those who favor the reamendment of the Constitution, admitting that a false start has been made and the step must be retraced.

We have come to our decision to-day to join the forces urging repeal primarily because of the now entirely demonstrated hopelessness of obtaining enforcement from the Government in this era of a collapsing capitalistic system. At least until the Government is largely made over, there is obviously no chance of an efficient or honest effort to enforce the law or to arouse public opinion to its support. The Government is to-day absorbed in saving itself and will be for a long time to come. Mr. Hoover is plainly as much of a hypocrite in the White House on this issue as were Mr. Coolidge and Mr. Harding. The best that can be said for him is that he, like his predecessors, can not control his own officials; that the Prohibition Service and parts of the judiciary are so corrupt and so false to their oaths of office as to make it impossible for the Chief Executive to obtain their fidelity to their trust. We believe that, given an Executive who deemed law enforcement a prime duty, and a civil service of the honesty and incorruptibility of the Germans before the war and of the British at this hour, it would be possible to secure an enforcement which would practically do the trick. To-day the President keeps up the false pretense of enforcement, as he misrepresented the wet Wickersham report, makes no effort to eliminate politics in the enforcement service, is oblivious to growing corruption, growing defiance of the fundamental law and the Constitution itself. There is no prospect that his successor will do anything else. Under the circumstances, what is there left but to ask for repeal?

We hope that both the parties in their coming conventions will let the world know exactly where they stand, that they will not be content with vague generalities, that they will definitely demand repeal. As our readers will recall, we have for years been urging a popular referendum upon this subject—that referendum which the dry forces now seem graciously disposed to grant. We had envisaged the taking of a poll of all the voters of the country by the Congress; we have believed that it could be authorized at a single session, and that Congress could provide such a nationwide referendum without having to go through the process of amending the Constitution. A Congress which could vote at the outbreak of war for a census of all our youth between certain ages and could create almost overnight the machinery for registering those liable to the draft, could also find a way of achieving a referendum on the prohibition question in a short time, provided that it and the administration seriously undertook to do so. We are now, however, prepared to go farther. We urge that the Congress take advantage of the amending clause of the Constitution, vote a substitute amendment abolishing the eighteenth, and call upon the several States to ratify this change, not by their legislatures but by conventions specially elected for the purpose of passing upon this question and upon no other.

This is a device never yet utilized by the Congress, which has heretofore asked ratification of amendments in the other constitutional way—that is, through ratification by three-quarters of the legislatures of the Union. It has the obvious advantage that delegates to such conventions need only answer one question: "Are you for repeal or are you against it; are you wet or dry?" There could be no equivocating, no hiding behind other issues, for no other could come before these conventions. There would thus be offered to the voters of the States a genuine referendum. If they were opposed to revocation through the recall of the eighteenth amendment, they could make it plain by electing dry delegates to such conventions.

Should the conventions decide in favor of retaining the amendment, there would be nothing left, we admit, but to continue the process of education until reform was achieved. As far back as April 17, 1929, the Nation said editorially that the "existing condition is intolerable," that there must either be enforcement or repeal. Since that time conditions have grown so unspeakably worse that there appears to us to-day to be no alternative to repeal. That does not mean that we are to turn the country over to the saloon or to the liquor traffic. Practically ever since the Nation was founded in 1865 its editors have looked upon the drink traffic as one of the greatest of evils and have hoped for the day when it would be so limited, if not abolished, as to end the horrible waste of human lives and treasure which the old saloon system involved. We shall continue to fight for rigid control and for the reeducation of the country in the direction of temperance. But for the moment this end must be subordinated to the question of repeal, and so must the question of what system shall take the place of the present rule by bootleggers. The one and only thing to-day is so to mass public opinion that the party conventions will act and after them the Congress—both, we hope, before the coming summer ends. The slate must be wiped clean before the new start is made.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF POWER COMPANIES IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by Franklin Hichborn delivered at the public-ownership conference in Los Angeles and published in Public Ownership for January, 1932, entitled "Political Activities of the Power Trust in California."

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

The address is as follows:

From the business revival following the Civil War, down to the present day, California has, with rare intervals of successful resistance by the people, been under the political domination of state-embracing public utilities privately owned. For the quarter of a century prior to the San Francisco earthquake and fire of 1906, this domination was monopolized by the organization popularly known as the Southern Pacific machine. California was then known as the Southern Pacific plantation—and plantation it was, exploited to the last cent on the basis of all the traffic would bear. The stories of the unsuccessful revolts against this railroad domination of State affairs make one of the most amazing chapters of American political history. One of these unsuccessful revolts is made the basis of Frank Norris's novel, the Octopus; a novel as significant could be based on any one of them.

EARLY STRUGGLES WITH UTILITY GIANTS

Slowly, imperceptibly, during the 10 years preceding the San Francisco fire, new utility forces were building up in California. The Western Pacific, fighting to enter the State, found itself blocked by the political power of the Southern Pacific. The telephone, from a toy, became a public-utility giant. Successful experiments with hydroelectric development established the most powerful utility of them all—the power company. But none of these, with the possible exception of the Western Pacific, had become significant in California State politics when the final revolt against corporation political domination of the State—1905–1910—culminated in the defeat of the Southern Pacific machine and the election of HIRAM W. JOHNSON, governor. JOHNSON'S slogan had been "Kick the Southern Pacific out of the State government." The chief objective of the movement was an effective railroad commission, with the power and the will to safeguard the public against railroad extortion. "I trust," said Governor

JOHNSON in his inaugural address, "that none of us will be terrified by the threat of resort to the courts that follows the instant a railroad extortion is resented or attempted to be remedied." Few had any thought that the railroad commission would deal with any other utility than railroads. But even as the railroad commission act was being written, the new utilities, particularly the power companies, were digging in, laying the foundation of the political machine which dominates the State to-day. This present-day machine, now at the full tide of its power, by comparison, makes the Southern Pacific political organization, smashed 20 years ago, look like a plaything of amateurs.

POWER COMPANIES WORM THEIR WAY IN

The group which came into political power with the defeat of the Southern Pacific machine was in the main comparatively young men. JOHNSON himself had just turned 40. It was not long before it became quite apparent that anyone with influence with the new administration could have most lucrative employment with the utility corporations. Particularly was this true of the power companies. Some of the most important of power-company officials in California to-day found their opportunity by a job with the utility, based on their supposed influence with the new reform administration. Under this system the frequency with which railroad commissioners and their subordinates "step up" from the comparatively small pay of the regulating commission to the decidedly good pay of the regulated utilities has led to the dubbing of the commission as a school for the education of utility executives.

GOVERNOR PARDEE'S WARNING

As early as the Pardee administration, 1903–1907, Governor Pardee sounded unheeded warning against letting the water resources of the State fall into the hands of private monopoly. JOHNSON recognized the danger, and in his inaugural address warned against it.

"In the abstract," said the governor, "all agree on the policy of conservation. It is only when we deal with conservation in the concrete that we find opposition to the enforcement of the doctrine enunciated originally by Gifford Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt. Conservation means development, but development and preservation; and it would seem that no argument should be required on the question of preserving, so far as we may, for all of the people those things which naturally belong to all. The great natural wealth of water in this State has been permitted, under our existing laws and lack of system, to be misappropriated and to be held to the great disadvantage of its economical development. The present laws in this respect should be amended. If it can be demonstrated that claims are wrongfully or illegally held, those claims should revert to the State. A rational and equitable code and method of procedure for water conservation and development should be adopted."

CONSERVATION BILLS BEATEN

But nothing was done at the 1911 session. Two years later, however, at the 1913 session, a water conservation bill backed by former Gov. George C. Pardee, Francis J. Heney, and other progressives, was enacted. The utilities held this measure up under the referendum. But at the November election of 1914 the voters upheld this measure at the polls. The water conservation commission which it provided was thereupon appointed. But the purposes of the progressive advocates of this measure have no more been carried out than have the purposes of the progressive advocates of the railroad commission act, now known as the public utilities act. The power companies have kept right on acquiring valuable water rights, which it was the purpose of the 1913 legislature and the Johnson administration to reserve for the use and benefit of all the people.

JOHNSON found himself as powerless to protect the interests of the public against the exploiters of the State's water resources as Pardee had been eight years before. It was not until 10 years after JOHNSON's inaugural (1921) that another attempt was made to save to the people the wealth of their water resources.

LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES TAKES UP THE FIGHT

At the 1921 session of the legislature, a bill sponsored by the League of California Municipalities was introduced by Senator M. B. Johnson. The purpose of this bill was to enable the people to escape the waste, extravagance, and expensive financing of private development of hydroelectric power.

By 1921 the present dominating State machine had become a decided factor in State affairs. The Johnson bill met with the effective opposition of the extensive lobby which the power companies and affiliated corporations maintain at Sacramento. Failing to defeat it in the Senate, where it passed with but 1 vote recorded against it, the power-company group opposed it in the assembly. There they succeeded in defeating it by indirection.

MEASURE KILLED IN COMMITTEE

The assembly committee to which the measure had been referred, neglected to return it to the assembly for action. The measure's proponents thereupon introduced a resolution requiring the committee to report it back. Forty-one votes were required to carry this resolution. The power company lobby's opposition was strong enough to hold the affirmative vote down to 37, 4 less than the number required for the resolution's adoption. The bill was held in committee; the assembly was given no opportunity to pass upon it.

In this way the Johnson bill for the conservation of the State's water resources prevented from becoming law, and the first serious attempt to break the power companies' strangle hold upon California defeated.

California has, however, a remedy for such success of corporation interference with the legislature—the initiative.

After adjournment of the legislature in 1921, representatives of the League of California Municipalities and other groups that had become interested met with representative citizens from all parts of the State to submit a water-conservation and hydroelectric-development measure to the people under the initiative.

THE CALIFORNIA WATER AND POWER ACT

The services of the best engineers, attorneys, and financial experts available were secured. These united in preparing the so-called California water and power act.

In effect this measure applied the Ontario plan of hydroelectric development to California, modified, of course, to conform with local conditions. It provided the necessary machinery for carrying out the work and a practical plan for financing the undertakings under it.

Gifford Pinchot, with a world reputation as an expert in such matters, declared the measure to be the most effective of the kind ever drawn. Congressman William Kent, thoroughly informed on California's water problem, declared himself as enthusiastic as Pinchot regarding it. Informed opinion throughout the State regarded the bill as the most effective that could be drawn. The measure was in due course submitted to the people.

The number of signatures necessary to have the measure put on the ballot for the November, 1922, election was completed in December, 1921.

POWER COMPANIES' TERRIFIC OPPOSITION

Immediately thereafter, as though by magic, organized opposition to the measure developed from one end of the State to the other. Overnight well-financed societies, with thoroughly equipped publicity, engineering, legal, and research departments, sprang into being. These either disclaimed connection with the power companies or were silent when charges of power-company support and affiliation were brought against them.

In the northern part of the State the principal organization was the Greater California League, ostensibly laboring for a greater California. In the south was the People's Economy League, its slogan being "Economy in State affairs." These two organizations, broadly speaking, covered the State. There were, too, numerous local organizations that came into being with the two larger groups. It soon developed that, in spite of their high-sounding names, the one purpose of these organizations was to defeat the water and power act. The campaign which they carried on against it was unparalleled in the history of California politics.

HOW MEASURE WAS DENOUNCED

The measure was denounced as bolshevistic, calculated to bring ruin upon the State; the most extraordinary misrepresentations of its provisions were made; its supporters were ridiculed and vilified; speakers went about the State denouncing it; every mail carried pamphlets opposing it; expensive newspaper advertising was directed against it.

To an extraordinary degree banks, bonding houses, newspapers, chambers of commerce, civic organizations joined in the cry raised by the Greater California League, the People's Economy League, and kindred organizations that the water and power act was bolshevistic, socialistic, would prove ruinous to the State; that it would mean financial and political disaster; that the Ontario project had proved a "flat, abject, and dismal failure"; that California could not afford to embark upon such a desperate enterprise.

Quite as extraordinary as this propaganda from financial and social groups was the opposition of leaders of organizations that had indorsed, or could be expected to indorse, the policy of public ownership of water and power.

The State federation of labor and labor unions generally, for example, indorsed the bill. But a few weeks before the election, P. H. McCarthy, for years State president of the building trades council, came out strongly in opposition to the measure.

San Francisco is committed to the policy of public ownership of such utilities. But San Francisco officials in the pay of the city stumped the State in opposition to the act. Finally, the Civic League of Improvement Clubs, an organization that included most of the civic bodies of San Francisco, declared against it. Social leaders prominent in women's club activities went from social gathering to social gathering urging that the measure be defeated. (Official verification of these and other similar statements will be found in the hearings of the Federal Trade Commission, 70th Cong., 1st sess., S. Doc. 92; exhibits to pts. 10–16, pp. 466–571 and 620.)

WHO FINANCED THE FIGHT?

The political affiliations of some of the leading opponents of the measure also had important bearing upon the campaign.

The president of the Greater California League, for example, was Mr. Eustace Cullinan. Cullinan had for years posed as a leading progressive. He was a political associate of United States Senator HIRAM W. JOHNSON. Cullinan took exceptional care throughout the campaign to emphasize his connection with the JOHNSON group.

The supporters of the measure realized, of course, that such an amazing campaign was costing some one enormously. Suspicion

naturally fell upon the power companies. But opponents in the open either denied that they were being paid by the power companies or were silent under charges that they were being so paid.

On one occasion a speaker for the bill in a small town in the San Joaquin Valley drove an opposition speaker from the hall by showing that this opposition speaker had come to the meeting in a car owned by a power-company official.

At Sacramento, what came very near developing into a fist fight resulted from a charge that the opposition speaker was in power-company pay. Both the San Joaquin Valley and the Sacramento speakers had denied that they were in any way connected with a power company. Later, when exposure of the methods used to defeat the act was made before a committee of the State senate, it was proved conclusively that they both had been well paid by the power companies for their work. The same was discovered to be true of San Francisco officials who had campaigned against the measure.

Eustace Cullinan coolly set forth in the San Jose News of March 20, 1922, that the question of his compensation was not in issue.

Generally speaking, the public was in ignorance that the power companies were financing the extraordinary campaign against the act. Nevertheless, the leaders of the support of the measure, without being able to prove it, were convinced that the power companies were financing the opposition. With these leaders the belief was general that the power companies were not only paying Cullinan and the other speakers for the opposition but even the social leaders who, at parties and receptions, were busy spreading opposition propaganda. But there was no direct evidence of this, and the public was slow to believe such a condition of men and women of the political and social standing of those involved.

POWER COMPANIES FILE NO REPORT

The supporters of the measure recognized that their remedy was in the provision of the California law which required that within 10 days preceding an election there be filed with the secretary of state a complete statement of receipts and itemized expenditures of groups organized to support or oppose initiative measures. With this filing, which the law directed should be made before election, the financing of the Greater California League, People's Economy League, and associated organizations would, as the law contemplated, be made public. The mooted question of whether Mr. Cullinan and his associates were acting without compensation, as some of them claimed, and the rest of them permitted to be inferred, or were paid by the power companies for their stand, would then be answered.

The organization that was supporting the act filed, as the law required, its statement of receipts and expenditures down to the last postage stamp. It had nothing to conceal.

But the Greater California League, the People's Economy League, and the other organizations that were opposing the act made no filing at all. Not an organization or individual connected with the opposition to the measure observed the law. The inference was, of course, that no money had been expended to defeat the act. The supporters of the measure knew, of course, that such a conclusion was absurd. But the general public, not so well informed, inclined to the belief that, after all, the power companies had probably had little to do with the Greater California League and kindred organizations, and that the rumors that P. H. McCarthy, Eustace Cullinan, persons prominent socially, and heads of civic bodies were getting power-company money for their work in opposition to this measure were without foundation.

On election day workers in opposition to the measure appeared at practically every voting place in the State. The supporters of the measure were utterly unable to meet such opposition. The campaign of misrepresentation of the measure, which had been carried on for a year, had raised the doubt in the minds of tens of thousands of voters. The polling-place organization on election day completed the job. The California water and power act was defeated after the most bitterly contested political struggle ever staged in California. And it had been done in such a way that probably not one in five hundred California voters in any way connected the power companies with the campaign for its defeat.

THE STATE SENATE INVESTIGATES

The California Legislature met at Sacramento in January following the November election at which the water and power act had been defeated. State Senator Herbert C. Jones, of San Jose, a progressive State leader, chairman of the senate judiciary committee, the most important committee of the legislature, offered a resolution calling for thorough investigation of all expenditures made in initiative campaigns at the election of the previous November, providing for a committee to conduct the investigation, and authorizing the committee to send for persons and papers, administer oaths, and compel witnesses to testify.

The Jones resolution came as a complete surprise to the members of the power-company lobby. At once they busied themselves against it, but their efforts failed. The resolution was adopted, and the committee appointed. The committee consisted of Senators Herbert C. Jones, chairman; M. B. Harris, of Fresno; H. C. Nelson, of Humboldt; Walter Eden, of Orange; and J. A. Romminger, of Long Beach.

Jones and Harris at the previous election had supported the water and power act; Nelson, Eden, and Romminger had opposed it.

The committee inquired into the expenditures of all the campaign for and against all the measures which were on the ballot at the 1922 election. But the testimony that startled the State, that filled the newspapers with first-page sensations for weeks, came from the lips of the opponents of the water and power act. With the testimony of these opponents of the water and power act spread over the State, it was well understood why they had been backward about making public their statement of receipts and expenditures as the California law required.

WHAT THE INVESTIGATION REVEALED

The committee was fortunate in that Eustace Cullinan was one of the first witnesses called.

Cullinan apparently thought that he had been very clever and wanted the public to know about it. The story he glibly told opened the way for general exposure of the amazing political methods of the organized power companies in California.

Cullinan testified that six power companies of northern California, through the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., had placed in his hands $244,941.04 to be used in the name of the Greater California League in opposition to the water and power act. For his services—over a period of about 11 months—he received $25,000. His chief assistant, William D'Egilbert, who went about the State as a farmer opponent of the measure, received $11,000. (The full text of the report of the California senate committee appears in the hearings of the Federal Trade Commission, 70th Cong., 1st sess., S. Doc. 92; exhibits to pts. 10–16, pp. 419–424.)

The People's Economy League, operating in the same way in southern California under the direction of Herbert L. Cornish, was provided by the power companies with $107,605. Cornish received for the 11 months' campaign $26,000.

As these amazing revelations came from these men the public was on edge to find the compensation that went to labor leader P. H. McCarthy, social leaders, civic leaders, and other prominent persons who had worked against the measure. But nothing concerning their compensation could be drawn from underlings of the type of Cullinan and Cornish.

PAID LABOR LEADER $10,000

Finally, when Wiggerton E. Creed, then president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., was on the stand, to meet a question put to him by the committee, he consulted a list. Later John A. Britton, then general manager of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., testifying, also drew out a list and consulted it. In answer to a question whether the list was the same as that consulted earlier by Creed, Britton answered in the affirmative. The committee examined the list. Heading it was McCarthy's name and his compensation, $10,000; and the names of many others politically and socially prominent who had opposed the measure, with the compensation allowed them. The officials of the power companies had dealt with these people directly and not through the medium of underlings.

McCarthy had been employed less than three months before election "to circulate," as Britton put it, "among his friends and acquaintances, and to educate the labor element that he represented against the act."

CIVIC LEAGUES SUBSIDIZED

Another on Britton's list was George Skaller, executive of the San Francisco Civic League of Improvement Clubs, who had received $6,000—$4,000 for his league and $2,000 for himself—for, as Mr. Britton testified, "services similar to those rendered by Mr. McCarthy."

Of how social leaders were handled, this manager of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. testified that one woman, prominent in club and social circles, had been paid $1,000 because of her "extended acquaintance; familiarity with women's clubs." "It occurred to me," went on Britton, "it would be a good opportunity to get an entrée into these clubs through her, to educate the women, particularly on the viciousness of the act, and she did her duty well, too—I'll tell you she did her duty very well, as the vote shows there."

The executive of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., who gave that testimony, was at the time receiving $24,000 a year for his services. His grateful company soon after increased his annual compensation to $30,000.

In addition to all this, it was shown that the several power companies carried on independent campaigns of their own.

Most of you have, for example, heard of the so-called Murray report, so admirably answered by Sir Adam Beck, in which Murray attempts to make it appear that the Ontario project is a monumental failure.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. joined with the Southern California Edison Co. in paying Murray $5,583.86 to spend a single month in California (October) to campaign against the water and power act. Murray was not much of a success as an orator. He made only one or two speeches and stopped.

Creed stated on the stand that "the Ontario scheme" was so thoroughly exposed without him, that "it" (the Ontario scheme) was "sort of a dead thing." So, according to Creed, Murray was not needed. But he had come to California much heralded as an authority on the Ontario "failure," nevertheless, and received the $5,583.86 which the power companies had, through Creed, agreed to give him for his month's work. I have these statements on Mr. Creed's sworn testimony before the Senate committee. Incidentally, the power companies bought and distributed in California a large number of copies of Murray's now discredited report on the Ontario project.

"MISLEADING AND DECEPTIVE" METHODS

The manner in which the corporations' enormous campaign fund was handled was perhaps the most extraordinary feature of their amazing campaign. It is best described in the words of the report of the Jones committee, which will be found published in full in the Journal of the California Senate for 1923:

"In reference to the methods employed in connection with the campaigns on some of the propositions on the ballot, the committee found they were such as to have the effect of misleading and deceiving the voter. This arises, for example, out of the use of high-sounding, patriotic names under which the real identity of the interested parties and actual proponents or opponents is disguised. While many campaign committees selected names that fairly indicated their purpose, others selected designations which gave the voter no indication as to the real purpose or nature of the organization. The most conspicuous example of the latter was the use of the name 'Greater California League' by the opponents of the water and power act. Such a name readily gives the impression of being a promotion organization which every citizen in California would feel free to join, and having nothing in its name to indicate that it was a political-campaign organization.

"The testimony before the committee showed that the Greater California League was in reality merely the name under which Mr. Eustace Cullinan, employed by the power companies, conducted the campaign against the water and power act in northern California.

"The following extracts from Mr. Cullinan's testimony indicate its actual identity:

"'The Greater California League never had control of the money [campaign contributions] at all. I put that money in the bank as I received it to an account called "The Greater California League," but no one had access to that account except me. * * * It was like most of these political groups or committees * * * never had a meeting. * * * I appointed myself president. I was employed by the power companies, through Mr. John S. Drum * * * and met with myself, after the employment, and organized the Greater California League.'"

OVER A HALF MILLION CAMPAIGN FUND

The committee traced and tagged $501,505.68 which the power companies had expended in this single campaign. But that the committee had failed to get to the bottom of those expenditures was recognized. Testimony brought out before the Federal Trade Commission has thrown more light on that campaign. The California Senate committee, for example, failed to uncover the work of the Hofer publicity agency operating out of Oregon, through which the power groups expend enormous sums for publicity. That particular exposure came through the Federal Power Commission. Also through the Federal Power Commission came exposure of the methods employed by power-company executives to keep the banks in line for power-company policies and purposes.

It seems that the California power companies, in combating the enlightened self-interests of the people of California, had shown themselves so efficient that power companies of Eastern States looked to the California groups for guidance and advice.

HOW THEY LINED UP THE BANKERS

President A. W. Robertson, of the Philadelphia Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., for example, wrote President A. F. Hockenbeamer, of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., as to the handling of banks. President Hockenbeamer graciously replied to President Robertson with illuminating illustrations. President Robertson thought the advice so good that he passed it on to President H. T. Sands, of the National Electric Light Association, commenting that "the method outlined in this correspondence appeals to me as being perhaps the finest way to create and maintain cordial relations with our friends the bankers." President Robertson then goes on to say that "In our Pittsburgh activities we have tried to follow such a scheme, although not on so extensive a scale as carried out in Mr. Hockenbeamer's organization."

From the National Electric Light Association this suggestive correspondence fell into the hands of investigators of the Federal Trade Commission, to be published in a public document. As public property it should do much good.

SAY IT WITH DEPOSITS

President Hockenbeamer's plan for handling the bankers is simplicity itself. In the fine, terse language of the successful business man, President Hockenbeamer told President Robertson that "as a practical incentive to get them [the bankers] to work with us, there is no substitute for deposits."

"A worth-while account," President Hockenbeamer then goes on to say, "has, therefore, been the keynote of our policy, and, to assure its application, it is our practice to regulate balances in country banks from the head office. I may add, in passing, that we have at this time (November 11, 1927) accounts with 230 country banks scattered all over our territory, and while our policy keeps an average of around a million and a half dollars tied up in balances in these country depositories, we believe it is well worth while—first, because the service they render to us as bankers is worth something; and, secondly, because it cements their friendship and cooperation. Incidentally, we require no interest on these deposits."

In the ordinary course of business the interest which the banks could reasonably have paid, as to an ordinary depositor, which unquestionably they would have paid, would have been 2 per cent, or $30,000 a year on the $1,500,000 tied up in those country banks. Such was the price of the "practical incentive" to insure California banks working with California power companies.

During the campaign for the water and power act one of the most difficult features of the opposition to understand was that of the country banks. In replying to the country bankers and similar opponents, Mayor D. W. Carmichael, of Sacramento, for years president of the California Real Estate Association, 12 years president of the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, pointed out:

"Any real-estate man or banker or big business man who fights the water and power act is fighting his own individual future welfare. He is trying to block a program which will give California a fuller development and greater prosperity than the State can have by any other process—a prosperity in which all classes will participate."

President Hockenbeamer in his correspondence with President Robertson on "the practical incentive to get country bankers to work with us" throws considerable light on the opposition of the bankers, which was so puzzling to Mr. Carmichael and other forward-looking Californians. Seeking practical example of how well the "saying it with deposits" works, President Hockenbeamer took as example the bankers' opposition to the water and power act:

"On the whole," writes President Hockenbeamer to President Robertson, "the relations with our bankers are about as cordial as they possibly could be. We have had occasion to test their friendliness on a number of occasions and they have never failed us. During our two big campaigns against the so-called water and power act—a scheme to put California in the power business with an initial issue of half a billion of bonds—they literally sent out hundreds of thousands of personal letters and pieces of literature to their depositors and stockholders, as well as campaigning against the act personally."

BANKERS CAME CHEAPER THAN LABOR LEADERS

The basis of the California power companies' policy with the banks—President Hockenbeamer in his letter to President Robertson states, "My impression is that the other power companies of California follow pretty much the same policies as I have above outlined"—is the depositing of large sums of money for which no interest to depositor is required. As has been seen, on the $1,500,000 used in this way by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., reasonable return to the company would have been $30,000 a year, or on the average of $130.80 to each bank. For three months each bank profited under this "practical incentive to work with the power companies" on the average $32.61.

When, in their campaign against the water and power act, the power companies wanted the assistance of a prominent labor leader for three months they paid P. H. McCarthy $10,000. Apparently bankers come very much cheaper than labor leaders.

President Hockenbeamer went to some pains to prevent his plan for handling country bankers falling into profane, worldly hands. "We have," wrote President Hockenbeamer to President Robertson, "already been suspected of undue connivance with bankers."

President Hockenbeamer is quite right. For long there has been that suspicion out here in California.

HUMBLE GRATITUDE OF THE BANKERS

I would that time permitted me to present the expressions of gratitude from the 230 banks for those free deposits upon which in the ordinary course of business at 2 per cent they would have paid $32.61 a quarter. A few samples will suffice:

First National Bank of Oroville: "While we appreciate the action of your executive committee and interpret its action that our efforts of handling the account in a manner to merit your approval have been successful, your kind words go further. They create an increased desire for opportunity to make our service of great value to you."

We have heard of a type of men, otherwise unpleasant, who are kind to their wives. There is some good in everything. Power companies are kind to little banks.

Bank of Italy, Rideou-Smith Branch, Oroville: "We very muchly appreciate the kindly thoughts expressed by you, for it is very pleasant to know that you are one of our many satisfied customers.

"Little expressions of appreciation and kindness are always welcome and make 'the long road' more easy to travel."

Who would have thought that $32.61 a quarter would go so far in "making the long road more easy to travel" for a grateful bank?

Mercantile Trust Co., Oakland, Calif.: "We appreciate the very attractive account which you have carried with us and have endeavored at all times to give a character of service which would justify a continuance of the same. It is a satisfaction to the writer that he has been able to reciprocate recently in a rather definite way as is already known by your Mr. Newbert and Mr. Furniss of your East Bay offices."

Mercantile Trust Co., Petaluma: "We assure you we appreciate this courtesy and will endeavor at all times to render you the best of service. Kindly feel free to command us at any time in any way we can be of assistance to your association."

And so on, and so on, through many pages of sloppy, mushy gratitude for that $32.61 free interest a quarter. It all goes to show how very "practical" and "incentive" $32.61 a quarter, $10.87 a month, can be made to be when put in the right place.

Nor have the state-wide campaigns of the power companies been confined to heading off public ownership. Their successful campaigns for control of the legislature, to defeat men for re-election who yield neither to persuasion nor "practical incentive," make a story in themselves. Their state-wide campaigns in matters of taxation have been astonishingly successful. The following from a resolution introduced by State Senator Herbert C. Jones (see Senate Journal for April 22, 1931, pp. 13–14) indicates something of the fruits of the propaganda on the tax problem:

"Whereas the report of the California Tax Commission, 1927–28, sets forth that on the basis of the 1.73 ad valorem rate levied against general property the gas and electric companies would have been paying a 10.25 per cent gross income tax instead of the 7.5 per cent tax actually paid, the difference in the State revenues actually collected under the lower rate and those that would have been collected under the higher rate being $10,052,593 for the years 1929–30, etc."

POLITICALLY INTRENCHED IN LEGISLATURE

So well intrenched were the power companies and their political allies at Sacramento at the last legislative session, and so effective has been their state-wide propaganda against any increase in the taxation of banks and utility companies, that nothing was done to compel these large property-owning groups to undertake their proportionate share of the tax burden. Conservative estimates place the amount of State taxes which the power companies and their political allies escaped during the last biennium and will escape during the present biennium at above $42,000,000.

FIGHTING MUNICIPAL, DISTRICT, AND LOCAL PROJECTS

Nor have the political activities of these corporations been confined to state-wide campaigns. We find them meddling politically in practically every community. At Sacramento they oppose bond issues to bring pure water to that city. At San Francisco they interfere with the Hetch Hetchy project; at Modesto they harass the Don Pedro development as they harass the department of power here at Los Angeles. Records on file at the railroad commission show the Los Angeles Gas & Electric Co.'s fight against the municipal power bureau has, in efforts to defeat bond issues for municipal power development, totaled expenditures of $186,163.49 from this company alone. In like endeavor to handicap Los Angeles municipal power development, the Southern California Edison Co. has expended enormous amounts. At the 1927 bond election alone this Edison Co., according to the railroad commission, spent $40,277.38 to defeat the bonds. At that election the Los Angeles Gas Co. expended an additional $51,297.93. These staggering figures relate to moneys directly expended and do not include the time of regular employees spent in electioneering.

The demoralizing effect of all this upon the State and upon the political subdivisions of the State can scarcely be overestimated. Most seriously is it reflected in the State legislature. There the successful opposition to able and public-spirited men and the support of the weak and docile by the power companies and their political allies has reduced the legislative body to a condition where it has become little more than a rubber stamp for the allied interests, of which the power companies have become by far the most potent group.

Next winter the legislature will be called into extra session to do two things that will affect every man, woman, and child in California above the pauper stage:

(1) Rubber stamp a tax plan which is being worked out by the tax experts of power companies, banks, and railroads to meet the threatened deficit in the State treasury due to the failure of large taxpaying groups to bear their proportionate share of the tax burden.

(2) Rubber stamp a plan of water development.

Mr. Bartlett has shown you how, 21 years ago, San Francisco voted its first bonds to bring water from Hetch Hetchy to San Francisco (in a paper on Municipal Ownership in and Around San Francisco, to be published later). During 18 years of that period, James Rolph, jr., the same James Rolph, jr., who is now Governor of California, was mayor of San Francisco. The Hetch Hetchy water development has been carried on almost wholly during continuous Rolph administrations. And not one drop of Hetch Hetchy water has flowed into San Francisco water mains.

DEMORALIZING AND DESPOILING THE STATE

On the other hand, during the Rolph municipal administration, hydroelectric power was brought, at the expense of the people of San Francisco, from the Hetch Hetchy development to a point several miles outside of San Francisco. There that power could be turned into the ground or put on the wires of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. It was put on the wires of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. It is still there.

The mayor under whom this was done has by minority vote of the people of this State become Governor of California. Our state-wide elections are decided at the August primaries; the November election on state-wide candidates is a mere form.

Of the 58 counties of the State, Rolph at those August primaries carried 14 and lost 44. Of the 2,187,484 voters registered for those primaries, he received the votes of 377,390, or 17 per cent. Of the 1,301,847 voters eligible to vote at the Republican primaries, Rolph received the votes of 28 per cent. Of the 1,044,051 Republicans who voted at the August primaries, 36 per cent voted for Rolph; nearly 63 per cent voted against him. Rolph, with his 17 per cent of the registered electors, 28 per cent of the vote of the registered Republican electors, 36 per cent of the vote of the Republican electors who voted, secured the Republican nomination for governor, which here in California is equivalent to election.

This minority governor has appointed a commission to draft legislation for disposition of California's priceless water resources. This Rolph commission, numbering several hundred persons, takes in former governors, mayors of cities, Members of Congress, county supervisors, State bar, State press, and what not, in an advisory capacity. Among these advisors are to be noted former labor leader, P. H. McCarthy, whose $10,000 power-company fee in the water and power controversy has been referred to, and President A. F. Hockenbeamer, who as a successful educator in the art of handling bankers has been dwelt upon.

The power companies are out to use the State in a large way in the matter of water development, as they have in the Hetch Hetchy development used San Francisco in a comparatively small way. They propose to take any power which the people of California may develop to be sold back to the people of California at monopoly rates. They could not get that power under the water and power act. They fought and defeated the water and power act. California as a State to-day is unquestionably in danger of suffering in her water development what San Francisco as a city has suffered.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY THEODORE ROOSEVELT, GOVERNOR GENERAL OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the RECORD the inaugural address of Gov. Gen. Theodore Roosevelt at Manila, February 29, 1932.

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

Ladies and gentlemen, it is with a profound sense of the responsibility and importance of the tasks that lie before me that I greet you here to-day. We know one another only slightly, but I hope as time passes that the bonds of common service will strengthen between us, and that from them will grow an enduring respect and friendship.

Fine words and phrases are easy to coin. Fine deeds are infinitely more difficult of accomplishment. I shall ask you to judge what I may say to-day, therefore, not in terms of literary style but by my acts in the future.

The position of governor general to which I have been named, is one that I consider as honorable as any within the gift of the American people. It is in my conception administrative, and the political relationships between the Philippine Islands and the United States do not come within its scope. These are matters to be decided by the President and the United States Congress, in consultation with the representatives of the Filipino people.

Being administrative, the service I can render you will depend largely on the confidence and comprehension that exists between us. I, for my part, shall do my best to work with the citizens of the islands in carrying out the constructive policies that they have initiated and are developing.

We are fortunate now in having as head of the Nation a President of exceptionally wide experience. He has as intimate a knowledge of the East, its peoples, and its problems, as any other Chief Executive the Nation has had. He knows the Orient, not from having read of it in books or from having passed through it as a tourist, but from having worked there many years and having made many close friends there. You can count on his sympathy and comprehension.

The United States in the past has sent its best to the islands. Distinguished administrators from President Taft to Governor General Davis have labored here and have treasured the memories of their work with you among the proudest recollections of their lives. At their side have worked many other Americans, from able educators and scientists to engineers and accountants. Though it would be idle to say they have been right in every action, for that would not be human, we can say that they have spent themselves freely, with rare judgment and ability, and with no other thought than aiding your citizens. It has been my pleasure to know personally many of these gentlemen. It will be my endeavor to guide myself in such fashion as to live up to the ideal of service to the Filipino people that they have set. Your last Governor General, Mr. Davis, I saw repeatedly after his return to the United States, where we discussed at length policies and plans, in order that there might be no lack of continuity in the constructive work under way in the islands.

For years the Philippine Islands and the Filipino people have interested me greatly. It has been my privilege at various times to meet some of your distinguished citizens, and I have not merely studied the material condition of the islands but also your history and culture. I speak with knowledge, therefore, when I say that I have a great respect for the Filipino people, their achievements, character, and valor. Their character to me is epitomized in the aspirations and unselfish devotion of José Rizal, who combined lofty idealism, rare abilities, and practical patriotism.

You should justly be proud of your record. No part of the civilized globe has seen such progress during the last 30 years as these islands. Where one school flourished 30 years ago there are hundreds now, and the students have increased proportionately. Where there were but a few roads, many of which were impassable during the rainy season, the islands are now linked with as fine a system of communication as any country in the Tropics. The 300 miles of first-class thoroughfares in 1907 have grown to

approximately 4,000 to-day. There are sanitary water systems in great centers where none were before. There are railroads, telephones, telegraph, and a dependable postal service. The young men and women at the insular universities are numbered by the thousands, and Filipinos of ability are making their mark in the higher branches of learning, scientific and theoretical, in the centers of learning all over the world. Other endeavors in health, agriculture, and economics have kept pace. A solid foundation has been laid on which to build the future happiness, both moral and material, of your people.

This has been accomplished in but one way—by teamwork. It is this that I shall strive to attain in my administration. Without it nothing can be done. With it everything is possible. I have had the pleasure of discussing with the members of your delegation in the United States the constructive internal policies that you are developing, and I feel confident that together we can make notable progress toward their realization.

All countries are in their essence the average of their citizens. A small group of brilliant men have never made any land permanently great. The well-being, moral stamina, and education of the rank and file of its citizens are what count most in every country.

There are three foundation stones on which these rest. The first of these is health. Without it there is no progress. A man shaking with fever, coughing from tuberculosis, or weak from lack of proper food and from intestinal parasites can not work or raise a proper family. A little child when undernourished can not avail himself fully of the opportunities offered by the school and falls the prey to any disease that may come. Therefore the health service of a nation is all-important and must be considered as one of the underlying policies to be developed.

The second is a sound system of laws, administered without fear or favor, laws based upon the rights of man, which deal equal justice to rich and poor. Every member of the community must enjoy the "right to live by no man's leave underneath the law." On such a system of laws administered by righteous judges, who consider neither private interest nor political advantage, is based personal liberty, the most treasured of human possessions. Where such a judicial system is lacking no form of government can achieve its end.

There are many lands throughout the world where the governments care nothing for the welfare of the poor and where the laws are interpreted by fear or favor. There the people have no protection and no personal liberty. There the rich arbitrarily take the poor man's carabao. When he goes to bed at night he never knows what outrage on his family or property may be perpetrated before morning dawns.

The American and Filipino peoples believe that the poor should be protected. Those autocratic governments do not recognize that the poor have rights. We believe that criticism of the Government is the right of any citizen and breeds reform and progress. They clap into prison, exile, or shoot anyone who protests an abuse. Their people have no conception of the personal liberty that is enjoyed by the humblest of the citizens here or in the United States.

A judicial system which guarantees true personal liberty stands with health in its importance to a people.

Third, and as vital as the two former, is education—education not for the few but for the many, education of a type that builds both morally and intellectually. The idea we are striving to realize has as its basis a school system where all children may have the opportunity for elementary education. That education should include practical or vocational training, as well as theoretical instruction. It should be of such a sort as to give to the children, when they leave school, the means whereby they can make for themselves happy, worth-while lives. It should give them aspirations for better things, and a keen interest in the affairs of their community, not merely in such as may affect them directly, but also in all affairs that touch on the well-being of their fellow citizens. It should be the root from which grows the tree of public opinion, on which all commonwealths depend for their success.

In all of these major policies I know that the Filipino people have made great strides. In all it will be my policy to work with you in every fashion that lies within my power, for I believe that the well-being of the average Filipino depends on them.

Our goal in agriculture and industrial development must be the well-being of the average Filipino. We must foster and protect the small farmer and the little business man, for they are the backbone of a nation.

The measure of strength of a country is not a few great estates, but a multitude of prosperous small independent holdings. A hundred little farm owners are far more valuable to a nation than one large plantation owner. I shall back to the limit the endeavors you have undertaken to secure for the little farmer clear title to his land, and to fence him with safeguards so that he may not be robbed thereof. We should plan in addition to increase the number of small holdings by pressing your policy of homesteading and by such other means as may be practical.

Through the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Commerce and other governmental organizations, we should continue to devise new means of bringing to the small farmer knowledge and aid. The islands' resources should be developed for the benefit of the Filipino people, and new policies should be judged primarily from this standpoint.

Above all, we should work to make the islands as close to self-sufficient agriculturally and industrially as circumstances permit. Gifted by nature with a diverse climate, a fertile soil, and great natural wealth, there is no reason why the islands should not grow the necessities of life for their own people. It is necessary that they should do so in order to form the proper economic basis for what the future holds. Our constant endeavor should be directed toward bringing this to pass.

All the work I have outlined takes money, and the islands, like the rest of the world, find themselves in straitened circumstances financially, due to the economic crisis in which all nations are engulfed. That means that if we are to maintain the necessary Government services we must exercise the strictest economy. Expenses that in better times might have been justified can not now be incurred. Above all, we must work for governmental efficiency, for that is the means whereby all nations can make the greatest practical economies. We must press the campaign you have initiated to eliminate inefficiency, duplication, or graft wherever they may be found, in order that the moneys saved thereby may be expended for the benefit of the average Filipino. Let us work together to make the Filipino government a model of efficiency for the rest of the world.

Important as material well-being is, it is not all, for things of the spirit are as important as things of the body. "Where there is no vision the people perish." At the same time that we are building economically we should develop and foster the cultural side. The Philippine Islands have a culture, deep-rooted in the past, a culture that springs from the songs and sayings of the people, as do all true cultures. It has flowered in the philosophical writings and poems of Rizal, in the paintings of Luna and Hidalgo, the statues of Tolentino, the music of countless singers and composers, and the achievements in different branches of learning of many Filipino men and women. It finds its natural center around the universities on the islands. It is a distinctive culture but broad as well, assimilating, as all true cultures should, what is best in the rest of the world—for genius knows no national boundary lines.

To me the Philippines of the future are an inspiring picture. They can be and should be a great center in tropical Asia, a center from which the surrounding countries can draw example and aid. I have spoken of health. Tropical diseases and health problems have not been studied as thoroughly as those of the colder climates. There is need that they should be. Here in the islands is already an excellent health service. It should grow and expand in the future until it serves not merely the islands, but by example the neighboring countries as well. Here might well be the recognized Asiatic school of tropical medicine, to which young men from other parts of the Orient come to study, and which in turn sends out its trained professors to teach other nations.

The same should hold true in agriculture, which is the major industry of the hotter climates. The Philippine Islands should be the Asiatic center of scientific tropical agriculture, where methods, plants, and diseases are studied, and whose experts are recognized the world over.

The advance of a people is indicated by the position that women hold in the community. The islands are a notable illustration of this truth. It is a splendid augury for the future to see the considerable part the women of the Philippines play in community affairs and social relationships.

This has brought its logical result—social-welfare work. History shows that this necessary part of community endeavor is generally attributable to the efforts of women. The government can do much, but the government itself can not do all. An important factor in building up any country is the action of its citizens to one another in their private capacity, their willingness to help one another. The individual who says he is not his brother's keeper and remains callously indifferent to the hardships and sufferings of his neighbors, is unworthy of citizenship. The Filipino people are known for their kind-heartedness and hospitality, and have undertaken successfully much work of this nature. There is room for still further effort, for welfare work is capable of infinite expansion. Through private organizations of the citizens of the islands we should strive to reach into every little home and better the conditions of life of mother and child.

My success in aiding you in the development of these policies will depend largely on the mutual understanding we can develop. I shall seek at all times the advice and counsel of the leaders, both political and intellectual. I shall welcome at all times the frank expression of constructive opinion and suggestions of any citizen. I am confident I shall obtain it. I trust I may obtain friendship as well.

At this moment it would be clearly inopportune for me to outline to you in detail any plans or thoughts that are in my mind. Though I have talked with many people and have read many books on conditions here, I have not seen those conditions myself, and I believe personal inspection is necessary to form sound conclusions. My plan is to start at once to familiarize myself with the islands and the problems. When that is done, and not until it is done, will I attempt to deal specifically with problems.

This is a most solemn moment in my life. Not only have I always had an abiding interest in the Filipino people, but the same held true of my father. When Governor of New York, he wrote to his intimate friend Senator Lodge that he did not wish to be a candidate for the Vice Presidency of the United States because his ambition was to be Governor General of the Philippines. I did not take the oath of office in the United States because I wanted to take it here before all of you. The Bible on which I am taking it is the one used by my father when he was sworn in as Governor of New York and afterwards as President of

the United States. It is the same that I used to take the oath of office as Governor of Porto Rico. I am not taking this oath to-day merely with my lips.

ERADICATION OF GRASSHOPPER PLAGUE

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 149) making funds available for grasshopper control.

Mr. REED. May the joint resolution be reported? Is it on the calendar?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It is on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the joint resolution be reported.

The Chief Clerk read the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 149) making funds available for grasshopper control, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That for the application of such methods of control of grasshoppers as, in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture, may be necessary, in cooperation with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations, or individuals as the Secretary may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing, rent outside of the District of Columbia, and for other expenses, the sum of $1,450,000 is hereby appropriated, to be immediately available and to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture, of which sum not to exceed $8,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That except for general administration and supervision, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, expenditures under this appropriation shall be limited to the purchase and transportation of poisoned bait, or materials for its manufacture, and that the cooperating States shall be responsible for the local distribution and utilization of such bait, including full labor costs: *Provided further*, That, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for grasshopper control in any State until such State has provided the necessary organization for the cooperation herein indicated: *And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or destroyed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BINGHAM. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BINGHAM. In case this joint resolution should be passed, what would be its effect on the appropriation already provided for in the agricultural appropriation bill which has been reported out of conference?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. That could only be corrected by the adoption of a concurrent resolution after the passage of the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask the Senator from Minnesota if it is his intention, in case the joint resolution shall pass, to present a concurrent resolution which will take out of the agricultural appropriation bill the identical item?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CURTAILMENT OF LARGE INCOMES

Mr. LONG. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 204.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the resolution be reported for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 204), submitted by Mr. LONG on the 21st instant, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States, and that it accordingly does instruct the Senate Finance Committee, that it reform the revenue act now under consideration (H. R. 10236) so that no person shall have an annual income in excess of $1,000,000, and so that no person during his or her lifetime shall receive by gifts, inheritances, or other bequests more than $5,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Louisiana how it is proposed to prevent persons from having incomes in excess of $1,000,000, and how it is proposed that inheritances shall be limited to $5,000,000?

Mr. LONG. The resolution proposes that no man shall be permitted to earn an annual income of more than $1,000,000 a year, exclusive of taxes, and no man shall inherit legacies or receive gifts during his lifetime, exclusive of taxes, in excess of $5,000,000. It is proposed to put a limit on swollen fortunes in the United States.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The idea is to take in the form of taxes all incomes in excess of $1,000,000, and to take in the form of inheritance taxes all amounts bequeathed in excess of $5,000,000?

Mr. LONG. All amounts in excess of $5,000,000; that is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I shall not object to the consideration of the resolution, but I do not give it my support.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I suggest that if the Finance Committee keeps on as it is going, there is no possibility of anybody having an income of anything like a million dollars, and there is not going to be enough left for anybody to inherit anything like $5,000,000. So I think the Senator's apprehensions are almost groundless.

Mr. LONG. Then, the Senator will vote for my resolution?

Mr. REED. No; I think the resolution ought to be sent to the Committee on Finance first, and, if consent shall be given for its immediate consideration, I shall move that it be referred to the Finance Committee.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, this is the first notice I have had of the resolution. I wonder if the Senator will permit the resolution to go over a day so that we may have time to study its effect?

Mr. LONG. My only purpose in calling it up was that we might instruct the Finance Committee before it reports the pending tax bill.

Mr. BORAH. I shall not ask that the resolution go over if the Senator desires to urge it, because it is simply an instruction to the Finance Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, I have never seen the resolution and have never read it. I understand it instructs the Finance Committee along certain lines.

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; the Senate has been doing that.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. And the resolution proposes to direct the committee to report favorably on the proposal?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I can not agree to do that, and I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California objects.

Mr. LONG. Then, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 204 at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana, which is not debatable.

Mr. LONG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered, and the motion was rejected.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar is in order. The Secretary will state the first bill on the calendar.

The bill (S. 88) to authorize the Postmaster General to investigate the conditions of the lease of the post-office garage in Boston, Mass., and to readjust the terms thereof was announced as first in order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 268) to amend subdivision (c) of section 4 of the immigration act of 1924, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1663) to prohibit the sending of unsolicited merchandise through the mails was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2642) to establish a commission to be known as a commission on a national museum of engineering and industry was announced as next in order.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I ask that this bill go over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) authorizing the President to reorganize the executive agencies of the Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. BRATTON. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1856) to provide for the relief of farmers in any State by the making of loans to drainage districts, levee districts, levee and drainage districts, irrigation, and/or similar districts other than Federal reclamation projects, or to counties, boards of supervisors, and/or other political subdivisions and legal entities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ROSCOE MEADOWS

The bill (S. 2375) for the relief of Roscoe Meadows was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will withhold his objection for a moment, I should like to explain that for several weeks I have been objecting to that bill, but I have only recently had it made clear to me that my understanding of it was wrong. Meadows was a chaplain in the Navy during the World War, with a sort of temporary-regular status. Since the war it has been ruled by the Navy Department that he was not a regular officer and not entitled to the benefits accruing to a regular officer. The Veterans' Administration has ruled that he was not a temporary officer and is not entitled to any benefits from them. So he is left hanging in the air between the two organizations, getting relief from nobody, and he needs relief.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REED. I gladly yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What is the recommendation of the department touching the bill?

Mr. REED. I do not know, but I think it is favorable. I can give the Senator the information in a moment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I see that the Director of the Veterans' Bureau says on page 2 of the report on the bill:

> It is believed that the committee will be able to judge for itself from the above report the merits of the bill and the propriety of its passage.

And on page 4 of the report I find this statement, quoting the message sent to the Senate by Acting Secretary Jahncke:

> Inasmuch as this bill does not involve any expenditure of funds under the Navy Department, the Navy Department refrains from further comment or recommendation.

Mr. REED. The Navy Department has held that Meadows was not a regular Navy officer, and that is in line with its report. The Comptroller General has held that if he was anything he was a regular, and therefore he is not entitled to the relief that an emergency officer would receive.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KING. Is it the purpose to give him the benefit of retirement?

Mr. REED. I am not sure as to that; he might receive the benefit of the emergency officers' retirement act.

Mr. KING. Then, for the present, I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2914) to authorize appropriations to pay in part the liability of the United States to the Indian pueblos herein named, under the terms of the act of June 7, 1924, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 166) to print the pamphlets entitled "Draft of Mooney-Billings Report" and "Appendix Containing Official Documents," was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2494) to amend section 4 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, passed and approved March 4, 1925, relating to the compensation of Members and Delegates to Congress, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2495) to repeal section 17 of the act passed and approved July 28, 1866, relating to mileage of Members of Congress, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3051) to reinstate Lawrence L. Myatt and Miller S. Burgin as midshipmen in the United States Naval Academy was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 276) for the construction and equipment of a hospital on Crow Indian Reservation was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2987) providing for the construction and equipment of a hospital upon the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 51) to authorize the building up of the United States Navy to the strength permitted by the Washington and London naval treaties was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE and Mr. KING asked that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS RECOMMITTED TO COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The bill (S. 1835) granting disability allowance to Harvey Wilson, which had been reported adversely from the Committee on Finance, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. One moment, Mr. President. This bill, being Order of Business No. 329, and also Orders of Business Nos. 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, and 414, were reported adversely. Owing to my absence, I was unable to appear before the committee in an attempt to justify the bills, and, if it is agreeable, I should like to have those several bills recommitted to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the several bills referred to by the Senator from California are recommitted to the Committee on Finance.

The bills referred to, recommitted to the Committee on Finance, are as follows:

S. 1835. A bill granting disability allowance to Harvey Wilson;

S. 1836. A bill for the relief of William D. Barbee;

S. 1879. A bill granting compensation to Willard Henry Amlaw;

S. 1881. A bill authorizing the payment of war-risk insurance to Laura E. De Armoun;

S. 1884. A bill granting disability allowance to Dan V. Smith;

S. 1886. A bill granting an increase of compensation to Addie Weeks; and

S. 2190. A bill to amend section 300 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3323) to provide funds for cooperation with the school district at Nespelem, Wash., in the construction of a public-school building to be available to Indian children of the Colville Indian Reservation was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

The bill (S. 3377) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3377 notwithstanding the objection, in order that we may start the debate on the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

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

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Connecticut whether his motion has the approval of the members of the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NORRIS. The motion is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. May I inquire if the Senator from Connecticut makes this motion with the approval of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs?

Mr. NORRIS. Again I make the point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the motion of the Senator from Connecticut carries and we proceed to the consideration of this measure, will we be under a rule of limited debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; unlimited debate.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut. [Putting the question.] The Chair is unable to decide.

Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. ASHURST called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. I do not know how he would vote on this question. Therefore I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. Being unable to secure a transfer, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DICKINSON (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. Not being able to secure a transfer, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN]. Not knowing how he would vote, I shall have to withdraw my vote. If at liberty to vote I should let my vote in the negative stand.

Mr. BULKLEY (after having voted in the negative). Has the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. BULKLEY. Not knowing how he would vote, I withdraw my vote on account of my general pair with that Senator.

Mr. BINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. In his absence, I transfer that pair to my colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT], and will let my vote stand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). The present occupant of the chair desires to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. HEBERT] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COHEN];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK];

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]; and

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] are necessarily detained from the Senate on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—39

Ashurst	Connally	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.
Austin	Coolidge	Logan	Robinson, Ind.
Bankhead	Costigan	McGill	Schall
Bingham	Cutting	McKellar	Sheppard
Bratton	Dale	Metcalf	Townsend
Broussard	Hale	Morrison	Trammell
Bulow	Harrison	Moses	Tydings
Byrnes	Hawes	Neely	Wagner
Capper	Hayden	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Howell	Reed	

NAYS—29

Blaine	Frazier	Long	Shortridge
Borah	Goldsborough	McNary	Smoot
Brookhart	Gore	Norbeck	Steiwer
Copeland	Hatfield	Norris	Vandenberg
Couzens	Hull	Nye	White
Davis	Johnson	Oddie	
Dill	Kean	Patterson	
Fess	La Follette	Shipstead	

NOT VOTING—28

Bailey	Dickinson	Jones	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Fletcher	Keyes	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	George	King	Walcott
Black	Glass	Lewis	Walsh, Mont.
Bulkley	Glenn	Smith	Waterman
Carey	Hastings	Stephens	Watson
Cohen	Hebert	Swanson	Wheeler

So, Mr. BINGHAM's motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3377) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs with an amendment.

CONDITIONS IN RUSSIA

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as the motion to take up the Philippine independence bill was made, I presume, without any hope that we would pass the bill between now and 2 o'clock, I want to take a little time on another matter, if it will not be disagreeable to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, in reply to what the Senator has said, I may state that the idea was that there were certain Senators who have quite a little in their systems in opposition to the bill, and I hoped that they might have the opportunity to get some of that opposition out of their systems this morning, so that we might approach the time when we would actually get the bill passed.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. The pending bill has been placed on the legislative program, I think being made the fifth item, and I realize that there were some votes against taking it up at this time because Senators did not desire to interfere with the calendar to-day. But I really think that possibly we might get a vote on the bill to-day.

Mr. BORAH. I am very much in favor of the independence of the Philippines, but there are a great many things in this bill which will take some time.

Mr. PITTMAN. Personally I am not opposed to having the bill taken up at this time, because it is a matter which will be debated, and the quicker we can get a number of the measures off the calendar which are now to be found on it the more certain it will be that we shall not be here all summer.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho will yield, lest the Senator be unduly discouraged by the suggestion that we give way to the Philippine discussion, I may suggest that it will take at least half an hour for the clerk to read the substitute which is lying on the desk, and which I shall submit as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. BORAH. I have seen the substitute. It will take more time than the reading.

Mr. BINGHAM. This is as good a time as any for reading the substitute.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I desire also to indicate that I have a substitute which I shall offer in lieu of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, as well as the pending bill.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I presumed there were certain things lying back of the pending bill on the calendar which had a great deal to do with the motion to take the Philippine bill up at this time.

I hold in my hand an address made by Charles A. Gill, who is superintendent of motive power of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. Mr. Gill has spent some months in Russia. Certain self-styled patriotic societies are now engaged in warning the American people of the terrific conditions which prevail in Russia and the imminence of this country being taken possession of by the communists; therefore, I think it might be well to have the view of an intelligent and dispassionate, honest observer of the situation in that country. Mr. Gill says:

I have had the opportunity to cover approximately 25,000 miles of the territory between Archangel and the Black Sea and from the western border of Russia extending through Moscow to the Ural Mountains. Within this territory there are approximately 40 large cities, including Moscow, Leningrad, Vologda, Yaroslavl, Voronezh, Poltava, Odessa, Kiev, Kharkov, Rostov, Minsk, Dnepropetrovsk, Alexandrov, Kazan, and many rural districts. I have, therefore, had an unusual opportunity to witness personally the true situation of the country as a whole.

Speaking then of the labor situation, he said:

Labor turnover continues to be a great problem, as the average Russian desires to travel and see what is going on in the various parts of his country. Increased wages and more attractive living conditions are helping to solve this problem. However, labor turnover in some of the railroad shops with which I was connected was so great that it was necessary to offer premiums and other inducements to keep the men from leaving. We had a total of 200,000 men, divided between the back shops and roundhouses, and a total of over 1,084,000 men in all branches of railroad service, which represents one of the largest organizations in Russia. As I was closely connected with the details of the various departments, as well as with other American engineers who handled different departmental work from time to time, I can freely declare that there was absolutely no evidence of forced labor. From my general observations of labor conditions in the Soviet Union I can state that while in some respects these conditions differ from those in the United States the Russian worker is free at all times to quit his job and apply elsewhere for work.

Speaking of the trade situation, he said, as appears on page 7 of his address:

The purchase of a large amount of machine-tool equipment is necessary to expedite such a large building program, and it would seem to me our American manufacturers would be interested in securing their proportion of this business. In order to make this statement clear I would like to quote some figures issued by the British machine-tool manufacturers covering machine-tool exports to Russia:

	Tons	Value
1929	562	$499,180
1930	1,252	1,079,450
1931 (9 months)	3,993	3,136,800

Orders placed in Germany by the Soviet Union during 1931, largely for machinery and equipment, amounted to $219,184,000, as compared with $135,060,000 in 1930, or a gain of 62 per cent. This increase was the result of better trade relations and a credit agreement between the two countries.

Reports published by the Amtorg Trading Corporation indicate that there is a continual falling off of Soviet purchases on the American market, due largely to the fact that more favorable terms can be secured elsewhere. During my stay in Russia I had the pleasure of recommending several million dollars' worth of machine tools for use in the various railroad shops. On the strength of my recommendations a commission visited the United States during the past year with authority to purchase this machinery, but due to the inability of American manufacturers to extend suitable credit to the Russians the business was tranferred to Germany and other countries. It is hard to understand such an attitude, in view of the fact that since 1923 the Soviet Government has purchased in America goods totaling over $600,000,000, and has never failed to meet its obligations when payment came due.

Mr. President, I have made some investigation with reference to trade between the people of our country and Russia since 1923. I have been unable to find where there was a single default in the trade agreements of Russia with reference to those in this country who were selling goods to Russia. I am advised that the agreements have been kept meticulously, and in no instance has there been complaint upon the part of our people.

Mr. Robert P. Lamont, jr., son of the United States Secretary of Commerce, has been for some time in Russia investigating conditions particularly with reference to the cattle-raising industry. In an interview published in the New York Times a few days ago he said:

LAMONT'S SON ASKS TRADE WITH RUSSIA—HE SAYS IN MOSCOW THAT THE COUNTRY OFFERS AMERICANS A VAST FOREIGN MARKET—SOVIET BACKS TWO EX-FOES—ACADEMIES ARE REPRIMANDED FOR DISMISSING PROFESSORS WHO ONCE OPPOSED THE RÉGIME

Moscow, April 20.—A conviction that American officials and business men should change their policy toward commerce with Soviet Russia was expressed to-day by Robert P. Lamont, jr., son of the United States Secretary of Commerce, after surveying the country's cattle-raising industry at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

The young man, who came to Russia about a month ago from his 15,000-acre ranch in Colorado, made a lengthy report on cattle-raising conditions as he saw them, with specific recommendations of methods necessary for development of the industry. But he

said that the question of whether he would undertake to direct it would not be discussed, if at all, until he returned to the United States.

The administration of the soviet state's large cattle farms was insufficiently trained in modern ranching methods, he said. He indicated that he had recommended the employment of American livestock experts to take charge of the industry, or the training of a number of soviet ranchers in the United States.

LARGE MARKET IS SEEN

"The sooner Soviet Russia builds up itself the better off the rest of the world will be," he said. This country would be a vast market for foreign goods for some time, he added, and the faster it developed the more goods it would need.

Reiterating that his visit was without political significance, he criticized the insistence of many in the United States on withholding long-term credit facilities for soviet purchases and measures against Soviet exports to the United States.

He said he thought American business men were "cutting off their noses to spite their faces" by failing to grasp opportunities for extensive trade with Russia.

"Personally, I should like to see these boys get on their feet," Mr. Lamont added.

In view of the progress the sponsors of the pending bill desire to make, I shall content myself with simply calling attention to the facts which I have mentioned. I shall discuss the matter on a later date.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, has the Senator stated the relationship of the author of the article he read to the Soviet Republic, if any?

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator mean the last article to which I referred, the one by Mr. Lamont, or to the address by Mr. Gill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I refer to the address of Mr. Gill.

Mr. BORAH. I understand that he is in the employ of the Soviet Government with relation to the conduct of the railroad business in Russia.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11452) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) providing for the acceptance of the statute of Charles Brantley Aycock, presented by the State of North Carolina, to be placed in Statuary Hall, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 194) for the relief of Jeff Davis Caperton and Lucy Virginia Caperton, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THE CENTENARY OF AMERICAN RADIOACTIVE SPA, HOT SPRINGS, ARK.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I regret that the Philippine matter should have been brought before us this morning. Everybody knows it is controversial, that very much time will be occupied when we come actually to consider in a serious way all the questions involved. Since the Senate has chosen to devote itself until 2 o'clock to a matter that could not possibly be settled in that time, I shall take advantage of the opportunity to make some remarks on another subject.

This week marks the one hundredth anniversary of the acquisition by the United States of the Hot Springs Reservation. There is in progress in Hot Springs, Ark., at this time a centennial celebration. I am glad it is being held, because certainly no act of Congress has been more significant nor more important in many ways than that by which the United States acquired this property. Just 100 years ago the Congress passed an act setting aside 1½ square miles of the public domain surrounding and including the Hot Springs of Arkansas.

I do not blame the Senate, which had its mouth all set to enjoy a discussion of the Philippine-independence question, for being a little impatient because of the intervention of a Member to discuss some extraneous matter. I am not doing this because I am opposed to the Philippine independence bill, which I am, but because there are times when the urge comes to each of us to say something; I have the urge this morning. I wish to speak about the Hot Springs of Arkansas and the radioactive waters which come from them.

When the Government took over the Hot Springs of Arkansas it was the beginning of our national-park policy. That was the first of our national parks, and because this is its centenary, as I have said, commemorative ceremonies are in progress at Hot Springs and will continue throughout the week.

Forty years passed before that initial act was followed by the establishment of a second national park, which was the Yellowstone. At the present moment we have 22 national centers of health and recreation. They comprise 12,531 square miles. In addition, we have 12 national military and other parks under the War Department. There are many lesser reservations classified as national monuments.

The Indians knew of the curative properties of Hot Springs. They believed that the Great Spirit was present in the waters. This tradition attached to the springs long before the time of their discovery in 1541 by De Soto. Hostile tribes are said to have fought for their possession. Finally their value to humanity was recognized by the Indians and by reason of a truce made and an agreement entered into between the various tribes they were finally dedicated to humanity as a whole. Because of that truce the blessings of Hot Springs were made available to the sick of all the Indian nations.

Mr. President, if you ever visited one of the healing springs, particularly one of the hot springs of America, you no doubt have been greatly interested in the evidence of Indian occupation of the grounds about the springs. For example, some years ago I visited the springs at Albany, Ga., some very wonderful springs. In the neighborhood of those springs are scores of mounds made up of chippings from flint implements. It was there that the Indians took their old people. The old men of the tribe, and the old women, too, I suppose, spent their time in making Indian arrowheads, as well as articles for domestic use. The remnants of those operations are still to be found there.

Chief of all these medicinal springs was the Hot Springs. As I have said, the virtues of the waters were recognized and the Indians from all the tribes went there in order that they might have the blessings of the healing waters.

Then the white man moved in. If I am rightly advised, the first white settlement was made in the region of Hot Springs about the year 1800. I have learned from a study of the history of those springs that two white men, Dunbar and Hunter, visited the location in December, 1804. At that time, according to the record which I have before me, they found an open log cabin and a few huts built of split boards. It is supposed that these buildings had been used by white persons who had gone to the springs in the hope of regaining health. So the popularity of the springs was widened and extended until in 1832 the Congress itself determined to take over the property and make it a national park.

Since that time knowledge of the waters and their virtues has increased to the extent that now, I am told, more than 300,000 of the citizens of our country visit the Arkansas Hot Springs every year. The Army and Navy General Hospital is maintained there. This is a famous institution, as every Senator knows. It is an institution dedicated to the treatment of serious and obstinate cases which resist the ordinary means of medical relief. The springs are widely advertised, and the reason for their popularity is because of the fact that the waters are radioactive. That is the case with reference to the waters of all the famous spas of the world.

I have in my hand some advertising from the New York Times of Sunday, January 24, 1932. This is an elaborate piece of advertising. In large type I find "Hot Springs,

Ark, radioactive waters, owned and controlled by the United States Government."

Since modern science has traced the curative properties of certain springs to their radioactivity, it was not long before the quacks took advantage of the popular belief in and approval of the public as regards radioactive waters. They foisted upon the public innumerable nostrums in the guise of radioactive cures.

Wherever there is justification for action and authority to act, the Federal Trade Commission has proceeded and is now proceeding against them claims of these and other menaces to the public health. Undoubtedly greater authority is needed by the various governmental agencies which have to do with such matters, the Public Health Service, the Food and Drug Division of the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Trade Commission. An appeal has been made to me that I might prepare and introduce such bill or bills as would provide for appropriate legislation to guard the public against the claims of radioactive waters or substances which are likely to be harmful. I have under consideration now such measures and am seeking to prepare such legislation as may be needed,

But in the meantime, as I view it, Mr. President, certain clarification of facts seems desirable. I say this because the centennial ceremonies now in progress at Hot Springs, Ark., come on the heels of a distressing incident. Very recently a citizen of the United States, Mr. Eben Byers, met a tragic death, which was attributed to his drinking "radium water." The newspapers were filled with most sensational reports about the death and its alleged cause. These stories have caused misunderstandings and aroused unwarranted fear on the part of many who have been making use of radioactive waters. It seems not inappropriate, in speaking about the centennial at Hot Springs, to say something about this.

The preparation which Mr. Byers used contained, not radon, which is a gaseous emanation of radium, but radium salts in solution. That makes something utterly different in the effects. But the unfortunate circumstance has seriously confused the public regarding the true value and the proper use of all radioactive waters. I want to make clear exactly what I have in mind because I desire to have grow out of my statement something which may be of real value to the American people. To this end I wish to make clear what is found in the natural waters of the Hot Springs and other springs of this country and of the Old World. I want to make clear that their radioactivity is due not to the presence of radium salts in the water, but it is produced by the gaseous emanation of radium known as radon. Because of the confusion of mind on the part of the public, there has been an unfortunate reaction against all radioactive waters. That is a public sentiment which I sincerely regret.

In connection with the warning issued after the Byers poisoning, the opinion of one American authority has received wide publicity. It is not my purpose, Mr. President, of course, to enter upon a medical controversy. On the contrary, it is my desire to urge that there be a scientific determination of the issue.

The question involved in the continued drinking of water made radioactive by radon or radium emanations—and the same question arises whether that radioactivity is induced by a scientific apparatus or as nature provided in the radioactive spring—is: Is it possible that the use of a radioactive water might eventually result in a dangerous accumulation or deposit of radium salts in the system?

The doctor to whom I have referred, who no doubt is sincere in his opinion, is quoted as saying that the benefits of the radioactive spas are due to hygiene and to psychic effect rather than to the radioactivity of the waters. Everyone of us who has visited one of the spas in Europe, at Baden-Baden, Carlsbad, or somewhere else, has been struck by the fact that there are thousands of visitors there "taking the cure." The last time I was at Baden-Baden, two or three years ago, I saw there "taking the cure" more American millionaires than I would be likely to meet in New York City, where I rarely come in contact with one. The authority of whom I have spoken advances the idea that there is nothing in the water, but it is simply the fact that the visitors have the benefit of simplicity of food and the psychological effect of the belief that the springs have virtue. Anyway, millions of Americans have consumed the radioactive waters of these spas in Europe, and also of the Arkansas hot springs and elsewhere in America. If there is sound basis for the opinion that these waters have no value or that their use may result in dangerous deposits of radium salts in the bones, the United States Government should discover it right away. I say this because, as I have indicated, the Government itself is responsible for the popularity of the Hot Springs of Arkansas and the conduct of the Army and the Navy General Hospital there. So if these waters are harmful, it is time we found out about it.

On the other hand, if the radioactive waters of these and similar springs are harmless and beneficent, as the world has believed regarding such springs since the times of the Romans, the mind of the public should be set at ease.

It is a very interesting thing to follow the history of the various spas in Europe. Practically every one of the famous springs in Europe was discovered and made use of by the Romans. During the prosperous days of the Roman Empire wealthy Romans traveled to various springs which they found here and there throughout Europe. We find the remains of the Roman baths; we find the remains of those elaborate marble establishments which were built by the Romans.

I remember one time being at Chester, England. It will be remembered that the name itself, "Chester," comes from a corruption of "castra," meaning "camp," and that Chester was a Roman camp. The very Roman legion, or its predecessor designated by the same Roman numeral, stationed in Rome at the time the Apostle Paul was confined there as a prisoner afterwards went to Britain and camped where modern Chester is located. There are found there the remains of the various baths which were built by the Romans at that time. Wherever they went the Romans carried with them their home customs.

Such springs have had throughout the history of civilization a popularity founded on the belief that the waters themselves contained something which had medicinal virtue and the possibility of the rehabilitation of those who were sick. If I correctly remember my history, Ponce de Leon came over seeking the fountain of eternal youth. I presume he thought he would find a spring somewhere in our country which had marvelous powers, possessing the possibility of physical rejuvenation.

Because of the alarm which has been engendered by the death of this unfortunate man there has arisen a doubt in the minds of the people, not alone as to the value of the waters but as to the possibility that they may actually be harmful. The extent of public alarm and the lack of confidence are indicated in such important publications as the New York Times and the news weekly Time. I have before me clippings from these journals pointing out the possible dangers in the use of radioactive waters. The science editor of the New York Times remarks:

> We shall probably hear less of the virtues of thermal springs.

The news weekly Time states:

> Experts say that, aside from the psychological effect, the only good derived is from the quantities of water imbibed, none from the emanation.

I have just received from the French Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which is incorporated in my State, New York, a letter calling attention to the possible consequences of unjustified public alarm and misunderstanding respecting radioactive spas. Seeking to make available the latest European scientific view of the value of radioactive waters, the French Chamber of Commerce in New York cabled its Paris office on April 19, requesting the office to call upon Professors Rathery and Desgrez, eminent French physicians, to get full replies to certain questions and as to the research made by Dr. Roger Monnery.

I hold in my hand, in the original French, the very interesting monograph by Doctor Monnery on radon, the emanation from radium, and its use in chronic rheumatism. This monograph is dedicated to the great medical authorities whom I have just mentioned—Professor Desgrez, who is professor of medical chemistry of the Faculty of Medicine of Paris, member of the Institute, member of the Academy of Medicine, and incidentally an officer in the Legion of Honor; and Doctor Rathery, professor of experimental medicine of the Faculty of Medicine at Paris; physician to the Hotel Dieu, the municipal hospital; and also an officer of the Legion of Honor. It will be seen that they are very distinguished men. Doctor Monnery dedicates his monograph to these eminent teachers of his.

The French Chamber of Commerce addressed their communication to their Paris correspondent asking that a call be made upon these eminent members of the profession to obtain answers to the questions, as follows:

First, whether the research of Dr. Roger Monnery, based upon clinical observations of the Paris municipal hospital, has been accepted as conclusive by European medical authorities?

Second, what have been the results of any later research?

Third, the present opinion of Professors Rathery and Desgrez as to the value of radioactive waters, and whether, in their opinion, there can be any possibility of radium being deposited in the body as the result of regularly drinking such waters.

I have already told the Senate—and let me repeat before giving the answers—that the men to whom these inquiries were addressed are among the most famous scientists in the world, universally recognized as great scientists. Doctor Desgrez's summary of the research of Doctor Monnery appeared in the bulletin of the French Academy of Medicine a year ago. The Monnery research was conducted under the supervision of Doctor Rathery, who, as I have already told the Senate, is professor of experimental medicine of the Faculty of Medicine and physician at the Paris municipal hospital, where the clinical studies referred to in this monograph were made.

Doctor Desgrez reported to the academy that the hospital patients were given water artificially charged with radon, a radium emanation, and the results were similar to the effects of the cures at the natural hot springs.

The Paris office of the French Chamber of Commerce of the United States replied on April 23. I have here copies of the cablegrams which came in reply to these questions last week. Professors Rathery and Desgrez stated:

First, that the findings of Doctor Monnery have been actually accepted by the medical authorities in Europe; second, that the monograph by Doctor Monnery, a 100-page printed document, which I have before me in the original French, is the latest research document on this subject.

Further, these professors replied that radioactive water—and this is what I want to bring out on the centennial of the Hot Springs—radioactive waters are considered as giving decided therapeutic results, and that it is impossible for radium deposits in the body to result from regularly drinking such waters. They added what all sound medical opinion would confirm, that "like any medicament, such waters should be used in certain doses, and not indiscriminately."

I need not remind you of the good sense of that suggestion. Practically every drug used by the medical profession is a poison if used in large doses. There must be skill and good sense in the application of drugs, I do not care what they are.

Since more of my listeners are lay members of society than Members of the Senate, I can not resist saying that nobody untrained in the use of drugs should make use of them without medical advice. It is a dangerous thing for anybody to have a row of bottles on the shelf in the bathroom, and, if he has the stomachache or the headache or the backache, or some other ache, to make use of these drugs indiscriminately. He ought not to do this without the direction of a physician. Likewise, these radioactive waters should be used as they are used at Hot Springs and at every spa where the waters are radioactive, or where they are alleged to have medicinal properties. They are always used under the direction of a physician. This is true, too, of the prepared waters.

The first thing that happens to you when you go to Mount Clemens in Michigan, or Hot Springs in Arkansas, or Baden-Baden, or Carlsbad, or any other of the spas, is that a physician gives the patient, or the would-be user of waters, a medical examination. He determines just how much of the water may be taken with safety every day.

One of the delightful experiences of visiting a spa is to see the procession of millionaires and multimillionaires and members of the white-collar class, and sometimes of the poverty-stricken class, marching up to the spring every morning to get a liter of some water which, perhaps, is as vile in its taste as if it were brine out of a pork barrel. On the other hand, however, many of the radioactive waters of this country of ours are delightful to the taste as well as capable of bringing healing to the ills of mankind.

In so far as the public can be reassured by research and medical opinion originating at the birthplace of scientific knowledge of radium, this may allay the fears of those who have been taking water made radioactive by radon or radium emanations.

Certainly because of the work in Paris of Madam Curie and of her distinguished husband, if one wished to have information regarding radium and its possible use, Paris is the place to go to get that information.

However, I want it distinctly understood that it does not minimize the danger to have this information if it is proposed to take radium salts in solution. That is where the harm comes. It is not from the use of natural radioactive waters, or water made radioactive by the radium gas, radon.

That is one thing, but actually to take the radium salts into the body is quite another. Certainly it is not enough simply to say, "They are all right." I doubt if they are. We should determine to drive quackery out of business.

To make reassurance doubly sure, I have to-day suggested to the able commissioner of health of the city of New York, Doctor Wynne, the desirability of having some research carried on in this country to parallel the work done by Monnery and others in Europe, and possibly to supplement that of these French experts, this research to be carried out immediately, and the results made public as quickly as may be practicable. I have said, in a letter to Doctor Wynne, which goes off to-day:

Hon. SHIRLEY W. WYNNE,
Commissioner of Health of New York City.

DEAR DOCTOR WYNNE: Permit me to call to your attention the attached copy of a communication I have received from the French Chamber of Commerce of the United States. It relates to current French scientific views on the value and safety of radioactive waters.

Would it not be in the public interest to carry out immediately research parallel, if not supplementary, to that conducted in the Paris municipal hospital?

Monnery's monograph, referred to in the French chamber's communication, is such a remarkable presentation of researches, both clinical and laboratory, that it should attract the attention of scientists everywhere. The author's training in chemistry is unusual, and apparently he speaks with great authority. His views have been confirmed by eminent members of the Faculty of Medicine of Paris. However, it would carry greater weight with the American people if our own research men confirmed these conclusions.

Such distress has been caused by the sensational reports of Byers' tragic death, attributed to "radium water," that many citizens of New York and elsewhere would be reassured by a report of your famous laboratories and hospitals that under proper control radium emanations are harmless. It is a menace to the public welfare to have in our midst so many needlessly frightened persons. If you will permit me to suggest it, I think you can render another important service by acting in the matter.

With kindest regards,

ROYAL S. COPELAND.

It so happens that the New York Board of Health, of which I have some personal knowledge, has attached to it one of the most famous research laboratories in the world, under the direction of Dr. William H. Park, whom I regard as the sanest and the most dependable of all the scientists of the present day. I say that without belittling any other scientist; but if Doctor Park made examination, it would mean much.

It is perfectly astonishing how many persons, including Members of this body, have come to me, since the death of Mr. Byers, in grat distress over the question of whether or not they might with safety continue the use of certain radioactive waters. If that is the attitude of mind of the persons with whom I have talked, I know it must be the attitude of mind of many others in our country. So I am hoping that Doctor Wynne will see fit to have checked up in the laboratories of the city of New York the conclusions reached by Doctor Monnery in his monograph. Then, if an authoritative statement is made, it will allay the fears of thousands of persons who now are needlessly disturbed and distressed over the possibility of harm that may come from radium emanation which they have taken in radioactive waters, or which they may have thought to take in the future.

Nothing short of convincing clinical data, collected under the direction of our own institutions, is likely to remove completely the loss of confidence in all radioactive waters. The alarm caused by the Byers tragedy and its resulting publicity has caused much mental suffering. The facts should be ascertained by American investigators of recognized standing.

I am more and more distressed by the effect of economic stress upon the minds of our people. It is a terrible thing to have the morale of the Nation broken down. I do not care whether you talk to a man who has been rich—because no man knows now whether he is rich or not—to a man who has been a great financier, to a manufacturer, to a clerk, to a carpenter, to a farmer; it makes no difference whom you meet; you find him broken in spirit and distressed over what may happen to our country. There never was a time when peace of mind was so necessary. So when I find now that many persons suffering from rheumatism and arthritis and Heaven knows what are worried and concerned because the favorite radioactive spring water they have been taking has been brought under suspicion by reason of the publicity given to the death of Mr. Byers, it is time that we should do our part to learn the truth and to give publicity to it.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President——

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

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I have been very much interested in the learned discussion of the Senator from New York. I believe he has performed a timely public service by his address on this subject.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator for what he has said; and I am sure that my genial friend, always so kind of heart, realizes what it means to have a dear one or a friend or acquaintance with loss of mental poise because of the possibility of poisoning and destruction and perhaps death from the effect of a substance which has been prescribed as a dependable one and a useful one and a necessary one.

We all know that depleted bodies are the inevitable sequel of want and worry. As the world emerges from its present stress, it will face new needs for physical and mental rehabilitation, and more than ever before will consideration of public health be a true index of governmental intelligence.

Have Senators thought of what the poverty of our people will mean to the next generation? If the children of to-day are underfed and undernourished, it means that the adults of the next generation are going to have tuberculosis and other ailments which can be traced to malnutrition. No matter how we may economize in other things, Mr. President, we can not afford to economize in all those matters which have to do with the preservation of the public and individual health. No matter how much we may reduce our appropriations for this, that, and the other thing, we must not reduce our appropriations for all those institutions and departments of government which have to do with the physical welfare of the people. I am sure every Senator here joins me in that thought.

Perhaps no better contribution can be made at this moment than to reassure the public—and that I desire to do—that the claims of the Arkansas hot springs and other spas are well founded, are scientifically founded. For myself, I feel that their reputation is well founded. I am glad they are having the celebration in Hot Springs to-day. I am glad that the Government, in its wisdom, a hundred years ago saw fit to take over this valuable property, valuable because it contributes to the health and the well-being and the longevity of those who make use of those waters.

I can think of no greater service the people of Arkansas can render the public than by drawing attention to the fact that those springs for a hundred years, under the auspices of the Government, have been used for the healing of our people.

I am particularly pleased that this opportunity to speak comes on this particular day. Senators will pardon me for saying that this is the anniversary of the day I entered upon public-health work in the city of New York. I shall never lose my interest in this subject. I can think of nothing more important to the human family than to forward every activity which has to do with the lessening of human pain and suffering and with the prolongation of human life. I think the act of Congress a hundred years ago dedicating this great institution at Hot Springs, the first national park, to this work of healing was a beneficent act on the part of Congress and, in many respects, far more important than thousands of other things which we have done and looked upon at the time as very significant.

I desire to express my congratulations to the people of Arkansas on the century of good works under our Government and on the ages of healing previous to that. I hope this water will continue through many centuries to be a source of healing to the sons of men.

Mr. President, if I have said anything to-day that is at all reassuring to those who have been unduly and unnecessarily alarmed over what may happen to them because they have made regular use of radioactive water, I feel that the hour spent in this discussion, which we had to spend, anyway, is far more important than the consideration of granting sovereignty to a people whom I would be glad to serve by granting them independence if it were not for the conviction I have in my mind that to grant them freedom without the consent of the people of the United States would be an unconstitutional act.

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

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. What the Senator from New York observed in his last remark leads me to ask this question: If the Congress of the United States in its constitutional processes expresses its consent, is not that the consent of the people of the United States?

Mr. COPELAND. No; it is not. We are the agents of the people of the United States, but we have been given no power of attorney to alienate one foot of the property which is the property of the people of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will yield further, is it the Senator's view that the Philippines are only chattels—so much property, so much soil and wealth? Are not the people to be regarded as people, even though they do live in the Philippines?

Mr. COPELAND. They are a people, a charming people. If it were not for the conviction which I have regarding the constitutional question, I would be delighted to give them their freedom, because my heart throbs with sympathy for any people seeking liberty.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that I am not taking issue with his view, except that I do take issue with his stand that the expression of the Congress under the Constitution with reference to a matter vested in the Congress is not the expression of the people. I have always regarded the voice of the Senator from New York, for instance, as representing the voice of the great people of the State of New York. The doctrine the Senator from New

York is now expressing would indicate that the Senator does not voice the sentiments and the welfare of the people of New York. I want to take issue with him on that. I want to take serious issue with the Senator on that.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I represent the people of the sovereign State of New York in all matters having to do with their welfare, but no power has been given me to alienate the sovereignty of the State of New York and to give it over to Canada.

Mr. CONNALLY. But the views the Senator expresses can not be confined to that one matter. He said a while ago that we could not secure the consent of the people of the United States even though Congress, under its constitutional power, should express that consent.

Mr. COPELAND. My friend is a great constitutional lawyer, far more learned in the law certainly than I am, but there are limitations even upon the Senator from Texas. There are times when he would like to do something but he can not because the people have not given him the power to act; and the people did not give the power to the Congress of the United States to alienate sovereignty over 1 square foot of American territory.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON. I want to ask the Senator if he will not permit me to interrupt him to have a message from the House of Representatives acted on. It will take but a minute, and, as I understand, it will be too late after 2 o'clock.

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

Mr. COPELAND. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. This is not a measure for the purpose of alienating any of the territory of the United States, is it?

Mr. MORRISON. No. It is to dedicate a monument in Statuary Hall.

Mr. CONNALLY. Unless it is to alienate territory, the Senator from New York will yield.

(At this point there was laid before the Senate, and agreed to, a concurrent resolution for the acceptance of a statue from the State of North Carolina to be placed in Statuary Hall.)

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from New York has just given an eloquent refutation of the very doctrine which he has been professing. He stood here and allowed to be passed through the Senate without objection a measure which, under the Constitution, is the expression of the consent of the people of the United States to have a statue placed in Statuary Hall. Yet a moment ago he said that Congress did not have the constitutional power to give the consent of the people of the United States to the freeing of the Philippines. He believes that we have the power to deal in marble and bronze and treat them as chattels; on the other hand, he wants to treat the Filipinos in the same way as property, chattels, things of tangible character but divested of any human or intellectual qualities or properties. That is the question on which I am taking issue with the Senator. To take the position of the Senator, we have to assume that we acquired the Philippines just as we would go out and buy a horse, or a house, or a tract of land, and, once having it, we can not divest ourselves of it, because he says we can not get the consent of the people of the United States, even though Congress should give that consent. Having acquired it by conquest, or by purchase, we are to forever have it on our shoulders and around us, like the shirt of Nessus, eating our very vitals, as it were, and we can not divest ourselves of this incubus of a dependency and a colonial possession. I am surprised at the Senator from New York enunciating doctrines of that kind.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the Senator has correctly stated my position. When once we acquire a piece of property, when once we add to our territory, it becomes fused with our original possessions, and we have no more right to divest ourselves of sovereignty over it than we would have to divest ourselves of sovereignty over the State of Texas, or over all the lands which came in under the Louisiana Purchase, or any other of our additions to territory.

If there is one question which goes back in my recollection to tender memories, it is this question of the conditions which were brought upon us by the Spanish-American War.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would like to have the Senator's reaction to this thought, that when we acquired the Philippines, we did not acquire them in fee simple, that we acquired them as trustees for the Filipino people——

Mr. COPELAND. Oh, no.

Mr. CONNALLY. And that in the discharge of that trust, whenever it occurs to us that the welfare of the Filipino people requires that we relinquish that trust and vest the title in the cestui que trust instead of the trustee, vest it in those people. Why is not that the broader, the more statesmanlike outlook, upon this question than that we bought the Philippines as we would buy a city lot; that we bought them as we would a farm, as we would a tract of land, to dig an oil well or a copper mine upon it. I resent that sort of idea in dealing with the Philippines. We hold the Philippine Islands as trustees for the benefit of the Filipino people, and when we divest ourselves of that trust and put the Philippines back into the Philippine people we are carrying out that trust.

Mr. COPELAND. The only trouble with my friend from Texas——

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad there is only one.

Mr. COPELAND. Is that in reading the treaty of peace he has mixed up the transfer to us of Cuba with the transfer to us of the Philippines. Apparently he thinks both were the same or else has in his mind conditions of the past relating to the acquisition of Cuba and the acquisition of the Philippines. They are not on all fours.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York will suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I would not delay for one moment the consideration of the appropriation bill, because that is of significance to the American people, and therefore I yield the floor.

STATUE OF CHARLES BRANTLEY AYCOCK

During the delivery of Mr. COPELAND'S speech,

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the concurrent resolution just received from the House of Representatives, and that it be favorably acted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the statue of Charles Brantley Aycock, presented by the State of North Carolina to be placed in Statuary Hall, is hereby accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered to the State of North Carolina for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for the high purpose of his life and his distinguished services to the State and Nation.

Second. That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of the State of North Carolina.

After the conclusion of Mr. COPELAND'S speech,

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 11452) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

STATE, JUSTICE, JUDICIARY, COMMERCE, AND LABOR APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9349) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and for the Judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The pending amendment of the Committee on Appropriations is on page 91, line 5, where the committee proposes to strike out "$45,000" and insert "$35,000," so as to read:

Provided, That not more than $35,000 of this amount shall be expended on the coasts of said outlying islands and the Atlantic entrance to the Panama Canal.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOWELL obtained the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

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

Mr. HOWELL. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

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

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, on several occasions I have invited the attention of the Senate to the desperate condition of agriculture and to the differential which has prevailed against the farmer for the past 10 years, a differential which was tremendously increased last year and is increasing this year. I propose now to invite attention to the obligations which the farmers of the country have outstanding as compared with their ability to pay.

Mr. President, agriculture can not repay its indebtedness unless something is done to bring the farmers a better price for their products. The farm-mortgage debt in the United States now amounts to the staggering total of nearly nine and one-half billion dollars. It has trebled in amount since 1910. Not only has the total amount of indebtedness greatly increased, but the ratio of the indebtedness to the value of farm lands is more than twice as high now as it was in 1910. The total farm-mortgage debt of the United States now represents about 22 per cent of the value of all farms, compared to only 10 per cent in 1910. This includes all farms whether mortgaged or not. The situation is much worse when only the mortgaged farms are considered. In 1928 the ratio of debt to value on owner-operated farms averaged 46 per cent.

A survey of 17,000 representative farms throughout the United States by the United States Department of Agriculture showed that on January 1, 1931, 38 per cent were mortgaged for more than half their value. In addition to mortgage indebtedness, the farmers owe about three and one-half billion dollars in short-term loans and nearly an other billion dollars in mercantile credits.

The debt situation of the farmers has become progressively worse since 1920. As a result of the deflation in 1920 farmers were forced to refund their store accounts and other short-term debts incurred for current expenses, by transferring these short-term debts into mortgage indebtedness. In addition, the continued unprofitable farming operations during subsequent years, entailing heavy losses, required the farmer to cover these losses by piling up a still higher amount of debt in the form of mortgages against his property.

Consequently, when the deflation of 1929 occurred, farmers were in the most unfavorable position to bear it. In many cases their cash reserves were exhausted and their capital investment mortgaged to the limit of its reduced value—not so much from extravagance as from several years of unprofitable operations due to low prices for farm products and high prices for labor, materials, and other factors entering into the cost of production.

The rapid increase in farm-mortgage indebtedness is shown in the following table which I desire to insert in the RECORD at this point.

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

The table is as follows:

Farm mortgage debt January 1

[From Farm mortgage Credit, by David L. Wickens, agricultural economist, Division of Agricultural Finance, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, February, 1932]

United States:	
1910	$3,320,470,000
1920	7,857,700,000
1925	9,360,620,000
1928	9,468,526,000

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, while farm debts were mounting upward, farm land values and farm prices declined enormously. Farm land values dropped more than $22,000,000,000 in the period 1920–1931, falling from $66,316,002,602 in 1920 (census of 1920) to $44,145,210,966 in 1931, or a decline of $22,170,791,636. The index of farm land values in 1931 was 106 per cent of the pre-war level, or only slightly above pre-war values. Farm prices declined from an index level of 205 in 1920 to 60 in February, 1932.

Thus the farm mortgage debt has risen to three times the pre-war level, but farm land values have dropped nearly to the pre-war level and farm prices have dropped until they are only little more than half the pre-war level.

It is apparent that something must be done and be done quickly to restore the level of farm prices to a point where farmers can pay these debts. Thousands of farmers are unable to pay even the interest on their debts, much less the principal, and their homes are being foreclosed. Thousands of farmers are unable to pay their taxes, and their farms are being sold for taxes, but so low has sunk the state of our agriculture that in many cases no one will offer to buy the farms for the amount of the taxes due.

Yet what has this Congress done to remedy this heart-rending situation? Nothing, except to offer to lend the farmer more money to put him deeper in debt. There is not a measure now upon the calendar of the Senate that proposes a constructive remedy for his relief.

Mr. President, measures for loaning money merely postpone for a brief time the evil day. For some it can not even be postponed; they have already lost their farms. Others are so deeply involved that they dare not borrow more. The few who are not in debt naturally hesitate to use borrowed funds when there is little or no prospect of receiving a price high enough for the products produced with this borrowed capital to repay it after paying the necessary costs of production, even if no allowance be made for profit.

What the farmer needs is not more credit but a price for his products that will enable him to pay the debts he already owes.

The only real relief for agriculture and the only real assurance to the creditors of agriculture that the farmers' debts will be paid is to bring about an increase in farm

prices as compared to nonfarm prices. The entire population of this country is equally interested in the return of the farmer to economic equality, because the present depression is largely due to the fact that agriculture has not enjoyed just and fair prices for its products.

It is possible, I believe, to bring this kind of relief to our basic farm products, such as wheat, corn, livestock, cotton, tobacco, rice, and other import products. It is possible to make tariffs on farm crops effective, thereby raising farm prices in the domestic markets above the world prices. Such action would give agriculture a tremendous boost toward a level of economic equality with industry. Both political parties have promised the farmer in the past that they would afford constructive legislation, but nothing has been done. What are we going to do about it? Are we going to adjourn without accomplishing anything of a constructive nature for the farmer?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The statement just made by the Senator from Nebraska comes with some surprise to me when I recall that Congress about two years ago appropriated $500,000,000, and put it in the hands of the Federal Farm Board for the purpose of aiding the farmers. Would the Senator object to commenting upon that legislation?

Mr. HOWELL. I have no hesitation about commenting upon that legislation. It was not the form of legislation for which agriculture asked.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely true.

Mr. HOWELL. Agriculture came here with a constructive plan and proposal, but agriculture was not listened to. I voted for the Farm Board bill because it was the only legislation we could get.

Mr. McKELLAR. So did I. If the Senator will yield to me——

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say that I also voted for the legislation to which the Senator refers, but it will be remembered by us all that, while Congress provided for the equalization fee and the debenture provisions, they were stricken out at the request of the President. The President had his exact way with the farm legislation, and, in my judgment, he emasculated it of all good that might have come to the farmers through it.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I believe the farm measure to which the Senator from Tennessee referred has done good in the way of aiding cooperatives, but, so far as establishing equality for the farmer is concerned, it has utterly failed. We enacted that law two years ago; we know it has been a failure; but that does not excuse us for doing nothing now.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator that it does not.

Mr. HOWELL. Something must be done now. We have only a little more than a month of this session in which to act. What are we going to do about it? Are we going back and tell the farmer that we did not have the will to act? The situation is serious, and it fundamentally affects the entire Nation, the industrialist as well as the farmer. When it takes two loads of agricultural products to buy industrial products that could have been bought with one load prior to the war, it ought to be realized that this is not merely an agricultural question but it is a question for the whole country to consider. The whole country is affected.

Forty-four per cent of our population are ruralists, and the economic fortunes of those ruralists who are not farmers follow that of the farmer; and with the buying power of 44 per cent of our population cut one-half, what could be expected would be the lot of the rest of the population which is largely dependent upon this outlet for its products?

Mr. President, this is not merely a matter affecting agriculture; it affects every other industry; it is a matter vitally affecting every man, woman, and child in the Nation to-day; and yet Congress is doing nothing. We have been in session for five months, little more than a month of the session remains, and the farmers are asking, "What are you going to do about it?" What is the answer?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator has just stated that Congress is doing nothing about it. I want to remind the Senator that the Committee on Agriculture is now holding hearings; he himself appeared before that committee on yesterday and was given ample time to be heard, and this morning three great farm organizations presented some recommendations to the committee. The hearings are not as yet completed; they will be this afternoon, in all probability, after which the committee, I understand, will probably go into executive session to consider the recommendations made by the farm organizations and by the Senator from Nebraska. So the statement made that "Congress is doing nothing" is hardly accurate. It may do nothing, but an honest effort is now being made to do something.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I realize that the Committee on Agriculture is now considering constructive measures before it, and I want to express my appreciation of the courtesy with which I was received when I appeared before the committee yesterday morning; I have no desire to criticize the committee; but I do want to emphasize, here on the floor of the Senate, that something has got to be done besides considering these measures in committee.

CURTAILMENT OF LARGE INCOMES—OUR BLOATED PLUTOCRACY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, since I undertook to obtain the floor this morning and asked for the consideration of Senate Resolution 204, so much time has elapsed that perhaps I do not recollect what was said by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] when I endeavored to secure consideration of that resolution. May I have the statement of the Senator from Arkansas read to me by the reporter, or would that be impracticable at this time?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I can repeat what I said to the Senator if he desires me to do so.

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I said I had no objection to the consideration of the resolution, but that I did not give it my support.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I understood that to be the statement of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. President, the position announced by the Senator, who so very ably and conscientiously leads this side of the Chamber, is that he can not support the substance of the Senate resolution which I have submitted. The resolution provides that, exclusive of taxes, no man shall earn an annual income in excess of a million dollars, and that no man shall be permitted to receive by gift by inheritance or other bequest more than $5,000,000 in a lifetime.

THE DISOWNED COALITION

When this matter first came up in connection with the tax bill I asked on the floor of the Senate—and the question was answered by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]—had there been a coalition such as had been reported by the press of this city and of the country; had there been a coalition for the purpose of re-forming the tax bill or preventing it from being re-formed in such a way as to dissipate swollen fortunes? The senior Senator from Mississippi spoke at some length to the point that there was no coalition whatever having any such idea in mind.

Prior to that time, Mr. President, I spoke on the floor of the Senate and mentioned the fact that the financial controllers of the oil industry in this country had manipulated taxes in such a way as to put a tariff on everything

that was being bought by the farmers and laborers of this country, but that when a tax had been proposed on oil, such as would have interfered with the dominion of the Standard Oil Co. and affiliated trusts, of which Mr. Mellon is such an important part, the senior Senator from Arkansas rose in his seat and called my attention to the fact that there was a proposal to put a tariff on oil of 1 cent a gallon in the bill that was pending in the House. I made the statement then that I feared that nothing was going to come of that proposition.

The bill has come to the Senate; the newspapers have reported a coalition, and that has been denied. I have stated here that this bill was apparently going to be framed in such a way, if the public press knew what it was talking about, as to give no relief whatever to the country. The existence of that kind of a coalition has been disputed, and I think properly disputed; but apparently water has sought and water has found its level; and now we have a meeting of minds. Although perhaps there was no intent to meet, nevertheless there has been such a meeting as to a common course of action in the Senate and in the House of Representatives of the United States. Where is the leadership of the people of the United States of America in the Democratic Party or in the Republican Party of the United States Senate and of the other House of Congress? If we are going to allow this tax bill to be formed and not undertake to sweat down these swollen fortunes in the United States, how are we going to go back to the people who have cried for bread and have been handed a stone of that kind?

THE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

I am not very familiar with the rules of our party caucuses, but I understand that the public press has been given information, more or less, as to what has been considered in our Democratic caucuses. If there is any objection or any offense involved, I do not propose to state anything that has not already become public property; but I gained the impression, Mr. President, from the two caucuses of the Democratic Party of the United States Senate which I attended, that there was almost a unanimity of impression that we had to use this tax bill for the purpose of breaking up swollen fortunes in the United States. I heard a splendid presentation of that matter by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and I understood that there was more or less unanimity of feeling, without quoting anybody.

Mr. President, I am going to read about three lines from an essay by Lord Bacon. Here is what Lord Bacon said many years ago—and this is the thought of the English-speaking people, the Caucasian race, throughout the world.

I might hesitate to quote Lord Bacon on the floor of the Senate, in view of the disaster which befell him in the latter part of his life, were it not for the fact that when the Supreme Court of the United States in 1910 overturned five of its own decisions in order to write a so-called rule of reason into the antitrust law, it was a decision of Lord Bacon upon which they based their dicta justifying a reversal of five previous decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Here is what Lord Bacon said many, many years ago, speaking as President Hoover spoke some days ago, but as he will never speak again until his campaign is over; speaking as the Saturday Evening Post spoke, and as it will never speak again as long as its owner can come here in a $3,000,000 yacht; speaking as men before have spoken. Here is what Lord Bacon said:

> Concerning the materials of sedition, it is a thing well to be considered—for the surest way to prevent seditions (if the times do bear it) is to take away the matter of them; for if there be fuel prepared, it is hard to tell whence the spark shall come that shall set it on fire. The matter of seditions is of two kinds, much poverty and much discontentment. It is certain, so many overthrown estates, so many votes for trouble. * * * This same "multis utile bellum" is an assured and infallible sign of a State disposed to seditions and troubles; and if this poverty and broken estate in the better sort be joined with a want and necessity in the mean people, the danger is imminent and great—for the rebellions of the belly are the worst.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Above all things, good policy is to be used—

I hope I may have the attention of the Senate in reading the next few lines:

> Above all things, good policy is to be used, that the treasures and monies in a state be not gathered into few hands, for otherwise, a state may have a great stock—

And we have the great stock—

> for otherwise, a state may have a great stock, and yet starve; and money is like muck, not good except it be spread. This is done chiefly by suppressing, or, at the least, keeping a strait hand upon the devouring trades of usury * * * and the like.

The United States, Mr. President, if it falls—and God forbid the day when it does—the Government of the United States, if it falls and when it falls, will owe its fall to the Congress of the United States. The United States to-day, with its millions of unemployed and its millions of starving, owes its condition to the Congresses of the United States, past and present, as well as to the fluctuating control of an Executive power that has managed to suppress the desire of Congress if and when the majority of the people of this country, through some sincere expression of popular will, gave this country a Congress upon which they could depend for intelligent action here.

Mr. President, I do not undertake to dispute the Democratic Party's position as enunciated here this morning through our illustrious leader. I do not undertake to question his leadership in the United States Senate on this side of the Chamber. I do not undertake to depreciate the value and the volume that must be attached to the apparent sound of doom from this side of the Chamber for legislation that is going to start this country on the prosperous path of destroying the swollen-fortune system of plutocracy that now has developed a condition where 504 men earn more than 2,300,000 men, and where 485 men earn more than all the people in the United States who are to-day in the clothing industry.

But we can go back and see that Lord Bacon has another authority. I quote another one:

> Woe be to that country that allows house to be joined to house and field to be joined to field until there is no place for habitation in the midst of it.

THE LAND OF PLENTY; LIFE IN THE GRAVE

Here we have a country with plenty. The people of the United States know that they can not get any distribution through the Republican Party. It can not be done. We know as well as we are living that if the Republican Party triumphs this fall it is going to mean the reelection of the present President of the United States. There is no hope for prosperity in this country that can possibly come, regardless of the outcome, through a victory at the polls of the Republican Party this November. All we can do is to get what we have now. Therefore the only thing, the only remedy, the only means of salvation of the people of this country—people who have had to put their own children in the ground to keep them warm, starting their lives in the grave—the only hope for this kind of people has to come through the Democratic Party; and here we have had a Democratic leadership over in the House and a Democratic leadership over in the Senate that imposes sales taxes! There is no such thing as cutting down swollen fortunes. Whatever is proposed that comes from the lords of the realm of Baruch, Rockefeller, and Morgan is going to be sponsored on this side of the Chamber of the United States Senate, as it was sponsored by the leadership of the lower House of Congress.

It is not the will, it is not the wish of the Democratic people of the United States. Although, whenever it comes up to a proposition we are going out here with this Congress standing here and its leaders committing the Democratic Party to principles of the worst kind.

I said we were acting as the outer guard of Wall Street. I once belonged to a lodge. We had an inner guard and an outer guard. The outer guard kept the nondescript from ever knocking on the door. The pronouncement here this morning of our great, illustrious, and patriotic leader on this

side of the Chamber [Mr. ROBINSON] is the announcement of the outer guard. We can not get up to the portal and demand admission for the people of the United States who are demanding relief from this condition that prevails to-day.

When it come to a campaign this fall, Mr. President, with a man running on the Farmer-Labor ticket advocating a reduction of these swollen fortunes against a man running on the Democratic ticket advocating ideas sounded by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], I am going to vote for the Farmer-Laborite; and when it comes to a campaign this fall with a man running on the Republican ticket advocating a reduction of these swollen fortunes and a distribution of the profits of this land among the people, as God Almighty demanded and ordained, and as against a Democrat sounding the ideas of Baruch, I am going to vote for the Republican if I am there.

I send to the desk, Mr. President, my resignation from every committee in the United States Senate that has been given to me by the Democratic leadership since I have been here. I want to be fair and honorable and right about it. I ask that it be read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resignation will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1932.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

I hereby resign as a member of the Committees on Naval Affairs, Manufactures, Commerce, and Interoceanic Canals.

HUEY P. LONG,
United States Senator from Louisiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter of resignation will lie on the table.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, these committee assignments have been very gratuitously given me. I have been a politician all my lifetime; and whenever the time came that anyone who had received anything from my political organization felt that he had to go another way, I expected him to surrender whatever the organization gave him. The Senator from Arkansas does not look on it in that light. I do. I think, in fairness and honor to him, there has got to be another leadership sponsored among the people of the United States for the Democratic Party in Congress.

THE PEOPLE NEED LEADERS, TOO

It may take two years. It may take four. It may take six, and I hope I will be here when the sixth is over; but there has got to be another kind of leadership. We can not sit here in Congress and tell the people that they can swap the devil for the witch. We can not sit here in the United States Senate and tell the people, "You can jump out of the frying pan, but you have got to get in the fire when you do it." We can not sit here—and I hope the distinguished Senators from Texas and from Tennessee and from Oklahoma and from Florida will hear me; we all come from the same section of the country—you can not go back to your people with that kind of political philosophy and come out any better this year than you did four years ago.

The people of this country want relief, and they do not have to eat a whole beef to tell when it is tainted. They have bitten off the hoof of this situation in the United States. They know. We have given them no place to go. We have only a few months in which to do any good.

I hope the prosperous country will be here when four more years shall have rolled around, if we do not win at this time. Certainly we ought to win with a government that the people feel means relief from the recommendations which come from Hoover and from Morgan and from Rockefeller and from Baruch. We ought to win with a government that is not a "heads I win and tails you lose" government.

Mr. President, if to-day I were to walk into the United States Senate or into the House of Representatives, recalling the pronouncement that has been made by the leader on this side of the Chamber and the stand that has been taken by the leaders in the other House of Congress, and if I were blindfolded and were required to pick which side of the Chamber was the Democratic side and which side of the Chamber was the Republican side, and should pass by the desk of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], I would certainly have to put my hand on him as representing the Democratic Party here.

I have the highest regard personally for the integrity of the leaders on both sides of this Chamber, and for the leaders on both sides of the House of Representatives. I have no intent to impute to those gentlemen anything but lofty ideals and holy purposes.

NO RELIEF FOR THE MASSES

But I say, Mr. President, that anything that undertakes to get itself through Congress to-day smacking of help to the people has to come through the Democratic Party, and if we adjourn this session of Congress, after disposing of the pending bill, and allow these fortunes which have been amassed at the top to grow bigger and bigger and bigger, then it will not make any difference whether we pass a farm relief bill or not, whether we pass a banking and currency bill or a tax bill or not, if we do not provide a means for distribution of the profits and fruits of this land, if we do not provide for distributing the surpluses which exist, the overproduction of wheat, and of cotton, and of corn, the overproduction of wool, the surplus of houses, when there is nobody to rent them and live in them; if we do not provide a means by which those tangible and intangible properties belonging to the people of this country can be enjoyed and used by the people, Senators need not worry about Congress reassembling; I do not know whether it is going to reassemble or not.

The only way we can go to the people of this country, the only way we can tell them, "Here is a chance, here is relief, here is hope," is to go to them through the leadership of the Democratic Party.

I hope my distinguished colleague the Senator from Arkansas will think a little longer and not irrevocably and irretrievably commit himself to the stand he has taken this morning. His voice could mean so much to the suffering people in his own State and in my State. His position might be the means by which many hungry people could be fed. His position might be the means by which all these surplus goods could be put on the backs of freezing people. His position might be the means by which those without shelter, where the children are put into the ground to keep warm, might start life in a house instead of in a grave.

I am sure, Mr. President, that more mature reflection and consideration of the basic and fundamental facts will appeal to this man with human motives and human emotions, that the light which can not be kept from being seen, and the impoverishment which no one can feel unless he has been in its midst, the hunger which no man can understand until he has been faced with it and known it, that those conditions, which can only be remedied through leadership, will be remedied. I must almost admit that we have reached the time when it is too late to get new leaders in time to do good this year. We have almost reached the point when we have but two or three or four months left. We have not time to train, we have not time for the people to acquire confidence from long years of experience in men as they could have in some of the great leadership the party has had. Therefore, I say that it is almost dependent upon the leadership of this great party, upon these great men, and instead of committing themselves against what could be a distribution and enjoyment of fruits and profits of this land, they should hesitate all the more until they find out some other remedy by which such things could be brought about.

Mr. President, what does my resolution propose? That no man can earn more than a million dollars a year. This "radical" resolution which I introduced would not allow a man to earn more than a million dollars a year. This bolshevistic, socialistic, communistic, radical, revolutionary resolution would not allow a man to have a net earning of more than a million dollars a year.

What else? The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] says that we do not need to pass that resolution; that nobody is going to be able to earn a million dollars a year

anyway. Then why should the Senator from Pennsylvania exhibit such opposition to this resolution, if nobody is going to be affected by it? If none of his friends or constituents, or the people of his State, or of the United States, are to be able to make more than a million dollars a year, then what interest or ground can anybody have for assailing a tax designed to prevent an income above a million dollars a year?

WHAT IS ENOUGH?

Is not a million dollars enough? How much more do they want? Are they like the dog described in McGuffey's old second or third reader, that sat back of the hay wagon and would not allow the cow to eat the hay he could not eat himself? Are they to keep the people of the United States from eating the grain and eating the meat and eating the bread they can not eat themselves? Are they going to keep them from wearing the clothes they can not wear, and sleeping in the houses they can not use? What are they going to do with any more than a million dollars a year? What is any man going to do with more than a million dollars a year?

All the palaces a man wants can be maintained in Switzerland or in Rome; works of art and pottery can be bought, lounging rooms can be embellished with all the gold and jewels that can be imported from the Orient; wines can be poured into the golden goblets in every country except the United States under authority of law. Nothing can be denied to a man with an income of a million dollars a year. But if those 540 men who had incomes of $1,185,000,000 had been limited to incomes of $540,000,000, it would have meant to-day something like three-quarters of a billion dollars of money that would have been distributed among the people of this country.

The senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] stated—and I have not verified his calculations—that in the year 1931 there was an income in this country of $60,000,000,000, and I suppose those figures were verified from some governmental department. I will ask the Senator from Iowa if he will do me the courtesy, just from where he is sitting, to state whether those figures were verified, and by whom.

Mr. BROOKHART. Those are the figures of the National Industrial Conference Board, which is recognized as one of the best authorities in the country. The income for 1930 was seventy-one billion, and their representative testified before the Banking and Currency Committee that the income for 1931 was sixty billion.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, as we all know, $60,000,000,000 distributed among the families of this country would have given around $2,500 to a family. Cut it down to $1,500 to the family, and give them the extra thousand, and, figuring on the 120,000,000 people of the United States, there would be prosperity in this land to-day, instead of the disaster and economic distress which we have in its stead.

We have another report, and that is why I offered the second part of the resolution, that no fortune shall be inherited by any man in excess of $5,000,000. This radical, impoverishing, distracting, revolutionary, communistic, bolshevistic product of a disordered mind would limit the amount a man could inherit to the pitiable sum of $5,000,000 per person! Yet the leader of the Democratic Party on this side of the Chamber says that this resolution can not receive any support from him.

Mr. President, how much do we want a man to inherit? How much are we going to allow a man to inherit? Is not $5,000,000 enough for a man to receive when he never worked a day for it in his lifetime? Is not $5,000,000 enough for one man to inherit by the chance of his birth? Has that money inured by any rule of right to a man who accidentally had one parent instead of another, so that he is to be allowed to inherit such a tremendous fortune that there will not be over 40 families in the United States with anything like a comfortable living if that can go on to the limit of time?

It is said that these fortunes were honestly acquired by ingenuity, but the battle is not to the strong, nor the race to the swift, but time and chance do interfere in all matters and in all things, we are told by the Scriptures.

If anybody is being done distressful, unrighteous harm in any respect by having been curbed so that he can inherit only $5,000,000, I fail to see where the argument can stand upon any rule of reason.

Gentlemen of the Senate, I do not object to a man inheriting $5,000,000 just to keep him from having $5,000,000 or more. I do not object to any man earning a million dollars or more just to keep him from having that much money. I only object to it because the Federal Trade Commission in its analysis tells us that 1 per cent of the decedents owned 59 per cent of the wealth of this country. I object to it because each year a smaller percentage of the people own a larger percentage of the wealth.

I object to it because back in 1916, 1 per cent of the people owned about 30 to 35 per cent of the wealth and now 1 per cent of the people own 59 per cent of the wealth.

I object to it because that concentration reached such a point that even a little town like the town in which I was born and raised, Winfield, La., a fine little town in the hills of the State of Louisiana, presented this case: I remember the day, Mr. President, when a grocery store stood on a corner. There were two partners in the business making about $5,000 or $6,000 apiece. They had a bookkeeper and credit man making about $2,500 a year. They had two or three clerks making about $1,800 a year, and they had a delivery man making about $1,000 a year. Those two partners making $5,000 a year bought Packards, bought Cadillacs. The bookkeeper making $2,500 a year bought a Buick. The clerks could buy Dodges. The delivery man could buy a Ford.

But instead of that business being there to-day—and the same condition that prevails in Louisiana prevails in Arkansas and all the other States around it, and all around here, too—instead of that store being there, there is another store on that corner doing three times the business that the other store ever did, and the highest salary of any man in it might be as much as $22 to $24 a week. There is no room and margin left above the bare sinews of existence for the top man to buy, and yet here we have the President of the United States yapping over the country that "prosperity is just around the corner." Here we have our own leadership on the Democratic side—and I will not say anything about the Republican side—advocating the cutting of wages of the only men who are getting anything like a living in the employ of the United States Government to-day.

Why have we not prosperity? It is because we have 120,000,000 of people who have not any money with which to buy anything and have not any way to get any money with which to buy anything. The American has no means whatever. I know that the same fears I have felt have been felt by other Members of this body, those of us who have children we are raising in the world. What business are you going to put your boy into to-morrow when he comes up? Working in a chain store? He can not own that store unless he inherits the store, and he will not own it long unless it is a chain store. He can not go into any legitimate business to-day in this country. I defy any man in the Senate now to tell me a place where a man coming up in the world can go into business to-morrow and make a living out of it. I defy any man on the floor of the Senate to tell where there is going to be a place on earth where any man can go into legitimate business in this country to-morrow. The chains have the drug stores, they have the dry-goods stores, they have all the grocery stores. The chains control the purchase and the sale.

Wealth is concentrated. Income is concentrated, where a mere handful of people are the only ones who receive anything with which to buy. Unless we get down to the basic and fundamental situation, free silver is not going to cure it, inflation of currency is not going to cure it, repealing the eighteenth amendment is not going to cure it, reforming the tariff will not cure it. Unless we get down to the basic and fundamental situation and prescribe and remove that which can only be prescribed and given through the Democratic Party of the United States, unless we get down and give the people of the country the sure and safe and right means by which the earnings, by which the income, by which

the fruits of the land can be enjoyed by 120,000,000 people—unless we put some money in the hands of 120,000,000 people to buy—there will be no means and no way by which prosperity can be restored.

Mr. President, sometimes I see how futile it is to undertake anything along this line. How unequal, how feeble, how distressed a man feels who goes back among his friends at home and sees them begging for work, pleading for bread, begging for a place to sleep. How feeble a man feels when he is approached by some friends who tell him that his children in his own house are crying for food to eat and he has not the money to buy it. He comes to the United States Senate, and it is like trying to shoot a bird through a brush heap to find any way under the sun that is hopeful unless and until the Democratic Party that is here in Congress takes this thing by the whip handle, stops these troubadors and crusades and trips to the White House, forgets that it is there, and assure the people that they will have a place to live. Prescribe the bonds; prescribe the limit. What man can exist in the country loaded as it is with all the raw materials it can have? How can you defend the civilization that we have when we have every product under the living creation that man can desire and have and control?

BACK TO GOD'S LAW

Sitting here as the representatives of the great American people, 120,000,000 of them, how can we justify that there is everything in the land that mankind needs and wants and desires? How can we fail to bring about a realization of this perfect dream of America that every man was born equal, endowed with the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? How can we go back and say we failed with all our balms, we failed with all our prescriptions? How, then, can we go back and say, if we fail with everything that we failed with, we will not take the law given by God Almighty to man and follow the law that He gives there when He said that no nation could last that did not follow it? If we have tried and failed, if the Republican leadership knows no way to do it, if the Democratic leadership knows no way to do this, then let us be smart enough to say that we will have to depend upon the Lord God Almighty and let the country live. Why can we not?

What was the rule? Chief among all, the one that would take paragraphs and pages to describe in detail, but that the way to do is to redistribute wealth into the hands of the people and keep the incomes in the hands of all the people; and that otherwise no nation could live; and that if we would follow those rules, we would lie down at night in safety and live in a land of plenty and there would be no hunger and no poverty in that land. The only hope the people have of independence is that this great Democratic Party of Jackson, of Jefferson, will find that kind of leadership. It is not going to be bound up with a Gordian knot in the House nor in the Senate, but will be joined by a coalition of the people's representatives in both of these Houses that will strike down these plutocratic fortunes until they reach something like a reasonable level, and we will go back to the people with a platform, with a program, whereby we have said we are going to provide that the enormous fruits of this land will be enjoyed and will be consumed by 120,000,000 people. Are we going to provide work for the idle, food for the hungry, clothes for the naked? Are we going to give shelter to the man who has none? If so, we are going to do it by prescribing that the wealth of the land shall not be concentrated in the hands of a few people to the extent that there is nothing left for the masses of the country.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, any man who serves in a position of public responsibility in times like these performs a difficult task. It is not conceivable to me that even the great genius in statesmanship, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], if given a free hand and unlimited control, could quickly solve all the problems which embarrass this Government and its people. I have no doubt there are some who believe there are individuals so wise and so capable that the mere enunciation of their views makes it evil for another to contradict them.

I have no doubt from the address which the Senator from Louisiana has just delivered in the Senate that he has the belief that if he were intrusted with the leadership of the Democrats and with the leadership of the Republicans in this body, that by processes and measures which his great mind conceives and designs to put into effect the very difficult situation in which our people find themselves could be made to disappear and that prosperity would be quickly restored.

But, Mr. President, if the measure which prompted the address of the Senator from Louisiana is to be taken as an illustration or definition of his views of Democratic doctrines, I am perfectly ready to concede that it is time for a new leadership on this side of the Chamber, and I am ready for my colleagues who have so highly honored me in years gone by to exercise their power and express their will just as promptly as possible.

Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss some of the declarations made by the Senator from Louisiana. I do not intend to assert that the measure which I have in mind, and which my associates generously support, are calculated to constitute a complete cure for all the ills that afflict mortals. There have been times during the last few months when a sense of overwhelming responsibility and of futility of effort have almost crushed my hopes and destroyed my ambition; and I wish now to say to the Senator from Louisiana that when he can convince a majority of the Senators on this side of the Chamber that he or another whom he designates can perform the functions of minority chairman better than its present occupant can, I shall be glad to surrender the measure of authority which I admittedly so ineffectively exercise.

But, Mr. President, Senators, and hearers, it is one thing to give vent to expressions that are calculated to arouse class hatred and class resentment and to point out evils and suffering that we all know exist; it is a very different thing to find adequate and proper remedies.

Reference has been made repeatedly here to an imaginary coalition leadership in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. Mr. President, everyone but the Senator from Louisiana knows that, difficult as conditions are, it is still necessary that this Government function and that a measure of coalition is unavoidable when the House of Representatives is controlled by one political party and the Senate and the Executive are controlled by a different political party.

The measure of coalition that is imperative is that opposition shall not extend to the point that the Government shall be prevented from functioning. If the House of Representatives, if the Democratic leadership in the Senate, should carry their opposition to the point that legislation may not be enacted, that appropriations may not be made, that taxes may not be levied, there would come a breakdown in the Government. It has not been my policy, and it is not my policy now, partisan though I admit myself to be, to carry opposition to such an extreme.

In determining my attitude on public questions my first thought is to consider the principles set forth in the platforms of my party and announced by its leadership in years gone by. Applying that test, the principle asserted by the Senator from Louisiana to-day can find no support in any Democratic platform adopted since the Constitution came into existence; and he may search the records of public debates throughout the history of the Nation, but he will not find a declaration from the leaders of the Democratic Party in favor of the confiscation of private property by governmental authority in order to limit incomes or fortunes.

The Senator from Louisiana, in characteristic manner, inquires if a million-dollar income is not sufficient. May I ask the Senator, if the principle of confiscation is to be applied to prevent excessive fortunes and incomes, why should $1,000,000 be the limit of income and why should $5,000,000 be the limit of inheritances? Why does not the Senator from Louisiana seek to prescribe a limit that will give comfort or abundance to an individual, and thus taking his property through the process of taxation for the avowed

purpose of preventing the accumulation of large estates or the enjoyment of large incomes, apply the remainder of the property so taken to the benefit of those who are less fortunate? What is the theory that makes a million dollars or $5,000,000 sacred? If the power of government is to be used to reduce fortunes, to restrict incomes, to confiscate excessive earnings and excessive accumulations, the millions of deserving citizens of this country for whom the Senator from Louisiana assumes himself to be the sole and authorized spokesman would find difficulty in understanding why the Senator from Louisiana desires to guarantee an annual income of a million dollars and an inheritance of $5,000,000 immune from his scheme of confiscation. Do they not know that many of them live year by year on only a few hundred dollars? Do they not know that a million dollars is more than they could spend?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I take it the Senator thinks that a million dollars would be too much. Am I wrong in that?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I do not care to enter into a colloquy with the Senator. I am trying to point out—and I think every other Senator sees it—that, if it is within the province of government to limit estates or incomes by the exercise of the power of taxation and by confiscation, consideration might very well be given to making the incomes much less than a million dollars and inheritances much less than $5,000,000.

But, Mr. President, this Government was founded chiefly on two fundamental principles—the right of personal liberty and the right of private property. I know it may be said that those rights are limited by law, but, nevertheless, I assert that no political party in the history of this Nation has ever committed itself to the policy of confiscating incomes or estates. Let it be recognized that inheritance is a privilege, that it can be entirely abolished or forbidden by law; nevertheless, once you assert the principle that it is a proper function of government to take all that one has or may make above a fixed amount, you must necessarily recognize the further principle that the amount may be only such as is needed to meet the requirements of the citizen for comfort and for necessities. This Government should not, even under the conditions that now exist, commit itself to the policy of confiscating private property. There is nothing else in this resolution. The maximum was made high by the Senator in an effort to popularize the principle, which is essentially vicious.

The Senator from Louisiana, in dramatic fashion, tendered his resignation from the committees to which he had been appointed on my motion. That was a comic-opera performance that does not do justice to the dramatic talents and powers of the great actor from Louisiana. [Laughter.] He came to my desk this morning and said, as he said on the floor, "Down in Louisiana when I give a man something, when I appoint him to a place, and he does not go along with me, I expect him to give it back. I make him give it back; and so I would like to tender my resignation from the committees to which you had me appointed."

I said, "That is a foolish suggestion"—those words being the most modest language that could be applied. [Laughter.] The Senator from Louisiana said, "Oh, no; that is my way of doing things. I am going to criticize you for not supporting my resolution; and before I do it, I just want to give you back everything you have given to me."

I said, "Why, go ahead and say anything which your judgment and conscience prompt you to say." Perhaps I ought to have modified that to some extent, and said to the Senator from Louisiana, "if you ever respond to the promptings of judgment." [Laughter.] But, Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has tendered his resignation from his committee assignments as if I had done him some great wrong by saying to the Senate this morning what every other Senator in this Chamber, save alone the Senator from Louisiana, thought—namely, that the resolution should not be supported.

I said to the Senator from Louisiana that I would not object to the consideration of his resolution, but that I would not give it my support. My object in making the latter declaration was to acquaint him with the fact that I did not think the resolution is sound. I should be glad to have the Senate vote on the resolution now. I should like to know how many United States Senators there are who believe that we ought to fix, by law or resolution, the maximum amount which an American citizen may earn or enjoy, taking everything above that amount for the use of some one else. Whenever the Members of the Senate on this side of the Chamber indorse that resolution, they will have another leader. Make certain of that.

Oh, I know it can be said, as it has been said, that one is in sympathy with big business, one is controlled by big business, merely because he does not approve the proposal to "soak the rich" every time some one makes such a proposal. It is not my theory, however, Senators, that government can rest on such principles. It is my theory that by the laws we have given special advantages to groups of our citizens. I believe it can be established that some of the great fortunes of the country have grown up in that way. When we come to exercise the power of taxation, which is the power to destroy, it is my thought that we ought to levy tribute upon the people in proportion to their ability to pay, speaking with respect to incomes; and I think the rates agreed on by the Finance Committee are high rates for peace-time levies. Whenever we take more than half the amount that a man makes, as the rates referred to will do in the higher brackets, we are exercising the power of taxation very freely and very fully.

Mr. President, I have not the slightest resentment at the course taken by the Senator from Louisiana. He seems to have the feeling that he must do something extraordinary, make some unusual display of himself, in order to have that publicity and notoriety which is his due. I have not the slightest objection. He is a handsome and spectacular figure. [Laughter.] His reference to the way things are run in Louisiana discloses the peculiarities of his mental processes. It is my thought that each Senator here should discharge his duties in accordance with what he believes to be sound principles, coordinating his efforts and activities, wherever he can do so without violation of judgment or conscience, with those of his associates, but always reflecting what he regards to be the best interests of the country.

I can not subscribe to the practice of which the Senator from Louisiana boasts. I have felt that his services on these great committees might be of value to the country. I had hoped that he would render those services according to the best of his ability. I am inclined to think now that it might be an exaggeration to express the opinion that I entertained before the speech of the Senator from Louisiana this morning; but, in any event, I believe that the Senator from Louisiana should go ahead and do his duty as he sees it. If he wishes a contest about the leadership on this side of the Chamber, he is welcome to it. I will call a conference for that purpose whenever he desires, or whenever any of my colleagues desire. I have said that the responsibilities are great. Let me say now that they are greater than I care to bear if I do not enjoy the confidence of my associates. What have I to gain by continuing in a leadership that is associated with very great difficulties and very often with futility of effort?

Reference was made by the Senator from Louisiana to visits to the White House. On another occasion he manifested his conception of statesmanship, dignity, and senatorial propriety by referring to visits to the White House on the part of the leaders in this body. Let me say that from the beginning of the history of this country whenever the President of the United States invites anyone to a consultation, courtesy and fairness require that the invitation be responded to, and I regard it as the exemplification of a smallness that can not be described with propriety in this Chamber for a Senator to rise here and criticize his nominal

leader for going to the White House when the President sends for him. I still feel that it is not only proper but necessary to accord to the head of this Nation that recognition and courtesy which his position has commanded from the beginning.

Regretting as much as I do that such action is distasteful to anyone, that it displeases my good personal friend but my rival for the honor of a leadership which sometimes very few follow, I must inform him that I shall continue to treat the President of the United States courteously and kindly; and whenever my associates desire a leader who will not do that they will have to obtain the services of some one else—and we all know where he can be found. [Laughter.]

I thank the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I did not intend to criticize the visits of the Senator from Arkansas to the White House, nor did I say anything except what I had in mind, and thought I expressed—that a number of conferences have been recently reported between the Economy Committee of the House of Representatives and the President to form a schedule for scalping the wages of Government employees. I am sure that the language used by me did not import anything at which the Senator could take any offense.

The further remark of the Senator from Arkansas is that I have arranged a comic-opera performance by sending in my resignation; but the distinguished Senator followed that with the statement that if he should now say about me what he thought before I made that speech, it would be an exaggeration. So to be honest and fair with the Senator, knowing that he would feel exactly as he now feels, I gave him the resignation; and I have done it in fairness to the leadership. I think that is only proper.

I do not think the Senator has any complaint about the way things are run in Louisiana. We gave the Senator more votes in Louisiana than he got in Arkansas when he ran for Vice President. [Laughter.] I went to Arkansas to speak for the Senator, and he did not have to come to Louisiana to speak for himself.

The Senator and I are not far apart. If he had kept talking, he would not have been far from the kingdom. He was about to nominate me to be leader. It looked as if the Senator would progress far enough to make it by unanimous consent had he carried this thing a little further.

I have not yet, Mr. President, sought the leadership of the Democratic Party except in the State of Louisiana, because if the Democratic Party is going to continue in the two Houses as it has been going since I have been here, there is no one who ought to want the leadership except the Senator from Arkansas, with the result that is going to happen in November.

It was a very generous act of my distinguished personal friend and political associate from Arkansas to have declined to acquiesce in the suggestion that I resign from the committees. But the Senator almost meets himself coming back, and he is going to get back. It just takes time, like the hands of the clock. I know the distinguished Senator started out right, with the hands both straight up. He has almost reached 6 o'clock, and he is on the way back, because he admits two things: He admits that it is not necessary for any man to earn a million dollars in the United States, or to inherit five million; and then he admits that fixing inheritances is not a matter of confiscation but that inheritances are rights which the law can grant or which the law can withhold. Inheritances are privileges of the law, and if there is no law providing for inheritances, then a man when his father dies would inherit none of his fortune. Likewise the Senator, so distinguished and cultured in the art and science of the law and in public performance as he is, further knows that the right of income and of occupation is statutory, which the Government can grant or which the Government can withhold. Yet the Senator admits on the floor of the Senate that there is no confiscation in it, and no reason why these earnings should be so high.

Mr. President and Members of the Democratic side and of the Republican side of the Senate, I think the Senator will accord me a little bit of learning in the science of political maneuvering in public bodies. I think the Senator will know for one thing that I probably have the discretion not to become a candidate, to take away the leadership which he has carried so honorably, and now so disastrously to the party. I have no idea in that respect except the fond hope that I may bring to his shoulders the weight of his own words, written out on a blackboard, as I will undertake to write them for him when I have time. They give the irresistible coordination of cooperation and approval and acquiescence in everything I have said here from the floor of the Senate to-day.

He says that I have constituted myself the sole and only defender of the people of the United States. He says that the party platform never has advocated anything like what I have advocated here.

Mr. President, there are some things above a party platform that did advocate it. I will read to the Senate about five lines from a platform of all the parties of the United States:

> When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which have impelled them to the separation.
>
> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.

Is there equality in America to-day when there are great stores of foodstuffs piled so high they can not be seen because they are almost in the way of the sun? Is there equality to-day when there is more wearing apparel in the United States than four generations of the size of this one could wear out in the next two years, yet people are in need of clothing? When there are all the tenement houses and all the landed estates needed by humanity? Is it equality when half are starving and half of the other half are eking out a mere existence, and only a small part of the other half know anything like reasonable convenience and comfort in the land?

It was the Declaration of Independence of the United States I read. Not only that, I will find for the Senator wherein those principles that the rich should not get richer and the poor should not be poorer have been enunciated by practically every standard bearer the Democratic Party ever had, and by most of the standard bearers the Republican Party ever had, since there have been political campaigns in the United States.

I do not undertake to cast any aspersions upon the motives of the Senator from Arkansas. I do not undertake to say that had he stood in his State as we had him stand in mine he would have been as much beloved there as he was in Louisiana. I do not undertake to say that the party principles which he has enunciated were responsible for Tennessee, Oklahoma, and Texas, immediately adjacent to Arkansas, having voted against the ticket upon which he ran, and the only State adjoining the State of Arkansas that went for him was the State of Louisiana, from which I come.

I do not undertake to say that those things were due to his lack of foresight and sagacity, but I do say that unless we offer to the people of the United States a chance, the only means possible by which they can distribute the wealth and the profits and the incomes of this country to the enjoyment of 120,000,000 people; unless we provide against this terrible concentration of wealth, where 1 per cent of the people own 59 per cent of the wealth; unless we provide against a condition where the Mellon, like other fortunes of that size, is one thirty-second of the total wealth of the entire United States, in one family; unless we provide against the conditions of concentration, then how can we exist as a free and independent country, or, worse still for the Democratic Party, how can we expect the people to accept our leadship in national affairs when we go before them in November?

It is a fact conceded on all hands and corners, and in every crack and crevice, that the Republican Party's administration has been a disaster to this country. But is the

Democratic Party to take as its law and inheritance and as part of the responsibility a coworking partnership in this impoverishment and in this poverty and this distress in this day and time? If so, I would urge the Senator from Arkansas not to wait for further invitations from the White House, but to seek them by night and by day, in order that he might carry on his partnership in what is going on in the United States to-day.

I am trying to answer all the things the Senator said. The Senator said one thing not in keeping with the high-minded record and characteristics of the Senator from Arkansas; it is far below the great motives which impel his actions in all matters, public and private; and they are certainly lofty and patriotic in every respect, in line with the distinguished service which he has rendered this country and his State. He said it is far more difficult to prescribe a remedy than it is to arouse class hatred.

Mr. President and Senators, what is the class hatred that has been aroused? I am not appealing for class hatred. If I have ever been a friend of the owners of wealth in this country, I am serving them as the greatest friend I have ever been to them before, and I have not been regarded as other than as a fair and honorable friend of the wealthy interests of any place over which I have had the slightest jurisdiction or where I have participated at all.

My friends, it is a great deal easier to give them the palaces and the comforts, all they can eat and wear and live in, everything they could have for comfort and luxury and convenience; it is a great deal easier to give them all they want, and allow the other twenty, fifty, or one hundred million people to eat, for by this it is a lot easier to guarantee them their continued more prosperity and comfort and life than it is going to be shortly.

Cæsar, Pompey, and Crassus divided the world into three parts, and they wound up by pouring molten gold down Crassus's throat so that he could have all he wanted. History can not simply remain stationary and not show some example of what we may expect.

England, Ark., is not the only place that can have a revolution in the United States of America when people become hungry, and there is plenty in the land wherewith they can be fed, and nothing with which to purchase the food.

I am not departing from the standard rules in what I am advocating. I am advocating what the Lord gave to Moses. I am advocating what Christ said on earth, that it was easier for the heavens and earth to fail than it was for one tittle of the law to fail. I am telling to-day what has been told by every prophet in the Bible, what has been told by every religion, whether one is a Buddhist or Confucianist, whether a Christian or what not, I am telling what has been prescribed by the Declaration of Independence, and what has been prescribed by the writers of England, even by the predecessor in the leadership of the Democratic Party in this body of the Senator from Arkansas, Senator Underwood, of Alabama, when I tell you that unless you provide for a sure, ready means of redistribution of the wealth of this country so that income can be enjoyed by the masses, until you put meat in the mouths of the hungry, clothes on the backs of the naked, and a roof above the head of the man without one, when you see them in this country and can put them above them; that no such thing as prosperity will ever come back to America. There is nobody to sell to, and there will be nobody to sell to. So, I say to-day, as I have said, that the leadership of the Democratic Party in the two houses of Congress does not give relief and does not give hope of relief. I say it is because of the fact that the people of the United States who want to support the Democratic Party this coming November, who want relief at the hands of the Democratic Party this coming November, have been left with no place to go to, when the leadership of these two houses advocates precisely and exactly everything that is advocated by the Republican administration of to-day, that this country has been brought to the disaster which it now suffers.

That is why we have to have something done. So far as the Senator continuing as leader in this body is concerned, I am not asking him to call any conference. I am not asking him for any test of strength in the United States Senate. I never ask a man for a test of strength among elected people. I usually ask for tests of strength before the people themselves. Those are the only kind of tests that count for anything with me. When the people want that kind of a test; when the people in this country voting the Democratic ticket can express themselves as to how they feel relative to what is described by the Saturday Evening Post, relative to what is described by the Federal Trade Commission, relative to what is described by the Scriptures, relative to what is described by Bryan and by Jackson and by Jefferson, relative to what is described by Roosevelt, in the words of the immortals, "a bloated plutocracy, 1 per cent of the people lording it over a starveling horde, with a mere margin of well-to-do in between," that is what I have undertaken to say would lead me to go before the people and to ask for a fair test, maybe in Louisiana, maybe in Arkansas, maybe elsewhere.

I hold a little responsibility for the Democratic Party, too. I represent a great State in this body, but of course that does not entitle me to any equality in this body. In addition to having served as governor of my State, I am also, I believe, national Democratic committeeman from my State. As a man having party responsibility, loving his party, and hoping for the party to prevail in the coming November, I am hoping our leadership in the two Houses of Congress will cease to be enamored by the ideas and principles that wrecked the last part of the Wilson administration and wrecked the Hoover administration. Whose ideas were they? Baruch and Hoover! It was the Hoover-Baruch régime that caused the great disaster to the great works that had been done in the six years preceding, and the Hoover-Baruch régime that we have here now.

As I said before on the floor of the Senate, and I say it again, though I may be mistaken in the view—but I am giving my honest impression—I would rather to-day know that Morgan and Rockefeller and Baruch favored this resolution than to know that anybody else in the two Houses of Congress were in favor of it. I would know that that insured the passage of the resolution. I insist that until they have awakened some morning and have been surrounded by a crowd of men they will never understand that there is no living for the top unless there is a living for the bottom; and when they have been divested of all their properties it will be too late to cry out for what I now advocate, for the abyss is yawning for all.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am not fitted by nature or training to engage in rough-and-tumble debate. But when the leadership of my party has been challenged, I think that somebody ought to say just a word of the impression the rest of us have regarding that leadership. I wish one who has been longer in the Senate than I might speak at this moment. But I think some one ought to say a word.

Mr. President, I yield to no man in sympathy for the submerged classes of America. I think no man has a better understanding of those classes than I have. I say that this is no time to create dissension between the millionaires and those who are in poverty, between the rich and the poor.

I say further that in my opinion this is no time for partisanship. The miseries that are upon us are the common miseries. They are common to all parties and to all men. I wish we might go forward in formulating plans for the common good.

I am satisfied that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is doing the very best he can and as much as any man alive could do in his administration of the office of leader on our side. It is a difficult task. It is difficult not only for the Senator from Arkansas, but it is difficult for the leaders on the other side.

Mr. President, these are serious times. I think the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is right when he speaks about the unrest prevailing in the country, but we are not allaying that unrest or that distress by calling attention to these distinctions. They are distinctions that are not so conspicuous to-day as they were two or three years ago.

There are not so many millionaires in this country as there were. I think if the truth were known that most of the men who have been accounted multimillionaires would be found to be just about as well off as the average one of us here.

I wish we might go forward with a firm and steadfast determination in every heart to solve the problems which exist. I believe that is the attitude, in fact I know it is the attitude of our leader. I want to say for myself, representing the largest constituency of any Senator except my colleague in this body, that so far as we are concerned we are content with our leadership and we have that humble sense of obligation that it is upon us to follow our leader in order that we may solve the great problems which distress us. I hesitate to say anything, but I do think that something ought to be said on this side, that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], our leader, should know that there is no lack of confidence on our part. We know he is doing exactly what one of us would do, no matter how one might feel regarding his own qualifications.

We realize, too, that the President of the United States, whom we hope to succeed pretty soon by a Democrat, has great burdens resting upon him. If the President chooses to send for our leader and discuss those problems with him, that certainly is a compliment to our leadership and the feeling the President has that he recognizes his ability and needs our support.

Mr. President, there are times when partisanship is of little avail. I think such a time is upon us now. We are more concerned, I am sure, with the return of our country to economic prosperity than we are as to what man shall be nominated for this office or that or which party may take control. Naturally, as a Democrat, I hope that our party will do so, and I am confident that it will, but nevertheless, when we are facing these problems, when we have the appropriation bills before us, when we have the necessity of passing a tax bill, when we have confronting us the obligation to balance the Budget, this is a time when each of us must submerge his views regarding party or candidate, regarding leader or leadership, and each of us strive as best he can to help to take the country out of the morass into which it has come.

I hope that our leader knows he has back of him a loyal constituency and a loyal following. We know his burdens are great, as burdens are great upon the shoulders of the leaders on the other side. We have just one obligation resting upon us now, and that is to preserve our own United States and bring it into the prosperity which it had a few brief years ago.

STATE, JUSTICE, JUDICIARY, COMMERCE, AND LABOR APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 9349) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be stated.

The pending amendment was stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on yesterday a question arose as to propaganda relating to reductions in the pending bill. I want to read from section 206 of the act approved June 10, 1921, constituting the Bureau of the Budget:

> SEC. 206. No estimate or request for an appropriation and no request for an increase in an item of any such estimate or request, and no recommendation as to how the revenue needs of the Government should be met shall be submitted to the Congress or any committee thereof by any officer or employee of any department or establishment unless at the request of either House of Congress.

Mr. President, I also on yesterday referred to a letter which had been sent out by the Department of Commerce. I was mistaken about it being a letter. It was a telegram. It was addressed to a business man in Memphis, my home city, and I read that part of the telegram referring to this matter:

> Present outlook is that Senate will very probably vote on the reduction Monday or Tuesday of next week. It will have a very serious effect on service of bureau, both domestic and abroad. Suggest you communicate your interest to your Senators and Representatives in Congress.
>
> R. P. LAMONT.

Mr. President, I want to say that under the rule established by the Budget and established by the various committees of the Congress, Cabinet officers are not expected to appear before committees unless invited. The chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], a courteous and splendid gentleman, when these reductions were proposed invited Mr. Lamont to come before the committee. He came and gave his views. But I want to say that, in my judgment, it is in absolute violation of the section of the act which I have just read for Mr. Lamont, after having been invited by the committee, after having presented his views to the committee, to undertake to build a fire back home behind the Senators who are asking reductions, which Mr. Lamont, forsooth, does not approve. For that reason I put this telegram in the RECORD. The telegram was dated April 11, and was addressed to a business man of my city, whose name I do not care to give. That is the telegram and, of course, Mr. Lamont will not deny it.

Mr. President, much was said on yesterday about our destroying this bureau if the 10 per cent reductions were made. Let us examine the history of appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. In 1914 Congress appropriated $174,860 for the entire bureau; in 1915, $446,989.59; in 1916, $419,280. That is for the entire Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. In 1917 Congress appropriated for the entire bureau $507,640; in 1918, $479,120; in 1919, $563,120; in 1920, $910,510, almost doubling the amount in one year. In 1921 the appropriation was $916,539. It was creeping up all the time. But just look at 1922. From 1921 to 1922 the appropriation jumped to $1,228,570; in 1923, $1,598,624. In 1924 it nearly doubled and went to $2,755,557. In 1925 it was $2,713,234. Ah, but we were prosperous then. But let us come to the next year. For 1926 we appropriated for the bureau $3,117,789.25.

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

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FESS. It was in 1925 that the consolidation took place and the Bureau of Mines and the other bureaus were turned over to the Commerce Department.

Mr. JONES. The Senator from Tennessee is referring to appropriations not for the entire Department of Commerce but for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of that department.

Mr. McKELLAR. I refer to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, which started in 1914 with an appropriation of $174,000 and in 1925 received in appropriations $2,713,234.50. In 1927 its appropriation grew to $3,264,922.17, in 1928 it was $3,711,867, in 1929 it was $4,367,962.90, in 1930 it was $4,718,224.69, in 1931 it was $4,893,421.14, and for the current year, 1932, it is $5,349,891.01. In 18 years the appropriations for this bureau have gone up from $174,000 to $5,349,891.01.

Mr. President, much is said about destroying this bureau; if we cut by a small sum we decrease its appropriations. The President recommended an appropriation of $4,100,000 plus; the committee, under the instruction to cut it 10 per cent, has reduced it to only $3,900,000 plus—a very little difference—and yet speeches are made indicating that we are going to destroy the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce if we reduce the appropriation.

I said yesterday that the opposition to the reduction was due to propaganda, and it is. It begins with the member of the Cabinet in charge of this department and runs through it. Senators ought not to be misled by it. If we are

going to turn over to the departments or to Cabinet members the power and duty to legislate for the people of the country, if we are, in the fact of a bankrupt Treasury—for that is what we have—going to continue to appropriate and to borrow money to make the appropriations good—for instance, appropriations for a bureau that 18 years ago spent only $174,000 and is now spending $5,000,000—it will be only a short time until we shall turn the entire Government over to the bureaucrats. We have come very nearly doing it already. They are specious arguments which are made against these cuts, but we ought to make them more than 10 per cent. In my judgment, Mr. President, this Congress, instead of taxing the American people additionally, ought to cut off a billion dollars of these expenses, these wasteful and inconceivably extravagant expenses, and balance the Budget by cutting down expenses rather than by taxing the already overtaxed people in this country.

I want to say that, so far as I am concerned, as I have before stated, I am infinitely more interested in cutting down the expenses of Government than I am in finding new sources of taxation; and I am not at all sure that I am going, by my vote, to put additional taxes on the American people in this hour of their distress and at the same time let these absolutely extravagant expenses be continued.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will permit this bill to pass with these savings made, because we are going to find, when we get to that point, that unless Congress shall make these savings as they have been begun there will not be any made.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I hope I shall never be slow to correct any injustice that I think may be done to any officer of the Government, no matter who he may be. It is, perhaps, rather a peculiar rôle for me to stand here in defense of any part of the administration, but as the chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, let me say that I have found the present head of the Department of Commerce in the United States Government to be a gentleman who is able, courteous, and cooperative, always endeavoring in every fashion that he can to aid, and one who has responded freely and efficiently to every call that has been made upon him.

Mr. President, in rather bitter fashion the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has commented upon telegrams which were sent by Secretary Lamont. Here are the facts, and if these facts constitute a wrong upon his part, I think he and the Senate may make the best of it. Various telegrams were received by the Secretary of Commerce from those who are interested in this particular activity protesting against the cuts which are made in the appropriations for that department. In response to these queries—and only in response to them—he sent a form reply. Telegrams such as the one to which I invite the attention of the Senator from Texas for the instant came to the Department of Commerce and Mr. Lamont. This is from Dallas, Tex.:

Dallas papers carry news item Congress about to abolish appropriation necessary to maintain Dallas office Bureau Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Our observation and work here fully demonstrate to abolish offices anywhere would result loss of millions of dollars annually business interests of country. This is not a theory but is being demonstrated every day through hundreds of merchants, this State being saved from failure result of work of this department. If the town is on fire is it time to abolish the fire department?

H. G. HILD, *President.*
VERNON HALL,
Secretary-Manager Dallas Wholesale Credit Men's Association.

Telegrams of similar import, wholly unsolicited, came to the Secretary of Commerce from different cities affected by the cuts in the appropriation, and finally, in response—and in response alone to these various telegrams that thus came to him—he sent telegrams in reply. The Senator from Tennessee omitted the first sentence of the telegram which was sent to the gentleman of whom he speaks, living in Memphis, Tenn., I believe, who telegraphed Secretary Lamont. The first sentence of the response of Secretary Lamont reads:

Greatly appreciate your telegram protesting against proposed reductions in funds of foreign and domestic commerce for next year.

And after this acknowledgment the reply proceeds:

Present outlook is that the Senate will very probably vote on the reductions Monday or Tuesday of next week. It would have very serious affect on services of bureau, both domestic and abroad. Suggest you communicate your interest to your Senators and Representatives in Congress.

That is the form telegram which was sent in response to the various telegrams and other communications that came to the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask if this form telegram was sent all over the United States?

Mr. JOHNSON. It was sent simply in reply to those who first telegraphed the department. It was not sent at all generally. It was sent as a response, and the response in each instance was the same.

Mr. McKELLAR. Can the Senator state to how many States the telegrams went?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not know.

Mr. McKELLAR. Because unquestionably the Senator strengthens the case when he adds Texas to the list. Maybe there were other States; I imagine there were.

Mr. JOHNSON. Unquestionably there were. But the places affected were few and the responses therefore necessarily so. I know that, unsolicited, to me there came telegrams that were quite numerous from San Francisco and from Los Angeles. I have no doubt that telegrams were sent to citizens in other communities, and I have no doubt that from the communities that were interested—and there were not so many, as the Senator will remember from the list which I read yesterday—that some of those communities that thought they would be affected telegraphed at once to the Secretary of Commerce. And there is his telegram.

Mr. President, if that constitutes treason to the United States or to the Senate or to the Appropriations Committee or to the Senator from Tennessee, I can only say, in the historic words familiar to all, "If that be treason, make the most of it."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, all I can say about it, if the Senator will permit me, is that the Secretary of Commerce is, in my judgment, indirectly violating the law as passed by the Congress. Of course, if a Cabinet officer wishes to do that, it is all right with me, because I am not in a position to prosecute him.

Mr. JOHNSON. I can not think that it is a violation of the law nor an ethical violation in any degree on the part of the Secretary of Commerce.

I merely want to say one word about the figures which have been read as to particular years. Just let me say that the cut reported by the Committee on Appropriations in this particular item was from $4,869,531 to $3,905,000, a cut of $964,531, and not of $200,000, as was stated upon the floor yesterday. There are the facts. We have passed the stage, as I understand the ruling yesterday and the action that was taken by the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Washington, where there can be any particular remedy applied. I have only risen, sir, in relation to the Secretary of Commerce and in justice to him and his department to make absolutely plain just what occurred in reference to the telegrams that have been complained of by the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VANDENBERG in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 91, line 10, after the name "United States," to strike out "$273,000" and insert "$200,000," so as to read:

Pacific coast: For surveys and necessary resurveys of coasts on the Pacific Ocean under the jurisdiction of the United States, $200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 15, after the name "United States," to strike out "$22,000" and insert "$20,000," so as to read:

Tides, currents, etc.: For continuing researches in physical hydrography, relating to harbors and bars, and for tidal and cur-

rent observations on the coasts of the United States, or other coasts under the jurisdiction of the United States, $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 19, after the word "same," to strike out "$6,500" and insert "$5,500," so as to read:

Coast Pilot: For compilation of the Coast Pilot, including the employment of such pilots and nautical experts, and stenographic help in the field and office as may be necessary for the same, $5,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, line 5, to strike out "$58,000" and insert "$40,000," so as to read:

Magnetic work: For continuing magnetic and seismological observations and to establish meridian lines in connection therewith in all parts of the United States; making magnetic and seismological observations in other regions under the jurisdiction of the United States; purchase of additional magnetic and seismological instruments; lease of sites where necessary and the erection of temporary magnetic and seismological buildings; and including the employment in the field and office of such magnetic and seismological observers and stenographic services as may be necessary, $40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, line 23, after the word "thereto," to strike out "$271,000" and insert "$150,000," and in line 24, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$43,000" and insert "$25,000," so as to read:

Federal, boundary, and State surveys: For continuing lines of exact levels between the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts; determining geographic positions by triangulation and traverse for the control of Federal, State, boundary, county, city, and other surveys and engineering works in all parts of the United States; including special geodetic surveys of first-order triangulation and leveling in regions subject to earthquakes, not exceeding $10,000; determining field astronomic positions and the variation of latitude, including the maintenance and operation of the latitude observatories at Ukiah, Calif., and Gaithersburg, Md., not exceeding $2,500 each; establishing lines of exact levels, determining geographic positions by triangulation and traverse, and making astronomic observations in Alaska; and continuing gravity observations in the United States and for making such observations in regions under the jurisdiction of the United States and also on islands and coasts adjacent thereto, $150,000, of which amount not to exceed $25,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, and not to exceed $1,500 may be expended to determine the difference in gravity between the international base station at Potsdam, Germany, and that of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 23, to reduce the total appropriation for field expenses of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from $837,500 to $572,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, line 1, after the words "ship chandlery," to strike out "$78,000" and insert "$60,000," so as to read:

Vessels: For repairs of vessels, including traveling expenses of persons inspecting the repairs, and exclusive of engineer's supplies and other ship chandlery, $60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, line 6, after the word "law," to strike out "$675,000" and insert "$555,000," so as to read:

For all necessary employees to man and equip the vessels, including professional seamen serving as mates on vessels of the survey, to execute the work of the survey herein provided for and authorized by law, $555,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, line 24, to reduce the appropriation for office force for personal services, in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from $549,620 to $500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 95, line 16, after the word "fares," to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$50,000," so as to read:

Office expenses: For purchase of new instruments (except surveying instruments), including their exchange, materials, equipment, and supplies required in the instrument shop, carpenter shop, and chart division; books, scientific and technical books, journals, books of reference, maps, charts, and subscriptions; copper plates, chart paper, printer's ink, copper, zinc, and chemicals for electrotyping and photographing; engraving, printing, photographing, rubber gloves, and electrotyping supplies; photolithographing and printing charts for immediate use; stationery for office and field parties; transportation of instruments and supplies when not charged to party expenses; telegrams; washing; office furniture, repairs; traveling expenses of officers and others employed in the office sent on special duty in the service of the office; miscellaneous expenses, contingencies of all kinds, not exceeding $90 for street-car fares, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Fisheries," on page 96, line 3, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "$198,480" and insert "$175,000," so as to read:

Commissioner's office: For the commissioner and other personal services in the District of Columbia, $175,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 96, line 11, after the word "therewith," to strike out "$4,180" and insert "$3,500," so as to read:

Administration: For expenses of the office of the commissioner, including stationery, scientific and reference books, periodicals and newspapers for library, furniture and equipment, telegraph and telephone service, street-car fares not exceeding $150, compensation of temporary employees, and all other necessary expenses connected therewith, $3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 96, line 18, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$457,550" and insert "$412,550"; and on page 97, line 1, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "$986,730" and insert "$886,730, of which $1,000 shall be expended for opening outlets to the Pacific Ocean of the Siltcoos and Takenitch Lakes in Douglas and Lane Counties, Oreg., by dredging, diking, or otherwise, with a view to the improvement of such lakes for fishing purposes," so as to make the paragraph read:

Propagation of food fishes: For maintenance, repair, alteration, improvement, equipment, and operation of fish-cultural stations, general propagation of food fishes and their distribution, including movement, maintenance, and repairs of cars, purchase of equipment (including rubber boots and oilskins) and apparatus, contingent expenses, pay of permanent employees not to exceed $412,550, temporary labor, and not to exceed $10,000 for propagation and distribution of fresh-water mussels and the necessary expenses connected therewith, and not to exceed $10,000 for the purchase, collection, and transportation of specimens and other expenses incidental to the maintenance and operation of aquarium, of which not to exceed $5,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, $886,730, of which $1,000 shall be expended for opening outlets to the Pacific Ocean of the Siltcoos and Takenitch Lakes in Douglas and Lane Counties, Oreg., by dredging, diking, or otherwise, with a view to the improvement of such lakes for fishing purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 97, line 16, after the word "vessels," to strike out "$316,920" and insert "$200,000"; in line 17, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$48,600" and insert "$32,600"; and in line 19, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$98,820" and insert "$66,000," so as to read:

Maintenance of vessels: For maintenance and operation of vessels and launches, including purchase and repair of boats, apparatus, machinery, and other facilities required for use with the same, hire of vessels, temporary employees, and all other necessary expenses in connection therewith, including not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase of plans and specifications for vessels or for contract personal services for the preparation thereof, and money accruing from commutation of rations and provisions on board vessels may be paid on proper vouchers to the persons having charge of the mess of such vessels, $200,000, of which not to exceed $32,600 may be expended for pay of officers and employees of vessels of the Atlantic coast and not to exceed $66,000 for pay of officers and crews of vessels for the Alaska Fisheries Service, and $10,000 shall be immediately available for the procurement of supplies and equipment required for shipment to the Pribilof Islands for the service of the fiscal year 1933.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 98, line 9, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$155,140" and insert "125,000," and at the end of line 12, to strike out "$281,340" and insert "$200,000," so as to read:

Inquiry respecting food fishes: For inquiry into the cause of the decrease of food fishes in the waters of the United States, and for investigation and experiments in respect to the aquatic animals, plants, and waters, and screening of irrigation ditches in fishways, in the interests of fish culture and the fishery industries, including pay of permanent employees not to exceed $125,000, temporary employees, maintenance, repair, improvement, equipment, and operations of biological stations, expenses of travel and preparation of reports, $200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 98, line 17, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$40,200" and insert "$36,200," and at the end of line 24, to strike out "$106,790" and insert "$95,790," so as to read:

Fishery industries: For collection and compilation of statistics of the fisheries and the study of their methods and relations, and the methods of preservation and utilization of fishery products, including pay of permanent employees not to exceed $36,200, compensation of temporary employees, travel and preparation of reports, including temporary employees in the District of Columbia not to exceed $1,800, and all other necessary expenses in connection therewith, including the purchase not to exceed $1,250, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in the field work of the Bureau of Fisheries, $95,790.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, line 11, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "$57,000" and insert "$54,000"; in line 21, after the word "exceed," strike out "$92,940" and insert "$87,940," and on page 100, line 2, before the word "of," to strike out "$412,300" and insert "$390,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

Alaska, general service: For protecting the seal fisheries of Alaska, including the furnishing of food, fuel, clothing, and other necessities of life to the natives of the Pribilof Islands, of Alaska; not exceeding $54,000 for construction, improvement, repair, and alteration of buildings and roads, transportation of supplies to and from the islands, expenses of travel of agents and other employees and subsistence while on said islands, hire and maintenance of vessels, purchase of sea otters, and for all expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to protect the seal fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved April 21, 1910 (U. S. C., title 16, secs. 631–658), and for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, including pay of permanent employees not to exceed $87,940, contract stenographic reporting service, travel, subsistence (or per diem in lieu of subsistence) of employees while on duty in Alaska, hire of boats, employment of temporary labor, and all other necessary expenses connected therewith, $390,000, of which $100,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 100, at the end of line 10, to strike out "$7,900" and insert "$7,000," so as to read:

Mississippi wild life and fish refuge: For construction of buildings, boats, and ponds, for purchase of equipment, including boats, for maintenance, operation, repair, and improvements, including expenditures for personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere as may be necessary, as authorized in the act approved June 7, 1924 (U. S. C., title 16, secs. 721–731), $7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 100, line 19, after the word "station," to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That not to exceed $12,000 of the appropriation in said act for the establishment of a fish-cultural substation in the State of New York shall be available for the purchase of additional land and for improvements at the Cape Vincent, N. Y., station," so as to read:

Construction of stations: The appropriations made under this head in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1930, and in the act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, are hereby continued and made available until June 30, 1933, and the appropriation contained in the last-mentioned act for the purchase of the Mill Creek station in the State of California shall be available for repairs and improvements to said station: *Provided*, That not to exceed $12,000 of the appropriation in said act for the establishment of a fish-cultural substation in the State of New York shall be available for the purchase of additional land and for improvements at the Cape Vincent, N. Y., station.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 101, line 5, before the word "of," to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$15,000," and in line 6, before the word "may," to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,600," so as to read:

Enforcement of black bass law: To enable the Secretary of Commerce to carry into effect the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to regulate interstate transportation of black bass, and for other purposes,' approved May 20, 1926" (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 16, secs. 851–856), approved July 2, 1930 (46 Stat., pp. 845–847), $15,000, of which not to exceed $2,600 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Patent Office," on page 102, line 12, after the name "Patent Office," to strike out "$36,000" and insert "$30,000," so as to read:

For purchase of law, professional, and other reference books and publications and scientific books, including their exchange, and expenses of transporting publications of patents issued by the Patent Office to foreign governments, directories, and for other contingent and miscellaneous expenses of the Patent Office, $30,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] a few moments ago mentioned the Bureau of Mines, and, as I understood him, attributed part of the appropriation to which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] referred to that organization.

May I say that I have here a statement showing the appropriation for the Bureau of Mines for a number of years.

In 1914 it was $664,000.

In 1915 it was $730,606.36.

In 1916 it was $757,307.23.

In 1917 it was $981,138.45.

In 1918 it was $1,466,773.95.

In 1919 it was $3,145,377.28.

My recollection is that the large increase there was brought about in part by reason of some activities during the war.

In 1920 the appropriation for the Bureau of Mines was $1,307,111.53.

In 1921 it was $1,315,963.79.

In 1922 it was $1,534,671.77.

In 1923 it was $1,581,329.52.

In 1924 it was $1,771,167.46.

In 1925 it was $1,900,821.27.

After it became a part of the Department of Commerce the Bureau of Mines continued to receive appropriations as follows:

1926	$2,100,265.57
1927	2,044,409.91
1928	1,946,354.17
1929	2,635,584.91
1930	1,457,417.49
1931	2,729,480.88
1932	2,973,668.29

So that the appropriations for this small organization have increased from $600,000 plus in 1914 to practically $3,000,000 in 1932.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to say that I imagine the Senator from Ohio was misled by an inadvertent error that I made in calling this bureau a department? I ask that that be corrected. I am sure that is what caused the trouble.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that correction will be made; and, without objection, the pending amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, yesterday there was some discussion about the rapid increase of the appropriations for the Commerce Department. I recognized that up to a certain time certain bureaus were separate, and later became part of the Commerce Department, and naturally the appropriations for the Commerce Department would be increased when those bureaus became a part of it. To-day, when the Senator from Tennessee was running over this list, and came to 1925, I suggested that it was that year that the Bureau of Mines had been made a part of the Commerce Department.

I recognize, as everybody does, that the Department of Commerce is one of the departments that have had a very rapid growth, and also that the particular activity of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce has had a very steady growth. I am of the opinion, however, that it did

not grow much more rapidly than the foreign business grew up to 1930. I also think that the Commerce Department has not grown beyond the growth of the business of the country. That is not true, of course, since the depression set in. That is quite obvious.

The only point I was making was that these rapid increases in the Commerce Department can be accounted for by consolidation of bureaus. That is the item I had in mind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 102, line 20, after the words "dry mounts," to strike out "$279,000" and insert "$275,000," so as to read:

For producing copies of weekly issue of drawings of patents and designs; reproduction of copies of drawings and specifications of exhausted patents, designs, trade-marks, and other papers, such other papers when reproduced for sale to be sold at not less than cost plus 10 per cent; reproduction of foreign patent drawings; photo prints of pending application drawings; and photostat and photographic supplies and dry mounts, $275,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I was called from the Chamber for a few moments. May I ask the Senator from California if he presented any amendments relating to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I asked yesterday that unanimous consent be accorded, and it was denied; so the amendments have not been presented.

Mr. COPELAND. Does not the Senator intend at some time to present those amendments?

Mr. JOHNSON. We have passed over the items, and they would all have to be reconsidered, one by one, before the amendments could be offered; and that reconsideration would be denied.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I desire to say again, regardless of all that was said in attempted refutation of my statement yesterday, that in my opinion it will be a calamity to our country, at a time when we are seeking economic rehabilitation, to reduce as radically as we have the appropriations for this bureau.

I have just this moment received from the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce a telegram reading as follows:

BUFFALO, N. Y., *April 29, 1932.*

Hon. ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulate you on stand taken reference closing district offices Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, particularly Buffalo. Urge you continue efforts. Our chamber supplies and maintains offices without charge for Buffalo district office, saving bureau thirty-six hundred annually, representing 30 per cent cost maintaining office western New York. Present and potential export business from western New York would be seriously handicapped by closing local office. In world competition for business, Government can obtain and distribute information not obtainable through private channels. When American industry is struggling to maintain pay rolls, closing offices which provide definite contact with world business will give foreign manufacturer great advantage. Please hand copies this telegram Senator WAGNER, Representatives MEAD, COOKE, and ANDREWS.

BUFFALO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

Mr. President, that telegram is expressive of the feeling entertained by business men everywhere in America.

Yesterday, using the material which was presented by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], I pointed out that the offices of the bureau in Memphis and Knoxville will be closed, and a lot more of these offices will be closed. It may be that they should be closed, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has just said. I do not believe it. I do not think it is good business. I do not think it is common sense.

It is all very well for us to make every possible effort to reduce appropriations. We should make those efforts. There can be no doubt that government has become top-heavy. There can be no doubt that our people are staggering under a burden of debt and of taxation. We must find ways to reduce the cost of government; but when we are making those efforts to reduce the cost of government, we must not invade and destroy activities which mean business to the merchants and manufacturers and farmers of the United States.

These district offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in a sense are the salesmen of American products. There can be no doubt about that. There can be no question of it.

What would you think of a business man, of a wholesaler or of a manufacturer, marketing his own goods, if he proceeded to do away with his salesmen, his traveling men, his advertising men, and all the other agents that have to do with the disposition of his products or of his goods? Senators, we can not do that. It is an outrage to do it.

I can think of activities where we could make greater economies, I believe, than we anticipate doing; but why do we seek to destroy these activities that have to do with the sale of our goods throughout the world, these gathering-places of information for the benefit of our merchants and our manufacturers and our farmers?

You have heard the appeal of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce. Ordinarily, I do not find any more heart in chambers of commerce than I do in bankers. They are cold-blooded, glass-eyed individuals when they represent these organizations. They may be human beings when they are home and in their clubs and in social contacts, but every one of them is glass-eyed when it comes to any human appeal. When an organization so effective in a business way as the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce makes an appeal such as I have indicated in the telegram which I have read; when the cold-blooded business men who are in the forefront in demanding economy in government, who are criticizing Senators and Representatives because of their failure to cut to the bone, say that we should continue to spend money for activities which have to do with our industrial and agricultural success, there must be a lot of reason why we should. There is not any heart about it with them. There is not any humanity involved in it. There is not anything involved in it except the cold-blooded urge to have business go on.

Mr. President, I share with my friend from California, a sense of hopelessness. I know that the standard has been raised; I know that we must conform to it; but individually I do not intend to conform to that standard without a protest.

I can not see how any Senator here, no matter what he may do as to other items of the bill, can vote to reduce the appropriations for activities which have to do with the very life of our country. May I say to the Senator from California that I suppose that if our tongues were touched with fire from heaven, it would not help any, but we ought to make the Senate understand, if we can, that by cutting off these appropriations and destroying these activities, we are helping to perpetuate and aggravate the economic distress and disease with which we are suffering.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, in view of the protests made by the Senator from New York and the Senator from California, what recourse have those who agree, except to vote against the bill as a whole?

Mr. COPELAND. Let me say to my friend from Colorado that I would dislike to vote against the bill as a whole. I think we should pass the appropriation bills. We should pass these appropriation bills and the tax bill, and then go home.

Mr. BORAH. I would like to have an executive session first.

Mr. COPELAND. Just a moment, and I will give the Senator a chance to ask for an executive session, as far as I am concerned. There must be some parliamentary way by which we can get this matter before this body.

A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COPELAND. There are those of us on the floor who are anxious to have items on pages 63 and following, to page 70, inclusive, to have certain additions made amount-

ing in all to about $450,000, I think. I ask the Senator from California what the total amount of the proposed changes would be.

Mr. JOHNSON. About $450,000 or $460,000.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, is there a parliamentary way by which this question can be presented to the Senate for a vote, without unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Only by a motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. COPELAND. That would require a two-thirds vote, would it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would require a two-thirds vote.

Mr. COPELAND. Then I may say to my friend from Colorado that we might just as well go out and bay at the moon. It is hopeless; and because of the fact that we are bound by that parliamentary law we can not do what we ought to do, and I am sorry. I think, when we have a call of the Senate, we ought to ask unanimous consent, and make a further appeal, because it is an outrageous thing and will be reflected in a very marked decrease in the revenues of the American people, if we permit these offices to be wiped out, as is proposed, and as will be done if the measure is left exactly as it is now.

Now I yield so that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] may ask for an executive session.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I think that in a moment or two we can get down to the provision for the Bureau of Mines, and I would like to go that far with the bill to-day.

Mr. MOSES. There are a great many individual amendments to be offered, I can assure the Senator from Washington, and the bill can not be completed to-night.

Mr. JONES. I do not think we can finish with the bill to-night, but I would like to get to the item for the Bureau of Mines, which is only a few pages further on, and it would take only a few moments to get to it.

Mr. BORAH. We will see.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 103, line 9, to reduce the appropriation for furniture and filing cases for the Patent Office from $27,000 to $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 103, line 13, after the word "indices," to strike out "$1,110,000" and insert "$1,050,000," and in line 15, after the word "binding," to strike out "$54,000; in all, $1,164,000" and insert "$50,000; in all, $1,100,000," so as to read:

For printing the weekly issue of patents, designs, trade-marks, prints, and labels, exclusive of illustrations; and for printing, engraving illustrations, and binding the Official Gazette, including weekly and annual indices, $1,050,000; for miscellaneous printing and binding, $50,000; in all, $1,100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF NAVAL ACADEMY GRADUATES IN 1932—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HALE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8083) providing for the appointment as ensigns in the line of the Navy of all midshipmen who graduate from the Naval Academy in 1932, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 7.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, inserting a comma after the figures "1932," and add thereto the following: "and at least 50 per cent of all graduates in subsequent years"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of said amendment, after the word "Academy" and before the comma, insert the following: "in 1932"; and the Senate agree to the same.

FREDERICK HALE,
TASKER L. ODDIE,
PARK TRAMMELL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CARL VINSON,
J. V. MCCLINTIC,
FRED A. BRITTEN,
GEORGE P. DARROW,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

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

Mr. HALE reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs sundry nominations in the Navy and Marine Corps.

TREATY OF ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION WITH SWITZERLAND

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read Executive B, a treaty of arbitration and conciliation with Switzerland, signed at Washington on February 16, 1931, which was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

To the end that I may receive the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of arbitration and conciliation between the United States and Switzerland, signed at Washington on February 16, 1931.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 3, 1932.*

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a treaty of arbitration and conciliation between the United States and Switzerland, signed at Washington on February 16, 1931.

This treaty embraces without any substantial differences the provisions concerning arbitration and conciliation which, in the relations of the United States with other countries, are contained in separate treaties on each subject.

Respectfully submitted.

HENRY L. STIMSON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 2, 1932.

The President of the United States of America and the Swiss Federal Council

Mindful of the obligations, which have been assumed by the United States of America and Switzerland, that the

settlement of all disputes of whatever nature or of whatever origin, which may arise between them, shall never be sought except by pacific means; desirous moreover of reaffirming the adherence of the two countries to the principle of submitting to impartial decision all juridical controversies in which they may become involved; and eager to demonstrate the sincerity of the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy in the relations between the United States of America and Switzerland.

Have decided to conclude a treaty of arbitration and conciliation and for that purpose have appointed as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State of the United States of America; and

The Swiss Federal Council:

Marc Peter, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Switzerland to the United States of America;

Who, having communicated to one another their full powers found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE 1

Every dispute arising between the Contracting Parties, of whatever nature it may be, shall, when ordinary diplomatic proceedings have failed, be submitted to arbitration or to conciliation, as the Contracting Parties may at the time decide.

ARTICLE 2

Any dispute which has not been settled by diplomacy and in regard to which the Contracting Parties do not in fact have recourse to adjudication by an arbitral tribunal shall be submitted for investigation and report to a Permanent Commission of Conciliation constituted in the manner hereinafter prescribed.

ARTICLE 3

The Permanent Commission of Conciliation shall be composed of five members and shall be constituted as soon as possible after the exchange of ratifications of this Treaty. Each of the Contracting Parties shall appoint two members, one from among its own nationals, the other from among the nationals of a third State. The Contracting Parties will, in common accord, appoint the fifth member, who shall not be one of their nationals, and who shall be ex officio the President of the Commission. If no agreement is reached as to the choice of the President of the Commission his election shall be conducted in accordance with the method prescribed in the fourth, fifth and sixth paragraphs of Article 45 of the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, concluded at The Hague on October 18, 1907.

At any time when there is no case before the Commission, either of the Contracting Parties may recall a member of the Commission appointed by it and may designate his successor. The recall of the President of the Commission will be effected at any such time on the request of either Contracting Party, provided that if the President shall have been elected in accordance with the method prescribed in the fourth, fifth and sixth paragraphs of Article 45 of the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, concluded at The Hague on October 18, 1907, no request for his recall may be made within a period of two years from the date of his election. Vacancies, from whatever cause shall be filled as soon as possible in the manner hereinabove provided for the making of original appointments.

Members of the Commission shall receive an adequate honorarium during the time when they are engaged in the performance of duties relating to a case before them. Each of the Contracting Parties will bear its own expenses and one-half of the expenses of the Commission.

ARTICLE 4

After the Contracting Parties shall have agreed to submit a dispute to conciliation, the Commission shall proceed to the consideration of such dispute upon a request sent to its President by either of them.

The Commission shall meet, in the absence of an agreement otherwise, at the place designated by its President.

The Commission may frame its own rules of procedure. In the absence of such rules it shall follow in so far as practicable the procedure set forth in Articles 18 to 34, inclusive, of the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes concluded at The Hague, October 18, 1907.

The Commission shall submit its report within one year after the date on which the case shall have been submitted to it, unless the Contracting Parties should, in common accord, shorten or extend the time limit. The report shall be prepared in triplicate, one copy shall be presented to each Government and the third retained by the Commission for its files.

The Contracting Parties agree to furnish the Commission with all the means and facilities required for its investigation and report.

The Contracting Parties reserve the right to act independently on the subject matter of the dispute after the report of the Commission shall have been submitted.

ARTICLE 5

The Contracting Parties bind themselves to submit to arbitration every difference which may have arisen or may arise between them by virtue of a claim of right, which is juridical in its nature, provided that it has not been possible to adjust such difference by diplomacy and it has not in fact been adjusted as a result of reference to the Permanent Commission of Conciliation constituted pursuant to Articles II and III of this Treaty.

ARTICLE 6

The provisions of Article V shall not be invoked in respect of any difference the subject matter of which

(a) is within the domestic jurisdiction of either of the Contracting Parties,

(b) involves the interests of third Parties,

(c) depends upon or involves the maintenance of the traditional attitude of the United States of America concerning American questions, commonly described as the Monroe Doctrine.

(d) depends upon or involves the observance of the obligations of Switzerland in accordance with the Covenant of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 7

The tribunal to which juridical differences shall be submitted shall be determined in each case by the Contracting Parties but shall, in the absence of other agreement, be the Permanent Court of Arbitration established at The Hague by the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes concluded October 18, 1907. Decision as to the tribunal shall be made in each case by a special agreement, which special agreement shall provide for the organization of the tribunal if necessary, shall define its powers, shall state the question or questions at issue and shall settle the terms of reference.

Such special agreement shall, in each case, be made on the part of the United States of America by the President thereof, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and on the part of Switzerland in accordance with its constitutional law.

ARTICLE 8

The present treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof and by Switzerland in accordance with its constitutional law.

The ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible, and the treaty shall come into force on the day of the exchange of the ratifications. It shall thereafter remain in force continuously unless and until terminated on notice of one year by either Contracting Party to the other.

In faith whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty in duplicate in the English and French languages, both texts having equal force, and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done at Washington the sixteenth day of February in the year one thousand nine hundred and thirty-one.

[SEAL.] HENRY L. STIMSON

[SEAL.] MARC PETER

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, this is an arbitration treaty with Switzerland in the usual, customary form. The two important articles are article 5 and article 6, which I will read. They are as follows:

ARTICLE 5

The contracting parties bind themselves to submit to arbitration every difference which may have arisen or may arise between them by virtue of a claim of right, which is juridical in its nature, provided that it has not been possible to adjust such difference by diplomacy and it has not in fact been adjusted as a result of reference to the Permanent Commission of Conciliation constituted pursuant to articles 2 and 3 of this treaty.

ARTICLE 6

The provisions of article 5 shall not be invoked in respect of any difference the subject matter of which—

(a) Is within the domestic jurisdiction of either of the contracting parties.

(b) Involves the interests of third parties.

(c) Depends upon or involves the maintenance of the traditional attitude of the United States of America concerning American questions, commonly described as the Monroe doctrine.

(d) Depends upon or involves the observance of the obligations of Switzerland in accordance with the covenant of the League of Nations.

There is no other provision in the treaty which I think needs to be called to the attention of the Senate, as the treaty is in the same form as other arbitration treaties.

The treaty was reported to the Senate without amendment. and the resolution of ratification was read, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive B, Seventy-second Congress, first session, an arbitration and conciliation treaty with Switzerland, signed at Washington on February 16, 1931.

The resolution was agreed to, two-thirds of the Senators present voting in the affirmative.

TREATY OF ESTABLISHMENT AND SOJOURN WITH TURKEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read Executive F, a treaty of establishment and sojourn signed by the plenipotentiaries of the United States and the Republic of Turkey at Ankara on October 28, 1931, which was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

To the end that I may receive the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of establishment and sojourn signed by the plenipotentiaries of the United States and the Republic of Turkey at Ankara on October 28, 1931.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 25, 1932.*

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a treaty of establishment and sojourn between the United States and the Republic of Turkey, signed at Ankara on October 28, 1931.

Respectfully submitted.

HENRY L. STIMSON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 24, 1932.

The United States of America and the Republic of Turkey, being desirous of prescribing, in accordance with modern international law, the conditions under which the nationals and corporations of each of the High Contracting Parties may settle and carry on business in the territory of the other Party, and with a view to regulating accordingly questions relating to jurisdiction and fiscal charges, have decided to conclude a treaty for that purpose and have appointed their plenipotentiaries:

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

Joseph C. Grew, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Turkish Republic; and

THE PRESIDENT OF THE TURKISH REPUBLIC:

Zekâi Bey, Minister for National Defence

who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions:

ARTICLE 1.

With reference to the conditions of establishment and sojourn which shall be applicable to the nationals and corporations of either country in the territories of the other, as well as to fiscal charges and judicial competence, the United States of America will accord to Turkey and Turkey will accord to the United States of America the same treatment in all cases as that which is accorded or shall be accorded to the most favored third country.

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed to affect existing statutes and regulations of either country in relation to the immigration of aliens or the right of either country to enact such statutes.

ARTICLE 2.

The present Treaty shall be ratified and the ratifications thereof shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

It shall take effect at the instant of the exchange of ratifications and shall remain in effect for three years. After this date it shall remain in effect until the expiration of twelve months from the date on which notice of its termination shall have been given by either High Contracting Party to the other.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have affixed their seals thereto.

Done in duplicate in the English and Turkish languages at Ankara this 28th day of October nineteen hundred and thirty one.

JOSEPH C. GREW
ZEKÂI

The treaty was reported to the Senate without amendment, and the resolution of ratification was read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive F, Seventy-second Congress, first session, a treaty of establishment and sojourn with Turkey, signed at Ankara on October 28, 1931.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Idaho the nature of this treaty with Turkey?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there is one paragraph, and that is practically all there is to the treaty. I will read that:

With reference to the conditions of establishment and sojourn which shall be applicable to the nationals and corporations of either country in the territories of the other, as well as to fiscal charges and judicial competence, the United States of America will accord to Turkey and Turkey will accord to the United States of America the same treatment in all cases as that which is accorded or shall be accorded to the most favored third country.

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed to affect existing statutes and regulations of either country in relation to the immigration of aliens or the right of either country to enact such statutes.

The Senate will see that the only thing the treaty really accomplishes is to give the most-favored-nation principle to both countries.

Mr. KING. The Senator will remember that a number of years ago, after prolonged discussion, the Lausanne treaty, which I thought very unfair and very unjust, was defeated in the Senate. I was wondering whether this proposed treaty, together with one or two others which have been suggested, are not intended to circumvent the action of the Senate and to give validity to a treaty which was defeated after full discussion.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator that such a thing is not accomplished, and I do not think there is any such intent. I have talked with Mr. Grew about this matter, and he has said that he had abandoned those controversial matters, and the matters about which we had the extended discussion, and simply contented himself with preserving the most-favored-nation principle and protecting us with reference to immigration. That is all there is in the treaty.

Mr. KING. Would the Senator object to this going over until Monday, or until to-morrow?

Mr. BORAH. I would not object to it going over until to-morrow, but Mr. Grew is very anxious to have it ratified.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will accommodate me so that I can look into it, I will be very much obliged to him.

Mr. BORAH. I will consent to it going over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The treaty will be passed over.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

The Senate resumed legislative business.

BOUNDARY LINE OF THE PANAMA CANAL ZONE

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of House bill 7119, to authorize the modification of the boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, and for other purposes. It has to do with foreign matters, but about which I think there will be no controversy and no discussion, in all probability. It is a bill for the modification of the boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, designed to incorporate under the jurisdiction of Panama the territory upon which we are proposing to build an embassy.

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

The Chief Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That with respect to that parcel of land in the Panama Canal Zone known as the Paitilla Point Military Reservation, title to which was acquired by the Government of the United States under the conventions concluded on November 18, 1903, and September 2, 1914, between the United States and Panama, the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to effect with the Republic of Panama a modification of the boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama so that such line shall then run as follows:

"Beginning at a concrete monument marked 'E,' which is a point on the line on the north boundary of the Paitilla Point Military Reservation as shown on Panama Canal Drawing No. X-6053-1, whose geodetic coordinates are latitude 8° 58′ plus 4,445.6 feet and longitude 79° 31′ plus 923.50 feet, and following along a course of south 33° east for 790 feet to a concrete monument marked 'F'; thence along a course of south 21° 45′ east for a distance of 490 feet to a concrete monument marked 'G'; thence along a course of south 52° west for 870 feet to a concrete monument marked 'H'; thence along a course of south 76° 30′ west for 780 feet more or less to a point marked 'I' on the map, which is an imaginary point located on the center line of the Matasnillo River, which forms the west boundary of the military reservation. All bearings are true. All coordinates are referred to the Panama Colon Datum."

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize the Secretary of State to convey or to surrender to the Government of Panama the title which the Government of the United States now holds in that parcel of land which may be detached from the Panama Canal Zone by virtue of the provisions of section 1 of this act.

SEC. 3. No civil or criminal case that may be pending in the courts of the Panama Canal Zone at the time this act shall become effective shall be affected thereby, either as to its present status or as to future proceedings, including final judgment or disposition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. My attention was diverted. What is this bill?

Mr. BORAH. It is a bill which I have asked to have considered, changing the boundary line of the Panama Canal Zone. The purpose is to include within the jurisdiction of the Panama Government a small piece of land which is now owned by the United States, the title to which is to remain in the United States but the control is to be transferred so that we may build thereon an embassy.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the Senator whether there was any difference of opinion in the committee, or whether the report was unanimous?

Mr. BORAH. It was a unanimous report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in connection with the bill the report upon it.

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

[Senate Report No. 602, 72d Cong., 1st sess.]

MODIFICATION OF PANAMA CANAL ZONE AND THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA BOUNDARY LINE

Mr. BORAH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted the following report (to accompany H. R. 7119):

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7119) to authorize the modification of the boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, reports the same favorably and recommends that it do pass.

The reasons for this bill are fully set forth in a report by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, which is hereto attached and made a part of this report.

"The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7119) to authorize the modification of the boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, and for other purposes, having considered same, reports thereon, without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

"The passage of this bill is recommended by the President in his message to Congress on December 10, 1931, as follows:

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"I inclose a report by the Secretary of State requesting the submission anew to the present Congress of his recommendation for a modification of the boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, so far as it affects that parcel of land in the Panama Canal Zone known as the Paitilla Point Military Reservation.

"I recommend that the Congress enact the necessary legislation authorizing and empowering the Secretary of State to effect the modification of the boundary line as indicated in the attached draft of a proposed bill covering this matter.

"HERBERT HOOVER.

"THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 10, 1931.*"

"The PRESIDENT:

"I have the honor to refer to my report dated December 19, 1930, concerning the modification of the existing boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama so far as it affects that parcel of land in the Panama Canal Zone known as the Paitilla Point Military Reservation. This report was transmitted by you to the Congress on December 20, 1930, with the recommendation that the necessary legislation be enacted authorizing and empowering me to effect with the Republic of Panama the modification of the boundary line as indicated. Your recommendation and my report were printed as House Document No. 700, Seventy-first Congress. A copy thereof is attached for convenient information.

"Bills S. 5570 and H. R. 15608, Seventy-first Congress, introduced on January 5, 1931, in the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, were intended to authorize and empower the Secretary of State to effect the proposed modification. The bill H. R. 15608 was reported favorably by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives (H. Rept. 2271, 71st Cong.), and was passed by the House of Representatives on February 21, 1931. It was transmitted to the Senate on February 23, 1931, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

"As the Congress adjourned without further action on the bill having been taken, I have the honor to recommend that the matter be submitted anew to the consideration of the Seventy-second Congress.

"For the convenience of the Congress, I attach a draft of a proposed bill covering this matter.

"Respectfully submitted.

"HENRY L. STIMSON.

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
"*Washington, November 11, 1931.*"

"A bill to authorize the modification of the boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, and for other purposes

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That with respect to that parcel of land in the Panama Canal Zone known as the Paitilla Point Military Reservation, title to which was acquired by the Government of the United States under the conventions concluded on November 18, 1903, and September 2, 1914, between the United States and Panama, the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to effect with the Republic of Panama a modification of the boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama so that such line shall then run as follows:

"Beginning at a concrete monument market 'E,' which is a point on the line on the north boundary of the Paitilla Point Military Reservation as shown on Panama Canal Drawing No. X-6053-1, whose geodetic coordinates are latitude 8° 58′ plus 4,445.06 feet and longitude 79° 31′ plus 923.50 feet, and following along a course of

S. 33° 00′ E. for 790 feet to a concrete monument marked 'F'; thence along a course of S. 21° 45′ E. for a distance of 490 feet to a concrete monument marked 'G'; thence along a course of S. 52° 00′ W. for 870 feet to a concrete monument marked 'H'; thence along a course of S. 76° 30′ W. for 780 feet more or less to a point marked 'I' on the map, which is an imaginary point located on the center line of the Matasnillo River, which forms the west boundary of the military reservation. All bearings are true. All coordinates are referred to the Panama-Colon Datum.

"SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize the Secretary of State to convey or to surrender to the Government of Panama the title which the Government of the United States now holds in that parcel of land which may be detached from the Panama Canal Zone by virtue of the provisions of section 1 of this act.

"SEC. 3. No civil or criminal case that may be pending in the courts of the Panama Canal Zone at the time this act shall become effective shall be affected thereby either as to its present status or as to future proceedings, including final judgment or disposition.

"The purpose of this bill is the modification of the existing boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama so far as it affects that parcel of land in the Panama Canal Zone known as the Paitilla Point Military Reservation.

"It has been found advisable to use a portion of this land as the site for the erection of a residence for the American minister to Panama. It is necessary that such a residence be located within the boundaries of the Republic of Panama. By Executive Order No. 3322, dated September 1, 1920, the land in question was placed under the jurisdiction of the War Department. This department stated in a letter dated October 3, 1928, that—

"'Relative to the use by the State Department of a part of Paitilla Point Military Reservation the War Department has no objection to the proposed use by the State Department of the area referred to, nor has it any objection to the recession of that area to the Republic of Panama, provided the three following conditions are fulfilled:

"'1. The private title thereto remains in the Government of the United States.

"'2. The military authorities have free and unrestricted use of all roads in the area in question, either existing or to be constructed, that provide access to and from the Paitilla Point Military Reservation through this area to the main highway in Panaman territory.

"'3. Should the property ceded cease to be used by the State Department it shall be ceded back to the United States and returned to the control of the War Department.'

"If this bill should be enacted by Congress it is proposed to effect the contemplated modification by an exchange of notes which will contain the conditions proposed by the War Department. The suggested change in the existing boundary line, therefore, is for the purpose of effecting a technical transfer of jurisdiction. Land now within the Canal Zone and under the jurisdiction of the United States is by this bill placed within the boundary of the Republic of Panama. Upon the erection of a legation by the United States upon this land the jurisdiction thus secured by Panama is again yielded back to the United States in accordance with the practice of diplomatic immunity and exemption from local jurisdiction."

RECESS

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 5 o'clock p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, April 30, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 29, 1932

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Asst. Surg. Edwin G. Williams to be past assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service, to rank as such from May 21, 1932.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Second Lieut. Leslie Haynes Wyman, Cavalry, with rank from June 9, 1928.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be captain

First Lieut. Edgar Eugene Glenn, Air Corps, from April 26, 1932.

To be first lieutenant

Second Lieut. Narcisse Lionel Cote, Air Corps, from April 26, 1932.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Major William Bertram Meister, Medical Corps, from April 27, 1932.

CHAPLAIN

To be chaplain with the rank of lieutenant colonel

Chaplain James Miles Webb (Major), United States Army, from April 26, 1932.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Edgar G. Gunnels to be postmaster at Emerson, Ark., in place of E. G. Gunnels. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1932.

John F. Halbrook to be postmaster at Plumerville, Ark., in place of J. W. Reed, resigned.

Menno S. Klopfenstein to be postmaster at Siloam Springs, Ark., in place of M. S. Klopfenstein. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1932.

CALIFORNIA

George P. Morse to be postmaster at Chico, Calif., in place of G. P. Morse. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1932.

Daniel McCloskey to be postmaster at Hollister, Calif., in place of Daniel McCloskey. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1932.

Edward G. Farmer to be postmaster at Needles, Calif., in place of J. H. Tittle, resigned.

May C. Baker to be postmaster at Paradise, Calif., in place of M. C. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1932.

John D. Chace to be postmaster at San Jose, Calif., in place of J. R. Chace, deceased.

Violet D. Manor to be postmaster at Williams, Calif., in place of H. G. Manor, deceased.

COLORADO

Roy McWilliams to be postmaster at Ault, Colo., in place of Roy McWilliams. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1932.

William V. Kerr to be postmaster at Eads, Colo., in place of W. V. Kerr. Incumbent's commission expires May 22, 1932.

GEORGIA

William H. Freeman to be postmaster at Toomsboro, Ga., in place of W. H. Freeman. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1930.

IDAHO

Peter W. McRoberts to be postmaster at Twin Falls, Idaho, in place of P. W. McRoberts. Incumbent's commission expires May 7, 1932.

ILLINOIS

Olive G. Woods to be postmaster at Hennepin, Ill., in place of O. G. Woods. Incumbent's commission expires May 12, 1932.

Charles J. Rohde to be postmaster at Lena, Ill., in place of C. J. Rohde. Incumbent's commission expires May 12, 1932.

James W. Corwine to be postmaster at Lincoln, Ill., in place of J. W. Corwine. Incumbent's commission expires May 25, 1932.

Lyle E. Wilcox to be postmaster at McLean, Ill., in place of L. E. Wilcox. Incumbent's commission expires May 25, 1932.

Leon M. Shugart to be postmaster at Pontiac, Ill., in place of L. M. Shugart. Incumbent's commission expires May 25, 1932.

Samuel M. Combs to be postmaster at Ridgway, Ill., in place of S. M. Combs. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

Fred A. Meskimen to be postmaster at Robinson, Ill., in place of F. A. Meskimen. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1932.

Alta Winn to be postmaster at Saybrook, Ill., in place of Alta Winn. Incumbent's commission expires May 25, 1932.

John Van Antwerp to be postmaster at Sparland, Ill., in place of John Van Antwerp. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1932.

Willis A. Myers to be postmaster at Wenona, Ill., in place of W. A. Myers. Incumbent's commission expires May 17, 1932.

INDIANA

Samuel I. Parker to be postmaster at Howe, Ind., in place of N. A. Parham. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

Paul R. Reece to be postmaster at Spiceland, Ind., in place of G. R. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1932.

James C. Stott to be postmaster at Westport, Ind., in place of F. R. McCullough. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1932.

IOWA

Louis C. Giencke to be postmaster at Guttenberg, Iowa, in place of L. C. Giencke. Incumbent's commission expires May 19, 1932.

Harvey S. Powers to be postmaster at Iowa Falls, Iowa, in place of H. S. Powers. Incumbent's commission expires May 19, 1932.

William A. Grummon to be postmaster at Rockwell, Iowa, in place of W. A. Grummon. Incumbent's commission expires May 19, 1932.

Cora B. Alberty to be postmaster at Thornton, Iowa, in place of C. B. Alberty. Incumbent's commission expires May 19, 1932.

KANSAS

John D. Ferrell to be postmaster at Cedar Vale, Kans., in place of M. W. Sanderson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Henry B. Gibbens to be postmaster at Cunningham, Kans., in place of H. B. Gibbens. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1932.

Merton M. Fletcher to be postmaster at Glasco, Kans., in place of M. M. Fletcher. Incumbent's commission expires May 12, 1932.

Onto R. Linday to be postmaster at Mound Valley, Kans., in place of J. M. Lear. Incumbent's commission expired March 26, 1932.

Callie L. Henderson to be postmaster at Udall, Kans., in place of O. R. Durham. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

KENTUCKY

Edgar Renshaw to be postmaster at Hopkinsville, Ky., in place of Edgar Renshaw. Incumbent's commission expires May 23, 1932.

LOUISIANA

John A. Moody to be postmaster at Cotton Valley, La., in place of J. A. Moody. Incumbent's commission expires May 2, 1932.

Lillian P. Gross to be postmaster at Lake Providence, La., in place of L. P. Gross. Incumbent's commission expires May 17, 1932.

MICHIGAN

Thomas S. Shober to be postmaster at Pentwater, Mich., in place of E. W. Shober, deceased.

MINNESOTA

David C. McKenzie to be postmaster at Lake City, Minn., in place of D. C. McKenzie. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1932.

James M. Patterson to be postmaster at West Concord, Minn., in place of J. M. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1932.

MISSISSIPPI

Mitchell E. McLaughlin to be postmaster at Leland, Miss., in place of J. F. Ellard, removed.

MISSOURI

Dorothy M. Ritter to be postmaster at Wellington, Mo., in place of D. M. Ritter. Incumbent's commission expired April 11, 1932.

NEBRASKA

Carl C. Moyer to be postmaster at Ainsworth, Nebr., in place of E. D. Gideon, jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1931.

Earnest E. Correll to be postmaster at Hebron, Nebr., in place of H. L. Boyes. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

NEVADA

James L. Finney to be postmaster at Boulder City, Nev. Office established.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

James H. Fitzgerald to be postmaster at East Jaffrey, N. H., in place of R. B. Henchman, deceased.

Evelyn H. Beane, to be postmaster at Henniker, N. H., in place of J. H. Falvey, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Harriet C. Rosenkrans to be postmaster at Branchville, N. J., in place of H. C. Rosenkrans. Incumbent's commission expires May 14, 1932.

Tobias V. Chieffo to be postmaster at Cliffside Park, N. J., in place of T. V. Chieffo. Incumbent's commission expires May 26, 1932.

Byron M. Prugh to be postmaster at Westfield, N. J., in place of B. M. Prugh. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1932.

NEW YORK

Charles H. Werger to be postmaster at Averill Park, N. Y., in place of F. A. Shoemaker, resigned.

Albert B. W. Firmin to be postmaster at Brooklyn, N. Y., in place of A. B. W. Firmin. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1932.

Nellie MacMorran to be postmaster at Firthcliffe, N. Y., in place of Nellie MacMorran. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

NORTH CAROLINA

Robert D. Herndon to be postmaster at Chapel Hill, N. C., in place of R. D. Herndon. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

B. Ray Cohoon to be postmaster at Columbia, N. C., in place of B. R. Cohoon. Incumbent's commission expires May 25, 1932.

Joseph S. Mitchell to be postmaster at Draper, N. C., in place of J. S. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expires May 16, 1932.

Frank L. Smith to be postmaster at Drexel, N. C., in place of F. L. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1932.

Ocie O. Freeman to be postmaster at Gates, N. C., in place of O. O. Freeman. Incumbent's commission expires May 10, 1932.

Thomas S. Keeter to be postmaster at Grover, N. C., in place of T. S. Keeter. Incumbent's commission expires May 17, 1932.

Charles M. Rosser to be postmaster at Jonesboro, N. C., in place of J. W. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1931.

James S. Ware to be postmaster at Kings Mountain, N. C., in place of S. S. Weir. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1931.

Christopher C. Snead to be postmaster at Laurel Hill, N. C., in place of C. C. Snead. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1932.

Joseph B. Harrell to be postmaster at Marshville, N. C., in place of J. B. Harrell. Incumbent's commission expired March 26, 1932.

Elmer D. Lansing to be postmaster at Montreat, N. C., in place of C. C. Lord. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1932.

Frank Dudgeon to be postmaster at Pinehurst, N. C., in place of Frank Dudgeon. Incumbent's commission expires May 17, 1932.

Benjamin F. Griffin to be postmaster at Pineville, N. C., in place of B. F. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expires May 17, 1932.

Lucile L. White to be postmaster at Salemburg, N. C., in place of L. L. White. Incumbent's commission expires May 10, 1932.

Annie L. Stanton to be postmaster at Stantonsburg, N. C., in place of A. L. Stanton. Incumbent's commission expires May 2, 1932.

William E. Kreeger to be postmaster at Pilot Mountain, N. C., in place of W. W. Redman, removed.

James R. Beal to be postmaster at Varina, N. C., in place of L. S. Proctor, removed.

NORTH DAKOTA

Jessie L. Kinsey to be postmaster at Beach, N. Dak., in place of J. L. Kinsey. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1932.

Marie Siverts to be postmaster at Dodge, N. Dak., in place of Marie Siverts. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1932.

OHIO

Jerome H. C. Goodhart to be postmaster at Brewster, Ohio, in place of J. H. C. Goodhart. Incumbent's commission expires May 25, 1932.

Hugh M. Hay to be postmaster at Coshocton, Ohio, in place of A. C. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

Edwin H. Garver to be postmaster at Navarre, Ohio, in place of E. H. Garver. Incumbent's commission expires May 16, 1932.

Henrietta Bennett to be postmaster at Tippecanoe City, Ohio, in place of Henrietta Bennett. Incumbent's commission expires May 23, 1932.

OKLAHOMA

Daisy E. Skinner to be postmaster at Adair, Okla., in place of D. E. Skinner. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1932.

OREGON

Elizabeth J. Morgan to be postmaster at Corbett, Oreg., in place of E. J. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1931.

PENNSYLVANIA

Arza R. Bullock to be postmaster at Cambridge Springs, Pa., in place of F. O. Hood, removed.

Edward R. Dithrich to be postmaster at Coraopolis, Pa., in place of E. R. Dithrich. Incumbent's commission expires May 26, 1932.

Bertha S. Kuns to be postmaster at Creighton, Pa., in place of W. L. Brinton. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

John J. Nichols to be postmaster at Lansdowne, Pa., in place of J. J. Nichols. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1932.

William M. Overholt to be postmaster at Mount Pleasant, Pa., in place of W. M. Overholt. Incumbent's commission expires May 22, 1932.

Clyde G. McMurray to be postmaster at Oakdale, Pa., in place of C. G. McMurray. Incumbent's commission expires May 25, 1932.

Wyndham C. Jones to be postmaster at Titusville, Pa., in place of C. H. Potter, deceased.

Ray J. Crowthers to be postmaster at West Elizabeth, Pa., in place of R. J. Crowthers. Incumbent's commission expires May 22, 1932.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William B. Tarkington to be postmaster at St. George, S. C., in place of W. H. Lott, removed.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Edward J. Groat to be postmaster at Thunder Hawk, S. Dak., in place of E. J. Groat. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1932.

TENNESSEE

Carlos C. Davis to be postmaster at Redboiling Springs, Tenn., in place of C. C. Davis. Incumbent's commission expires May 16, 1932.

Alice L. Needham to be postmaster at Trimble, Tenn., in place of A. L. Needham. Incumbent's commission expires April 30, 1932.

TEXAS

Harvey L. Pettit to be postmaster at Bloomburg, Tex., in place of H. L. Pettit. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

Zella H. Mitchell to be postmaster at Campbell, Tex., in place of F. R. Ridley. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1931.

James A. Morgan to be postmaster at Vega, Tex., in place of J. A. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expires May 12, 1932.

VERMONT

James E. Kidder to be postmaster at Derby, Vt., in place of J. E. Kidder. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1931.

VIRGINIA

McClung Patton to be postmaster at Lexington, Va., in place of McClung Patton. Incumbent's commission expires May 26, 1932.

WEST VIRGINIA

Charles Ash to be postmaster at Glen Jean, W. Va., in place of Charles Ash. Incumbent's commission expires May 29, 1932.

Alphonse Leuthardt to be postmaster at Grafton, W. Va., in place of Alphonse Leuthardt. Incumbent's commission expires May 10, 1932.

WISCONSIN

Adolph R. Mill to be postmaster at Kaukauna, Wis., in place of A. R. Mill. Incumbent's commission expires May 26, 1932.

Theodore B. Ottum to be postmaster at McFarland, Wis., in place of T. B. Ottum. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1932.

William Frankland to be postmaster at Montfort, Wis., in place of William Frankland. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1932.

WYOMING

Frank Breitenstein to be postmaster at Parco, Wyo., in place of H. J. Thompson, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 29, 1932

CONSUL GENERAL

Oscar S. Heizer to be consul general.

SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

John McArdle.
Gordon P. Merriam.
John K. Caldwell.
William C. Burdett.
Perry N. Jester.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, CLASS 5, CONSUL, AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Paul Trauger Culbertson to be Foreign Service officer, class 5, consul and secretary in the Diplomatic Service.

POSTMASTERS

HAWAII

Joseph Herrscher, Hana.

IOWA

Emma H. Hager, Burdette.
Charles B. Santee, Cedar Falls.
Harlie A. Grantham, Dewitt.
Grace F. Newton, Dickens.
Rose M. Ward, Neola.

MICHIGAN

Elmer C. Clute, Harrison.
Adrian J. Westveer, Holland.
Bird L. Hight, Howell.
Clyde E. Dohm, Sodus.

MINNESOTA

Charles W. Patsold, Cambridge.
Jennie L. Phillips, Clearwater.
Christ Bottge, Correll.
Ida V. Lund, Farwell.
Edwin H. Anderson, Monticello.
Alvin A. Ogren, New London.
George Neumann, Osseo.
Maggie N. Halgren, Wahkon.
Emory B. Linsley, Willow River.

NEBRASKA

Orin J. Schwieger, Chadron.
Wesley E. Snider, Osceola.

NEW JERSEY

George Coleman, Delanco.
Winifred E. Lindstedt, Helmetta.
Jacob D. Roe, Newton.
Ida H. Collom, Pemberton.
Raymond Johnson, Riverside.
G. Raymond Beck, Roebling.
Hillis K. Colkitt, Vincentown.

NEW YORK

Clayton M. Card, Amenia.
Ethel M. Bluestone, Canaseraga.
Margaret M. Senecal, Champlain.
Henry E. Thompson, Chateaugay.
Daniel T. Evans, Chittenango.
Berton G. Johnson, Cooperstown.
Clifford C. Wenzel, Deferiet.
Elmer C. Wyman, Dover Plains.
Clinton H. Card, Fredonia.
Clarence E. Snyder, Glenfield.
William L. Froehley, Hamburg.
Ralph D. Sanford, Hammondsport.
Mary A. Blazina, Harrison.
Albert F. Becker, Livonia.
George W. Millicker, Mahopac Falls.
George B. Bradish, Malone.
Warren C. Edgar, New Hamburg.
Ralph F. Spaulding, Piermont.
Kate L. Holden, Peru.
Austin E. Hummel, Prattsville.
George A. Hager, Watertown.
Thomas Wheatcroft, Watervliet.

NORTH CAROLINA

Ida L. Dennis, Fuquay Springs.
James W. Stanton, La Grange.
Nora Stedman, Moncure.
James M. Thrasher, Stoneville.
Fronie L. Perry, Wingate.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Malcolm J. Stanley, Hampton.
Thomas W. Blakely, Langley.
James V. Askew, jr., Lockhart.
William J. Hughes, Loris.
Bessie T. Cooper, Mayesville.
Neely J. Smith, Ridgeville.
Ben Harper, Seneca.

TENNESSEE

Baltis L. Kemp, Adamsville.
Herschel H. Tatlock, Covington.
Samuel W. Ingersoll, Decherd.
James Rogers, Dyer.
William G. Leach, Huntingdon.
Lonnie A. Jernigan, Manchester.
Gertrude Jamison, Millington.
Alvin L. Henderson, Tracy City.
Jesse C. Watson, Waverly.

TEXAS

Lela T. Toone, Brownfield.

VERMONT

Paul W. Higbee, Proctor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

We would behold the vision of the Most High God. It is only as we rise by faith, by prayer, and by contemplation that evil loses its power. By the majesty of Thy truth, by the attraction of Thy beauty, by the charm of Thy love, and by virtue of the ideals of the Teacher of Nazareth will the embellishments of human life be realized. Deliver us from any false standards and let us see the light in Thy light. Almighty God, breathe into our breasts that power that shall redeem us from any mental confusion. Lift us up into that sphere in which we shall be in unison with Thy purpose. O fill us all with a divine impulse that shall strike any overhanging cloud through and through with light-bearing devotion and sacrifice to our country's needs. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2967. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3270. An act for the relief of Daniel S. Schaffer Co. (Inc.).

THE MISSION OF THE PROGRESSIVES IN THE PRESENT CONGRESS

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert therein a speech made by me over the Columbia network on April 4, 1932.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address over the Columbia Broadcasting System by myself, Monday, April 4, 1932, from Columbia's studios in Washington:

The mission of the progressives in Congress—and I speak for my colleagues in the House of Representatives only—is mainly to keep legislation abreast of the times. We seek to translate into legislation promises and pledges made by both parties in platforms and in campaign speeches before election. I say pledges made by both parties, because on popular issues and necessary economic reforms there is very little difference in these campaign pledges and promises. Often we believe that remedies suggested or reforms proposed do not go far enough, and in these instances we seek to set the pace in an effort to reach the mark and effect the desired result.

Progressives believe that a plank in the platform or a campaign pledge is a solemn promise which must be kept. We are not satisfied to talk about issues. We propose remedies and insist upon their enactment into law. We grow tired of platitudes and demand action. We believe in representative government and insist upon Congress functioning as such and in keeping with original American traditions.

The most useful purpose of the progressives is our fundamental belief that legislation should be considered from a national viewpoint and not in accordance with local or sectional interests. We believe in this country as one nation. We have learned by the sad experience of our respective constituencies, whether in the city or on the farms, whether up North or down South. The lesson of long periods of unemployment, of absolute control of commodity prices has taught us that the people in this country have a common interest. Politicians and exploiters have been able for a long time to flame sectional feeling and to array rural

regions against the cities and the workers in the industries against the farmers.

It is our purpose and hope to demolish these artificial barriers. We have learned in discussing our problems that the people of this country have been kept apart by artificially created issues and by local interests while they have been submitted to a systematic exploitation.

The farmer, as well as the skilled and unskilled mechanic, the planters and the wage earners have eventually learned that all the wisdom of financing is not in the possession of the bankers. The people of this country have learned that there is no mystery in a monetary system and that the theoretical gold reserves, while interesting in academic discussions of the classroom, are of no value in the efforts of the unemployed or the underpaid farmer to balance their family budget.

The farmer has learned to view the value of money not in terms of theoretical reserve furnished by high-pressured economists of the banking fraternity, but to weigh his wheat and crops in terms of shoes and clothing, machinery, and the manufactured goods upon which he is dependent. The wage earners of the city now measure their wage in terms of cotton and beefsteak, bread, milk, and rent. They all insist upon a fair and just return for their products and labor.

The time has passed when the producers of this country may be awed into silence by the use of big words or the recital of long columns of figures. They have learned through bitter experience the mathematics of their economics. They demand a square deal, and the progressives will insist that they get it.

The workers and the farmers of this country know that they are not to blame for the present depression. They understand, if big business and the bankers have not yet realized it, that we can not expect to restore prosperity by an increase in our foreign trade. That day is gone, and gone forever, for the reason that other countries are on a production basis themselves in addition to other unsurmountable barriers which need not be discussed at this time. We can only return to prosperity by a complete change of our industrial system along with an economic readjustment.

We can not get out of this depression by proclamations, political speeches, or pep talks. We must so arrange our industries to give immediate employment to all of the willing workers of this country. It means that the working day and the working week must be shortened, thereby giving the benefit of our advanced and efficient methods of quantity production to all the people of the country. Of course this is costly, but nothing can be as costly as unemployment, a destroyed purchasing power, closed factories, and tottering banks and national economic crisis.

Along with this we must provide for a national system of unemployment insurance not only to guarantee economic security to the wage earners and producers of the country but to maintain a certain level of purchasing power, thereby making impossible the recurring cycles of depression under a system which permits of exploitation and overproduction along with unemployment and undernourishment.

The remedy suggested may seem radical and far-fetched to-day, but I venture the prophecy that unless some such constructive change is brought about the remedies we suggest to-day will seem indeed tame and conservative to-morrow.

Much has been said of the activities of the progressives in connection with the consideration of the revenue bill which passed the House last Friday. Indeed, we may well point to this instance in exemplifying the necessity of the exploited and suffering people of this country getting together. In this instance, when bankers and manipulators who were mainly responsible for the present economic crisis were seeking to put upon the backs of the American people the entire cost of paying the deficit which they themselves had created, sectional lines disappeared, partisan affiliations were set aside, and a fine and wholesome coalition was spontaneously formed which succeeded in eliminating the sales tax which had been written into the bill.

It may be well to say in passing that the friends of the sales tax outside of Congress did more than the opponents in Congress to defeat their own measure. The sales tax had no friends in the House. Every Member who took the floor in support of it apologized for so doing. The greed, selfishness, and heartlessness of some of the main sponsors of the sales-tax system were soon brought to light by their gloating over victory which they believed certain. So accustomed were they of controlling revenue bills, they could not imagine a defeat.

Their greed and grasp were such that they could not wait for the proposition to be written into the law, but immediately started a movement, editorialized propaganda, coercion and pressure to bring about the repeal of our income-tax system. They revealed their own insincerity, they exposed their hand, they left no doubt that they were seeking to avoid the payment of their just taxes and passing it on to the great masses of people who were unable to take any additional burden. The vicious attack on the income system, the misrepresentation, the unjustifiable criticism of Congress for standing by this American system of taxation, I will say, and I was in that fight, was one of the main factors which defeated the sales tax.

In order to obtain the passage of the sales tax the slogan of "balancing the Budget" was coined. Yes, we are in favor of balancing the Budget. I have always so stated, but I want to recall to the country last October, when the Treasury Department issued $1,000,000,000 of Government bonds and again in the early part of this year when $900,000,000 of Government bonds were issued, there was no talk of balancing the Budget then. The deficit was just as great. This $1,900,000,000 of long-term bonds was nothing else than making the next generation pay for the current expenses of to-day.

The bankers wanted this additional $1,900,000,000 of Government bonds. As far back as last October I criticized the then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Mellon, for issuing long-term bonds for current expenditures. The slogan "balancing the Budget" was accompanied by repeated threats of a panic from supposedly responsible citizens. A threat of a panic brought about the declaration of the moratorium on the payment of our foreign debts. A threat of panic brought about the enactment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation law when Congress appropriated $2,000,000,000 to aid tottering banks and insolvent railroads.

Last Thursday, when the House had practically finished with the revenue bill, word was sent to Washington from New York City that unless the Treasury Department guaranteed that the Budget would be balanced there was grave danger of a panic. And let it be said to the everlasting credit of the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee they added $80,000,000 that night by placing under the normal tax all stock dividends. Personally I believe that it was not necessary to put this additional amount into the bill. But the committee responded to the last demand made, and there certainly can be no complaint, for the quarter who must pay this tax are responsible for its having been written into the bill.

Just one final word to offset the misrepresentation that is being made as to the cause of the present deficit in the Treasury. It is not the fault of extravagance in the necessary expenditures for the maintenance of the American Government. In the first place, the revenues of the Government from income taxes have fallen because the American investor has been swindled out of money by the bankers in whom he had a right to have confidence. Swindled to the tune of over $2,000,000,000 of South American securities alone and several additional hundreds of millions of dollars in European securities. Again, the revenue from income tax has been reduced because American investors were deceived by the bondmongers and the same bankers into buying securities that were artificially inflated.

In some instances the banks artificially inflated their own securities. This breach of confidence—this imposition—resulted in the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars to the investor and millions and millions of dollars to the United States Government in the shape of taxes. Then the forced moratorium resulted in a loss of $252,000,000 during the present fiscal year and about $270,000,000 in all likelihood the next fiscal year.

In addition to that, we have appropriated out of current expenses $500,000,000 for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—to do what? To turn over to the railroads and banks.

In addition to that, we are spending $20,000,000 a year in subsidies to aviation companies, $50,000,000 in subsidies to private shipowners. There again is $70,000,000.

One billion dollars is required to pay the interest and sinking-fund requirements on our national debt. It will readily be seen that in these days of talk of economy that little is being said of the main causes of our depression and Treasury deficit. While small savings may be made here and there, it will amount to very little in comparison with the staggering deficit of the Treasury.

In connection with the sales-tax program there was announced a plan for a general reduction of the salaries of Federal employees and it became known that industry and commerce and business would immediately follow with a like reduction.

It is impossible to understand how anyone could be so short-sighted as not to see the folly of any general wage reduction in this country. Such a plan would only result in further reducing the purchasing power of the American people and prolonging the present depression to a point of complete catastrophe.

The progressives do not intend to stay idle and see the country brought to ruin. We can get out of this depression. We shall get out of it. We will do so by bringing up the purchasing power of the American people and by raising commodity prices; by bringing up the level of the producers instead of a destructive plan of bringing everything down except interest rates and the power of monopolies. Along these lines we have patiently been working for years and we expect to continue. The success and progress of our Republic can not be measured in terms of skyscrapers or reserves in banks. It can not be measured in terms of foreign credits. There is only one way and that is to reestablish a well-balanced prosperity by the distribution of employment in keeping with the machine age in which we are living, creating a high purchasing power able to meet increased commodity prices—and in that way bring about the readjustment essential to our future well-being.

BEER AND FARM RELIEF

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an address recently delivered over the radio by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House to extend my own remarks in the RECORD I include the following address which I recently delivered over radio station WJSV:

In recent years this country has heard much about farm relief. Many plans have been discussed. Much legislation has been en-

acted. Recently we have heard something about a new plan. We are told that all the farmers' troubles will be over if we legalize beer. In fact, if we are to believe the enthusiastic gentlemen who are now shouting so loudly for beer, it is the magic formula which will solve all our problems, whether they be crime, debts, taxation, unemployment, or farm distress.

I have time this evening to discuss the beer question from one angle alone; that is, as a farm-relief measure. I happen to represent one of the greatest grain-growing districts in the country, and because of the claims which have been made that the legalization of beer would furnish a market for the farmer's grain and start him back on the road to prosperity, I have taken some interest in looking up the facts in that connection.

It is a singular thing that in all the discussion we have had of beer as a farm-relief measure, none of it has come from farmers or those representing farmers. Recently the Committee on Manufactures in the Senate held extensive hearings upon the proposal to legalize beer. The report of these hearings comprises a document of some 574 pages. More than 50 witnesses testified in favor of the measure. A great many of them predicated their advocacy of it on the theory that the manufacture of beer would be of great benefit to agriculture. Yet not one of the witnesses so testifying was a farmer or the representative of a farm organization. Among the witnesses were numerous Members of Congress. They, too, stated that beer would help the farmer. Yet not one of these Members represented a strictly rural district. On the contrary, on looking over the list we find that they were from Detroit, St. Louis, Buffalo, New York, Chicago, Peoria, and Seattle, to mention only a few. The only representative of a farm organization who appeared was Mr. Louis J. Taber, the head of that great farm organization, the National Grange, who appeared not to support, but to oppose the legalization of beer.

During all the time I have been in Congress I have been a member of the Committee on Agriculture. I am acquainted with the legislative representatives of all the farm organizations in the country. They have been assiduously working here in Washington for legislation which their organizations believe will be of benefit to agriculture. Yet I have never heard of any representative of these organizations advocating beer.

It would seem, therefore, that if beer is a solution of our agricultural ills that the farmers and their representatives have singularly overlooked an opportunity. However, after carefully investigating the matter it is not difficult to see why the farmers of this country are not excited about beer as a solution for their troubles.

The theory upon which it is argued that the legalizing of beer would help the farmer is that it would furnish a market for his grain. However, when we come to investigate the amount of grain which was used in the manufacture of beer, and in fact of all alcoholic liquors, in preprohibition days, we find that compared with the total production it was insignificant. During the five years immediately previous to national prohibition we consumed an average of a little less than 100,000,000 bushels of grain, including corn, rye, barley, oats, wheat, and rice, in the production of all distilled and fermented liquors. About 65,000,000 bushels of this was barley, used in making beer. The average annual crop of all the grains just mentioned is approximately 5,000,000,000 bushels, so that it can readily be seen that in preprohibition days we used only 2 per cent of our present grain crop in the manufacture of all alcoholic liquors and only about 1⅓ per cent in the manufacture of beer.

Even assuming that a market for 1⅓ per cent of our grain has been lost because of the prohibition of beer, such an infinitesimal loss is certainly nothing for any farmer to get excited about. As a matter of fact, however, it hasn't been lost.

Most of the propagandists for beer assume that since the coming of prohibition the production of barley has declined. The only thing wrong with this assumption is that it is not true. Mr. August A. Busch, the president of Anheuser-Busch (Inc.), has made the statement that "with the coming of prohibition the barley farmers naturally seeded their lands to wheat and entered into competition with the wheat farmers." Others, following Mr. Busch's lead and, no doubt, without investigating the facts, have made the same statement. The facts, however, are entirely different.

In 1916 the acreage of barley in this country was 7,674,000 and the production was 180,927,000 bushels. In 1917, the year in which more barley was consumed by the beer industry than any other, the acreage was 8,835,000 and the production was 208,975,000 bushels. Contrast these figures with 1929, 1930, and 1931. In 1929 the acreage was 13,068,000 and the yield was 302,892,000 bushels. In 1930 the acreage was 12,437,000 and the yield was 325,893,000. In 1931 the Northwest States, where the greater part of our barley is produced, suffered a very severe drought, which interfered somewhat with the seeding of barley. Nevertheless, in that year, the acreage planted was 11,471,000 and the total yield, in spite of the drought, was 198,965,000 bushels. It can be seen, therefore, that instead of there being a decrease in the production and consumption of barley, there has actually been a very marked increase. It is hard to see how the barley farmer has been injured by prohibition.

Furthermore, the figures reveal that instead of the barley farmers shifting to the production of wheat, thus increasing the wheat surplus, the shift has been the other way. The great increase in barley has been in the Northwest, in the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, and North and South Dakota, and, generally speaking, this region has reduced its wheat acreage since the war period. The great increase in wheat acreage has been in the hard winter-wheat region of the Southwest, and it has not displaced barley, which has never been grown to any extent in that section.

Now, it may be asked what is being done with all this barley? Well, the figures show it is being used as feed for livestock, particularly for dairy cattle and hogs. The States in the Northwest, where the great increase in barley production has taken place, are the premier dairy States of the Union. They have also greatly increased their production of pork. Now, some one may say, What has that to do with beer? Simply this: That instead of converting our barley into beer, we are converting it into milk and pork chops. Figures compiled by the Department of Agriculture show that in 1917 the average per capita consumption of milk and milk products, computed in terms of milk, in this country was 754.8 pounds, while in 1929, the last normal year, it was 997.5 pounds. I do not have the figures for 1931, but for 1930 the consumption of milk and milk products was almost exactly the same as for 1929, only a fraction of 1 per cent less. Now, this great increase in the per capita consumption of milk means the consumption not only of more grain than was used in the manufacture of all distilled and fermented liquors in 1917 but means the consumption of a great additional quantity of hay and other roughage grown by the farmers of this country. This was very clearly pointed out by Mr. Taber in his statement before the Senate committee, in which he showed that in order to produce this increased consumption of milk we consume a total of over 10,000,000,000 pounds of grain and 25,000,000,000 pounds of roughage, whereas all grain used in distilled and fermented liquors in 1917 was but 6,200,000,000 pounds. Furthermore, when a farmer converts his barley into milk or pork, he gets some of the manufacturing profits, whereas if it goes into beer, the brewer and the saloon get all the profit.

If time permitted one might go on and enumerate other economic benefits which have come to the farmer as a result of prohibition. I might call attention to the matter of the corn-sugar manufacturing industry, which has developed so greatly in recent years. Corn sugar is used quite largely in the manufacture of confectionery, soft drinks, and like products, the production of which has greatly expanded during the prohibition era. The return of beer would certainly not increase the consumption of these products.

In 1917 we produced a little over 60,000,000 barrels of beer. I don't know much about the price of beer, but in the discussions in Congress it has been suggested that if beer were legalized it would sell for 15 cents per pint. Sixty million barrels at 15 cents per pint would be $2,232,000,000. Can you imagine that the expenditure of over $2,000,000,000 for beer would help the market for farm products? This is a day of intense competition for the consumer's dollar and past experience has demonstrated that in competing for the dollar no product has a chance with liquor. It gets the first call every time. The farmer knows that the dollar which is spent for beer can not be spent for milk, cheese, pork, or any other product of the farm. Therefore, it is not hard to understand why he is not throwing his hat in the air over the idea of legalizing beer. He knows that a return of beer, while it may afford a market for an insignificant amount of his grain, means losing a much larger market for products which are infinitely more profitable to him.

The farmer's opposition to beer is not alone on economic grounds. He is against it generally speaking on moral and social grounds. Irrespective of these reasons, every thinking farmer can justify his opposition to beer solely on the basis of economics. I am not afraid, therefore, that any of the farmer's would-be friends from the metropolitan centers of this country are going to convince him that beer and farm relief have any connection.

POINT OF NO QUORUM

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McDUFFIE. 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. 11267) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government 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 bill H. R. 11267, with Mr. WARREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose last night Title III had been read and is now subject to amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CANNON: Strike out section 303.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, of necessity this bill has been very hastily compiled. Into it has been thrown hodgepodge many diverse propositions relating to numerous governmental activities. It follows, necessarily, that some have been included without adequate consideration. That is particularly true of the proposition to dispense with aid to vocational education. It is difficult to believe that the committee gave the subject more than cursory attention, for this provision is a blow not only at education but at labor and agriculture. At a time when we need—as we never have needed before—and as, I trust, we never will need again—skilled hands and trained minds in the ranks of organized labor; at a time when we need constructive management and trained leadership in every department of agriculture, this bill proposes to discontinue Federal aid and encouragement in the education of the young men and the young women who in a few short years must take over the burdens and responsibilities of solving the vocational problems of both agriculture and labor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SIMMONS. The gentleman's amendment, as I understand it, strikes out of this bill that section which in effect repeals during the next 10 years Federal aid for vocational education, and would permit the Federal Government to continue to give the aid that is now being given?

Mr. CANNON. That is true. The effect of the amendment is to continue, unimpaired, the cooperation of the Federal Government with the States in the maintenance of the vocational courses in the public schools, every year turning out future citizens specially trained to meet the practical problems of life.

Mr. SIMMONS. And that ought to be done.

Mr. CANNON. Beyond question. It is a particularly appealing form of education. It involves not only mental training but correlated manual training as well. It is a form of education most needed to-day. It is a direct and practical preparation for life. It is a direct and practical preparation for service. It transforms the street loafer into a skilled artisan. It transforms the irresponsible girl into an efficient home maker. It is a guaranty of the adequacy of the American home and is the ideal preparation for American citizenship.

This provision to eliminate it would deny that training to 92 per cent of the young men and young women of the country, for only 8 per cent come from families which are able at this time to give their children the advantages of the professional colleges, the trade schools, or the technical institutes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. With pleasure.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does the gentleman think this training would be possible to these students unless this aid is afforded?

Mr. CANNON. We have information, carefully compiled, that the withdrawal of Federal aid means the discontinuance of 90 per cent of these vocational courses in the schools of my own State, and that is to some extent indicative of the situation in the schools of every State of the Union. To deny this training is to condemn 92 per cent of our young men and young women to a scale of income commensurate only with their mere physical capacities. It chains them to a treadmill of existence in which there can be no hope of progress or advancement. It tends to a condition typified by the Man with the Hoe. It shuts out from their lives—

The upward looking and the light.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes. I yield to my friend the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Is it not also a repudiation of an obligation entered into by Uncle Sam with the States and the States through contracts with teachers in the schools, ramifying in all States of the Union?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman states the situation accurately. It is a repudiation of a contract which was entered into at the suggestion of the Federal Government itself. Cooperation in education was not initiated at the request of the States, but at the sole instance of the Federal Government. In conformity with the implied agreement thus entered into, the States have invested large sums in equipment which can not be used for any other purpose, and have permanently reorganized their schools and their courses of instruction. For the Federal Government to now withdraw from this partnership with the States is little short of a breach of contract and smacks of bad faith.

And it will not save a dollar. This bill is proposed as an economy measure. It is intended to tide over the situation for the coming fiscal year. It is announced as purely temporary. And yet here is a proposition which during the coming fiscal year of 1933 will not reduce Government expenditures a single penny. This is not an economy measure. It is not an emergency measure. It is not a retrenchment. Then why is it included in this bill? The answer is obvious. There is a school of thought in this country that is opposed to the education of the people at the expense of the Federal Government. It means nothing to them that such a policy produces an unintelligent electorate; that it tends to reduce men to the status of beasts of burden in the fields and unthinking human machines in the shops and factories. They are concerned only with lower corporation taxes and larger dividends.

But they defeat their own purpose. Experience has demonstrated that their profits are dependent on the skill and intelligence of their workmen. America is recognized as the foremost agricultural and industrial nation of the world. She has the most productive farms, the most efficient manufactories, and the output of her fields and factories is higher per unit than that of any other country on the globe. Why is Russia's agricultural and industrial program failing? It is because they lack competent man power. Why are other European nations unable to cope with us in the production of commodities? It is because our farmers and artisans have been trained in better schools and therefore have a higher mental capacity and adaptability. That is the secret of American supremacy in the markets of the world. America leads because America educates. And when America ceases to educate, America will cease to lead. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The suggestion made by the gentleman from Missouri that this provision will destroy vocational education in 90 per cent of the schools of this country certainly must be the result of a lack of understanding of this problem on his part. In the first place, the committee does not interfere with these funds for the year 1933.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. For a brief question.

Mr. BULWINKLE. We are acting under an economy bill, are we not?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. This provision does not touch the appropriation for this year, does it?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Not at all.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Then what is the use of reaching out for 10 years?

Mr. McDUFFIE. You can practice economy in other years as well as in this year. This curtailment does not interfere at all with the rehabilitation of those injured in industry. Whenever a man is crippled and must be trained, it does not touch that fund at all. The idea of the committee was—and we gave it careful study—that in the Department of Agriculture you have the Bureau of Home Economics; you have your agricultural extension work and you have your county agents going into the home and into the field teaching the very things that are being taught under the appropriations carried by this bill. There has been an urge from the beginning to get the Federal Government further and further into the business, if you please, of educating the youth of this land. We thought the time has come for the

taxpayers themselves to stop and think—even though the Federal Government puts up a small part of this money, the States putting up about $3 to $1—whether or not it was a proper function of the Federal Government to educate the children in the various States. You are doing this work through your Agricultural Department in so far as agriculture is concerned. We already have an overproduction of agricultural products. Evidently we have been educated to that point where we are producing more than we can consume or sell; yet we are providing high-priced officials in Washington and furnishing money for teaching those things we should have learned by this time.

Mr. GLOVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes.

Mr. GLOVER. Is it not true that practically every large school district throughout the country districts of the United States has erected buildings to carry out the agreement they made with the Government?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Not as to this money.

Mr. GLOVER. That is true in my district.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Oh, no. This is the way this money is expended: The States make up their budgets and the local communities raise so much money; they add it to the funds of the States, and then they come to Washington and say, "We have complied with your rules; therefore we ask you to reimburse us about $1 for the $3 or $4 we are putting up for this fund."

It is folly to say that education will be stopped in this country if this fund is discontinued, especially since we are not discontinuing the funds all at once.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes.

Mr. HARE. Under the original act does the State obligate itself in advance, and is a State required to accept this from the Government or can a State reject it if it wants to do so?

Mr. McDUFFIE. A State can reject it if it wants to do so, but when did the gentleman ever know a State to reject anything coming from the Federal Treasury? The States are always ready and willing to accept such aid, and the result of that policy is that communities have incurred bonded indebtedness—and so have States throughout this country—to such an extent that they can not pay it for many years to come. Of course, there are some things in which the Federal Government had to become a pioneer. It is hard to draw the line, but if we continue all the Federal activities and increase them, as the tendency now is, it is only a question of time before the jurisdiction and authority of the States will be merged into the Central Government.

By a gradual reduction of 10 per cent a year for 10 years this bill gets the Government out of the vocational education business, and after much study the committee felt that the Government could well afford to let this responsibility fall where it originally belonged and where it belongs to-day, and that is upon the localities or States affected.

The activities of certain educational organizations now are toward the establishment of a new executive department for education, which will ultimately mean that our common schools will be operated under rules and regulations of some bureau in Washington. Personally I prefer the children of my State educated under regulations of my State rather than under any rules emanating from Washington. I wish to quote the following on very good authority inserted in the committee report:

SEC. 303. Under the bill, the permanent annual appropriations for vocational education (see U. S. C., title 20, secs. 11–28), now amounting to $7,167,000, are reduced in the sum of 10 per cent of that amount, beginning with the fiscal year 1934, and in a like sum for each succeeding year, so that, after the fiscal year 1942, these appropriations will have been abolished. The permanent annual appropriation of $200,000 for administration of the vocational education act is abolished, and, in lieu thereof, authority is provided for an annual appropriation of $200,000 for the purpose.

The authority for the existing annual appropriation of $1,500,000, to supplement the permanent appropriation, is continued for the fiscal year 1934 in the sum of $1,500,000, at which time the law authorizing it expires by its own terms (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 20, secs. 15a–15c). The amount authorized for 1932 is $1,500,000, for 1933 it is $2,000,000, and for 1934, $2,500,000. The Budget estimate for 1933 was for $1,500,000, retaining the level of 1932, and the present bill continues it for 1934 at the same level.

The extent to which Federal legislation has tended to remove final control of education from the States to the Federal Government may be indicated by citing the last important act establishing a new and extensive program of Federal participation, the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917.

This act requires the final approval of the Federal Board for Vocational Education for every State plan adopted. The plan must be initiated by a State, but it can be rejected by the Federal agencies. The act requires that moneys offered by the Federal Government shall be matched by the State or local governments or both. But Federal moneys are not advanced. The State and the community anticipate the grant, spend their own money, and are reimbursed for the moneys advanced, provided the Federal authority believes standards are met. Minimum standards determining hours and minutes of instruction are set up in the Federal acts and must be accepted by both State and Federal agencies.

Recognizing fully that constructive advances in the theory and practice of vocational education have been made because of the activities initiated by this act, it is, nevertheless, a fair question whether these benefits compensate for the inevitable weakening of local responsibility and autonomy that follows continuous applications of the prescriptions of the act.

The existing status of the permanent annual appropriations for vocational education is as follows:

The vocational education act of February 23, 1917 (U. S. C., title 20, secs. 11–28), provides permanent annual appropriations for vocational education in cooperation with the States, as follows:

Agricultural training: For training in agricultural subjects, $3,000,000, to be allotted among the several States on the proportional basis of their rural population, no State to receive less than $10,000 for any fiscal year, a further permanent annual appropriation of $27,000 being provided to care for the minimum allotments.

Training in trade, industrial, and home-economics subjects: For such training there is provided a permanent annual appropriation of $3,000,000, to be allotted among the several States on the proportional basis of their urban population, no State to receive less than $10,000 for any fiscal year, a further permanent annual appropriation of $50,000 being provided to care for the minimum allotments.

Teacher training: For the training of teachers in the foregoing subjects there is provided a permanent annual appropriation of $1,000,000, to be allotted among the several States on the proportional basis of their total population, no State to receive less than $10,000 for any fiscal year, a further permanent annual appropriation of $90,000 being provided to care for the minimum allotments.

Administration: A permanent annual appropriation of $200,000 is provided for expenditure by the Federal Board for Vocational Education for making studies and investigations, and reporting thereon, concerning suitable courses of study and training in the foregoing subjects, and for other administrative purposes.

Total: The total amount of the foregoing permanent annual appropriations for cooperation with the States in vocational education, including the $200,000 for administrative purposes, is $7,367,000.

State cooperation: The act provides that for each dollar expended by the Federal Government, aside from administration, for vocational training the State or local community shall expend an equal amount for the purpose. Under this provision the States and localities are now expending approximately $3 for every dollar expended by the Federal Government, savings approximately a million per year for 10 years.

The following table sets out, year by year, the diminishing permanent annual appropriations as they are provided for by the terms of the accompanying bill:

Year	Agricultural training	Industrial training	Teacher training	Minimum allotments	Administration	Total
1933	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$1,000,000	$167,000	$200,000	$7,367,000
1934	2,700,000	2,700,000	900,000	150,300	(1)	[2] 6,450,000
1935	2,400,000	2,400,000	800,000	133,600	(1)	[2] 5,733,300
1936	2,100,000	2,100,000	700,000	116,900	(1)	[2] 5,016,600
1937	1,800,000	1,800,000	600,000	100,200	(1)	[2] 4,299,900
1938	1,500,000	1,500,000	500,000	83,500	(1)	[2] 3,583,200
1939	1,200,000	1,200,000	400,000	66,800	(1)	[2] 2,866,500
1940	900,000	900,000	300,000	50,100	(1)	[2] 2,149,800
1941	600,000	600,000	200,000	33,400	(1)	[2] 1,433,100
1942	300,000	300,000	100,000	16,700	(1)	[2] 716,700
1943	0	0	0	0	0	0

[1] The permanent appropriation of $200,000 per annum for administration is abolished entirely, beginning with the fiscal year 1934, and there is substituted for it an authorization of an annual appropriation of not to exceed $200,000.

[2] Together with such annual appropriation for administration as may be made by Congress.

With respect to this section we call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that within the Department of Agriculture, which is quite independent from the Board for Vocational Education and not affected by the provisions of this section, there are several agencies, viz, the Extension Service, which includes education in agriculture; administration of economics of the home; Bureau of Agricultural Engineering; and a Bureau of Home Economics, all of which perform services not exactly identical but very similar to those performed by the Federal Board for Voca-

tional Education, the difference between the two being largely that in the case of vocational education instruction is carried on in the schools, while in the case of agencies within the Department of Agriculture the education is carried on in the field and in the home. Moreover, it should be noted that the provisions of this section do not at any time reduce the appropriations for vocational rehabilitation of those injured in trades and industries.

In further explanation the situation in detail is as follows:

This section relates solely to appropriations for vocational education. It does not affect in any way vocational rehabilitation of persons injured in industry, which is taken care of in the act of June 5, 1924, and in the act of June 9, 1930. Nor does this section reduce or otherwise interfere with either agricultural extension work or agricultural experiment stations under the Purnell Act or its predecessors. This section relates to vocational education.

The section does not affect any appropriation, either permanent or annual, for the fiscal year 1933. It does not begin to operate until after June 30, 1933, so that the section does not affect contemplated State programs for the fiscal year beginning July 1 of this year.

The existing appropriations for vocational education total $9,102,000. Of this sum $7,367,000 is a permanent annual appropriation made by the Smith-Hughes Act of February 23, 1917. The Smith-Hughes Act allocates $3,000,000 annually to vocational education in agriculture, $3,000,000 annually to vocational education in home economics and trade and industrial subjects, $1,000,000 to the training of teachers, $200,000 annually to the Federal Board for Vocational Education for administrative purposes, and $167,000 annually to provide that each State shall receive the minimum allotment of $10,000 for each of the three separate purposes of the act. These appropriations—amounting to $7,367,000—are permanent annual appropriations, and so do not come to Congress for the usual annual action by the Congress.

The purpose of subsection (b) of section 303 is the gradual withdrawal of the Federal aid to vocational education begun in the Smith-Hughes Act. This is accomplished by reducing the amounts appropriated for each fiscal year by 10 per cent of the amounts now appropriated. As a result, the appropriations for the fiscal year 1934, under that act, will be 10 per cent less than the appropriations for the fiscal year 1933. For the fiscal year 1935 the appropriations will be 20 per cent less than the appropriations for 1933, and so on, until the appropriations for the fiscal year 1942 will be but 10 per cent of the 1933 appropriations, and for the fiscal year 1943 and following years no appropriations whatever will be made under the Smith-Hughes Act. The reduction for each year is spread through the various items, so that the $3,000,000 appropriation for education in agriculture is reduced $300,000 annually, that for education in home economics and trades and industries by the same amount annually, and that for teacher training by $100,000 annually. Likewise the minimum allotment to each State, now $10,000, is reduced $1,000 each year; and the amount appropriated for the purpose of providing such allotments, a total of $167,000, is reduced by 10 per cent in each year.

Subsection (c) of section 303 substitutes for the annual appropriation permanently made by the Smith-Hughes Act to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, for administrative purposes, amounting to $200,000, an authorization for an appropriation of the same amount, the effect, of course, being to permit Congress to reduce the appropriation to the board in such amounts as it may deem proper, as the work of the board is gradually diminished.

The Reed-Moses Act of February 5, 1929, authorized appropriations for the purposes of the Smith-Hughes Act. The authority was for an appropriation of $500,000 for the fiscal year 1930, and for appropriations for the four succeeding fiscal years, increasing by $500,000 each fiscal year. Under this act $1,400,000 was appropriated for the fiscal year 1932. The independent offices appropriation bill carries an appropriation of $1,500,000 for the fiscal year 1933. If the maximum authorized appropriation for this year had been made for the purposes of the Reed-Moses Act, $2,000,000 would have been appropriated. The maximum authorized appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, is $2,500,000. Section 303 (a) of the bill provides that instead of an authorization of $2,500,000 for this purpose for the fiscal year 1934, only $1,500,000 will be authorized—the same amount as is appropriated for this coming fiscal year. Since the authorization contained in the Reed-Moses Act expires by its own force at the end of the fiscal year 1934, the effect of the committee's action is to reduce by $1,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated.

The Reed-Moses Act also authorizes an annual appropriation of $100,000 to the Federal Board for Vocational Education for administrative purposes. This authorization will also expire with the remainder of the act, and it is not affected by the bill. The power to reduce this authorization is left with the Appropriations Committee and Congress.

The benefits of the Smith-Hughes and Reed-Moses Acts were extended to Hawaii and Porto Rico by the acts of March 10, 1924, and March 3, 1931, respectively. The latter acts authorize $30,000 annually for Hawaii and $105,000 annually for Porto Rico. The authorization for Porto Rico allocates $30,000 to agriculture, $30,000 to home economics, $30,000 to trade and industrial work, and $15,000 to teacher training.

Subsection (d) cuts $3,000 from the Hawaiian authorization in each successive year for 10 years, beginning with the fiscal year 1934, so that no authority for further appropriations will exist at the end of that time. Porto Rico is similarly treated, the authorization being cut $10,500 each year. The amount allocated to each item of the Porto Rican appropriation is reduced 10 per cent in each year, in conformity with the reduction applied to corresponding items under the Smith-Hughes Act. The policy as to Hawaii and Porto Rico, effected by subsection (d) of section 303, conforms in every respect to the policy as to the States, effected by the other subsections of section 303.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment. On page 15, line 14, strike out the figures "1934" and insert "1935."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: On page 15, line 14, strike out "1934" and insert in lieu thereof "1935."

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, this is a proposal, as I see it, that has no part whatever in this bill.

As the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] has said, we are dealing with a deficit and the need for economy now, and this proposal is to save nothing whatever during the next fiscal year. It is aimed, however, with all due deference to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE], directly at the public schools of this country. Throughout all of the farming regions, as well as in the cities, the school system has been built up upon the basis of the Federal Government contributing to vocational-education work. It is true that the Department of Agriculture appropriations do carry items that go to agricultural vocational work in the home and on the farm, but that is one thing and the vocational work in the schools is entirely another thing, and this cuts that off effectively after 10 years.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does not the gentleman think this is one piece of cooperation between the States and the Federal Government that pays as large dividends as any investment the Government has ever made?

Mr. SIMMONS. There is no doubt in the world about that. If we are going to stop cooperation with the States, there are any number of places where economy could be effected much better than here, and in this proposal there is no economy during the next fiscal year.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. FULMER. A few minutes ago the gentleman from Alabama referred to the experiment-station work. Is it not a fact that this is about the only way we have to get back to the boys and girls and the farmers the real work carried on at the various experiment stations?

Mr. SIMMONS. This takes into the schools the type of work that the experiment station takes to the farm.

Mr. MANLOVE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. MANLOVE. Is it not a fact that the amount appropriated for vocational education represents only one-fifth of 1 per cent of the total expenses of our Government?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know just how much it is in proportion.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KETCHAM. Has the gentleman given any attention to the particular number of young men and women who are engaged in studying in these schools at night, working during the day in order that they may have an opportunity to advance themselves in the field of education?

Mr. SIMMONS. I only have those figures for my own State.

Mr. KETCHAM. The gentleman, as well as the committee, will be interested to know, I am sure, that for the entire country during the last year there were 153,384 young men and women who took advantage of this particular feature of this law and did the best they could to remove themselves from the handicap of a lack of education; and for this reason alone, if for no other, it seems to me, therefore, that certainly this subtitle should be eliminated and the excellent vocational-education work continued as at present.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is making a contribution toward developing better citizens far beyond what it costs the Federal Government or the States.

Mr. MOUSER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. MOUSER. Is it not true that a great many of these schools will have to do away with the practical good of vocational education if Federal aid is withdrawn?

Mr. SIMMONS. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I would like to ask the gentleman whether in this comprehensive economy bill there is any place where they skip the fiscal year 1933 and start in on economies for the next 10 years after that?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know about that. I know it is being done here and there is no justification for it.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Would it be fair in any sense to economize and not meet our obligation in this respect when the States have already mapped out their programs?

Mr. SIMMONS. The States have already mapped their programs and they are built up with respect to and in reliance upon this contribution.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I have watched the gentleman vote in this House and I know the gentleman is in favor of economy, but I do not believe the gentleman is in favor of economizing at the expense of the education of the children of the country.

Mr. SIMMONS. Not in this way; no.

Mr. ALLGOOD. And I do not believe the House is in favor of economizing in this way. In fact, I have talked with a great number of the Members of this House since this provision was incorporated in the economy measure and it has been my privilege to urge each one of these Representatives to help defeat this part of the bill, and I know that a majority of the House is now opposed to discontinuing Federal appropriations to vocational education.

There is to-day no industry in this Nation in worse plight than agriculture. There is no class of people whose incomes or purchasing powers are as low and as nearly depleted as those of the farmer. Discontinuance of Federal aid will possibly mean that our rural schools will have to discontinue the teaching of scientific agriculture. To-day I had a letter from a farmer who is a patron of a vocational agricultural school. He told me that his two sons had learned more in two courses in vocational agriculture than he had learned in 30 years of experience on the farm. In my district there are 14 vocational schools, and in each of these communities our citizens have contributed out of their own funds and taxes for the erection and equipment of special buildings. There are more than 1,500 boys and girls being trained in a practical way to meet the problems of home and farm life. We all realize the great necessity of this character of education when there are several millions of men and women in this country who are now out of employment and can not make a living because they do not have this character of education. The old system of education prepared the students largely for white-collar jobs. Vocational education is practical education. It educates the hand as well as the head. It gives the boys and girls pride and confidence in doing things. It is a sound type of Americanism.

I repeat again, I am for economy; but if this section is not stricken, I will oppose the bill and vote against its enactment.

Mr. SIMMONS. No.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. HASTINGS. Of course the motion of the gentleman from Missouri is to strike out the section, while the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska is to change the date for one year. Of course the gentleman from Nebraska is in favor of striking out the section.

Mr. SIMMONS. I offered the amendment in order to get the floor. I am heartily in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to section 303 of the bill and I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska, which only postpones the evil day one year, and the amendment ought not to be considered.

The vocational education bill passed by Congress has been so very helpful and popular throughout the entire country that it would be most unfortunate to discontinue the same. It is performing a remarkable service for the tradesmen, the farmers, and all women, both on the farm and in homes of our industrial centers. Education is suffering materially because of lack of funds in many of the States. A further crippling of our educational institutions will accentuate the spirit of unrest which is now broadcast in the country.

The States and localities have incurred heavy expense in the construction of buildings and equipment for these vocational schools. We should improve our school systems rather than eliminate one of the most important departments in the rural schools.

Vocational agriculture is the most beneficial farming agency we have to-day, and is making more progress than any other educational group. To discontinue these Federal appropriations would penalize the rural districts and place the burden on the common people.

The amount contributed by the Federal Government for this form of education encourages the States and localities to contribute to their support, and the three together make a success.

We hear much in this day and time on the subject of farm relief. I do not know of anything that can be done for the farmers that would be more helpful than to educate the young men on the farms in the best methods of agriculture and enable them to make it a success and profitable.

These schools are doing work that meets with the hearty approval of the country people, those who live on the farms and are engaged in the basic industry.

When agriculture succeeds all business succeeds, when agriculture fails and lags all business is affected thereby. I regard Federal aid for vocational schools the most im-

portant thing that is being done by the Federal Government in cooperation with the States. We are spending millions of dollars each year in cooperation with the States in the building of highways, and I am heartily in favor of its continuance. If Federal aid for vocational schools is withdrawn during the next 10 years, it will encourage the discontinuance of Federal aid to roads, which would be, indeed, most unfortunate. We spend millions of dollars in cooperation with the States in all branches of agriculture, animal industry, plant industry, Forest Service, entomology, economics, grasshopper control, and so forth, but none of these activities are more important than the education of the young men and women along the lines of agriculture, trades, and home economics. It would be the poorest form of economy to discontinue this splendid work that is meeting with so much success.

I sincerely trust that this section providing for the elimination of Federal funds for vocational schools during the next 10 years will be voted out of this measure by a practically unanimous vote, so that there will be known and understood throughout the country the views of the Congress in connection with this educational program. It required years of time to make the beginning; now it would be most unfortunate to destroy it when its success and usefulness has been so thoroughly demonstrated.

I am in favor of economy, but this, in my opinion, would not be economy. We can not afford to economize at the expense of the young men and women of the country in destroying their opportunities for education and training that will enable them to make a success in life. [Applause.]

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that debate on this amendment is exhausted under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SNOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 14, strike out the figures "1935" and substitute "1936."

Mr. SNOW. Mr. Chairman, the original intention of the Economy Committee was to include a provision in this bill, H. R. 11597, which would eliminate for one year the appropriation for vocational education. However, when their bill finally made its appearance on the floor of the House this provision was conspicuous by its absence, but in its stead we find section 303, providing eventual death for this appropriation by slow and polite strangulation. This section should here and now be removed from the bill and thrown out the window.

Section 303 leaves the appropriation as it is for the next fiscal year and then provides for a gradual reduction year by year until the appropriation is practically wiped out at the end of the tenth year. Why this attempt to look so far ahead regarding this activity when provision after provision in this bill relating to such important subjects as pay cuts, suspension of half holidays, reductions and promotions, reduction of travel allowances, and limitations on expenditures for printing and stationery contain a limitation restricting the application of all of these provisions to "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933"?

In other words, these provisions affecting many reductions and changes relate only to this present financial crisis, and in no way attempt to hamstring Congress in facing these problems a year hence, at which time we all hope and pray conditions in the United States will be vastly improved. Many of the provisions in this bill will be inoperative after June 30, 1933. Not so, however, with section 303.

The Federal Government by this appropriation for vocational education during the past few years has made it possible for thousands upon thousands of our boys and girls, who for financial reasons were unable to attend college, to prepare themselves for their life work by receiving vocational education, particularly in trade and industry, agriculture and home economics. I am especially familiar with the benefits accruing from instruction thus far given in agriculture and made possible by this appropriation.

For years all kinds of suggestions have been made for farm relief. Some are nonsense, while some are sound. In my opinion, scientific training in agriculture as made possible by this appropriation for vocational education is without question the best and sanest form of farm relief.

A scientifically trained rural citizenry will realize that the problem of farm relief in general, and overproduction and businesslike marketing specifically, is within and among themselves. Farming has arrived at such a condition of skill that persons without proper training will not be able to continue on the farms. Prospective young farmers must be given instruction in production and marketing if we are ever going to have any farm relief, and conditions in this country will never be normal until overproduction ceases to a great extent and the horrible spread between the price the farmer actually receives for his products on the farm and the price the housewife pays for these same products is eliminated.

Speaking of economy, the elimination of this appropriation will be false economy. In recent years this House has passed bills appropriating thousands of dollars for the erection of monuments in honor of Indian chiefs, of whom not one-tenth of 1 per cent of our population ever heard; millions of dollars to dredge and widen streams barely navigable by punts, and untold sums of money to reclaim and irrigate waste land when a vast number of fertile acres were growing up to bushes in other sections of the country, and I might go on and on.

And now when it is proposed to continue an appropriation for vocational education—an appropriation that dollar for dollar has in results accomplished as much as any like amount ever before appropriated by the Federal Government—an attempt is made to strangle it.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNOW. I hope the gentleman will excuse me, but I prefer not to be interrupted at this time.

The farm urgently needs the trained man and woman as never before. Eliminating this appropriation would throw many trained teachers out of employment and cause many boys and girls to leave school and return to the farm without the proper education and training for their future welfare. It would greatly curtail the development of a type of education which is bringing values to the life of many communities far in excess of its cost to the town, State, and United States and at a time when those values are most needed.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNOW. Yes; but for a brief question only, as my time is very limited.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I indorse what you are saying, except that part which refers to 1936. I think the section should be eliminated entirely. It is not in the interest of economy.

Mr. SNOW. The gentleman should realize that the parliamentary situation is such that the only possible avenue open to me in order to be heard in opposition to the elimination of the appropriation for vocational education was to offer the amendment I have just sent to the Speaker's desk. If I could have my way, I would make it the year 2036. [Laughter.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNOW. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. I realize the parliamentary situation and indorse the splendid address the gentleman is making.

Mr. SPARKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNOW. Yes.

Mr. SPARKS. Is it not a fact that the Federal Government is contributing to the States for military education, and should not it contribute for vocational education?

Mr. SNOW. Only one answer can properly be made to the question of the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman now be kind enough to yield to me?

Mr. SNOW. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I simply want to say at this point, that I have followed the record of the gentleman

from Maine on agriculture and public education very closely. He is one of the best-informed men in Congress on agriculture and I think he is to be congratulated in his district and State for the stand he has always taken to protect public education and to advance the interest of agriculture. [Applause.]

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNOW. Yes; but please be brief.

Mr. YON. Does not the gentleman from Maine think that if the appropriation for vocational education is eliminated it will upset the school system throughout the country?

Mr. SNOW. In the gentleman's State of Florida as well as in my home State it will take away from hundreds of boys and girls the privilege of obtaining instruction in trade and industry, agriculture and home economics.

Please bear in mind that the children of this country are not in any way responsible for the financial crisis we are now passing through.

They still are entitled to and deserve our continued thought and care. If anything, they are entitled to greater educational opportunities and facilities in this period of depression than even during past prosperous years when parents were better able to finance the costs of education.

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

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute by the gentleman from Maine and in favor of the amendment by the gentleman from Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is a sad day in this Congress, when we see some men get up and oppose the continuation of vocational education in our country.

I wish to give you some figures that are interesting. Vocational education last year received an appropriation of $32,000,000, and only about $7,000,000 of that was from the Federal Government.

In the classes enrolled there were more than a million of young people taking vocational education. It is not confined to the rural communities, even though these were doing splendid work in practically every State in the Union. Then there is the vocational trade school in the cities and also the evening classes and part-time schools doing splendid work, where hundreds of thousands of boys and girls are engaged in this work. There are more than a million of these young people benefiting from this work, and it would be a tragedy to break faith with these classes and fail. We can not afford to do it—we must not, we will not. In my own State and other sections which I have visited, the vocational agricultural school is the center of community life in many instances. I know community after community where people have sacrificed and mortgaged their homes in order to help build and carry on this work. They have both the agricultural work for boys and the home economics for girls.

In times like this we ought not to withdraw Federal aid for such work as our vocational schools, for it is not economy during any period, and everyone can see that this provision is entirely out of harmony with the most of the bill, for this proposes to permanently abolish this work, and does not effect one penny of economy for the year 1933. Then what is this measure and its purpose to abolish vocational education for good and for all time and break faith with the States and our people?

I want to say something to some of these economy experts. I favor economy as much as anyone, and can see some very large economies we should make, for I think the waste in government must be cut out and no service of government should be established or continue which does not render more in service than it costs. But I do not believe in reducing the income of a class of people who now have an insufficient income. And I oppose the proposition to eliminate a service which has justified itself like vocational education. This is, in my judgment, some of the most valuable money appropriated by our Government.

Let me say this to some of those economy experts who advocate the elimination of vocational education: Just two years ago practically all of you supported a measure to give back to the income-tax payers, some of whom at that time had net incomes of more than $10,000,000—enough to carry on this work for nearly 25 years. There were less than 40 Members of this House who opposed that, and as I have shown from time to time with a few others the fallacy of this legislation, not one man in the light of years has defended it. O my colleagues, let us not fail the people at this time. It is true the eyes of the people are on us, and we must not fail them.

I hope the Cannon amendment will be agreed to, and then this valuable work will continue to give its benefits and spread to every section of our country.

Can this country, in a progressive age like this, afford to stop education and progress and turn backward 40 years? It can not, and we shall meet the test by carrying forward this valuable work. I hope at an early date, when I can get more time, to give more in detail some facts in reference to this work.

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

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that debate is exhausted upon the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

The substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will send his amendment to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: Page 15, line 14, strike out "1934" and insert "1939."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the provision in this bill gradually eliminates the funds for vocational training and is typical of the spirit of the so-called economy under which we are operating. I am sure that the committee in its desperation simply closed its eyes and reached out and grabbed anything it could put its hands on, regardless of the merits of the proposition. It has been repeatedly stated on the floor of the House that as to wages, if we went below the $2,000 exemption, 70 per cent of the employees or 75 per cent would be found to be in that category. Hence the greatest economy is to be made out of the salaries of the lowest-paid employees. There is no recommendation in this bill to reduce the subsidies given to the private shipowners. There is no recommendation in the bill to reduce the subsidies given to the operators of air mail. There is no suggestion here of a moratorium on the interest of Government bonds for one year. After the committee deducted 11 per cent of the wages of the employees, the bill seeks to gradually eliminate all activities of the Federal Government for vocational education. My city alone appropriates for education over $10,000,000 a year. We will get along without this appropriation, but we are interested in education as a national proposition. [Applause.] My State perhaps will pay the greater portion of this appropriation. I take sharp issue with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER], usually correct, when yesterday he so forgot himself as to take the floor and revert back 30 years and try to array the workers of the city against the producers on the farms. That speech will ring as a discordant note for a long time, particularly that part where he said, "We farmers must stand for this economy bill because the representatives of the city are opposing these reductions."

In reply to that, speaking for the workers of my city, I say to the gentleman that we are opposed to eliminating appropriations for vocational training for the people of the gentleman's State. The new spirit of this day is the common understanding between the farms and the cities, because as long as we are kept apart each is being exploited by a handful of people who are urging this economy bill.

ACTIVITIES OF THE BOARD

The activities or responsibilities of the Federal Board for Vocational Education are prescribed under the terms of the national vocational education act, the rehabilitation act, and other acts complementary thereto. In general they may be grouped under six different headings:

Administrative: The board is responsible (1) for certifying to the Treasury Department the allotments to the States as provided under these acts; (2) for ascertaining that Federal funds are actually used for the purposes for which they are appropriated.

Advisory: The board is called upon to advise State boards with regard to the proper use of funds, to the preparation of State plans to meet the varying conditions existing in the several States, in order that the work may be best adapted to the situation existing in individual States, and to the development and promotion of programs on a statewide basis.

Service: A general cooperative service is rendered to other Government departments, to State boards for vocational education, to local educational authorities on request of State boards, and to a large variety of national business, industrial, agricultural, and educational associations.

The general character of this service is indicated as follows:

First. Assisting States in developing more effective programs of teacher training.

Second. Assisting industrial, commercial, and business organizations to develop programs for the training of their employees.

Third. Cooperation in vocational education surveys.

Fourth. Making analyses of training needs for specific occupations.

Fifth. Conducting special schools of instruction.

Sixth. Establishing foreman training as a phase of industrial education.

Seventh. Conducting conferences of employers and labor to define local needs for vocational training.

Eighth. Assisting other departments of the Government in connection with their problems of vocational training.

A somewhat detailed list of the organizations and groups with which the board has cooperated is attached to this letter.

Research: The board is responsible under the several acts which it administers for making studies and investigations in the field of vocational education as specified in the act. It is also responsible for bringing the results of such studies to the attention of State and local authorities engaged in the operation and promotion of programs of vocational education through the personal services of its staff and through publications.

Quasi judicial: Under the terms of the vocational education act the Federal board is specifically charged with wide powers of interpretation, in order that situations in different States may be effectively met. This power was conferred upon the board to avoid implanting by statutory provisions a stereotyped program on all States. The law as drawn is very general in its scope because Congress recognized that in the development of this new line of work many adaptations would be necessary as more experience was secured. The way in which this responsibility has been met is shown in the various administrative bulletins of the board.

In addition, the board is responsible for withholding funds in case a State has not expended them in accordance with the provisions of the acts under which they are appropriated.

Regulatory: This activity consists essentially in seeing that all programs where Federal funds are applied are operated in accordance with the general intent of Congress and the spirit of the act.

REASONS FOR ESTABLISHING AN INDEPENDENT BOARD

In enacting the vocational education act it is clearly apparent that Congress had in mind service to that group of young people and adults who were not being reached and efficiently served by the regular public schools. It was emphasized that the contemplated service should be of practical value, and that it should be directed by practical people.

Congress recognized that while generous provision had been made for vocational education for the professions, the great majority of young people and adult citizens who had dropped out of the regular public schools were in need of an opportunity to secure practical vocational education and training of less than college grade to meet their needs.

In view of the existing situation, Congress recognized that the program must be safeguarded if the large group of people, both young and old, who had left school and gone to work, or who were desirous of preparing themselves to go to work, were to be effectively served. The first purpose was to provide serviceable education and training to assist people to get a job, hold a job, or get a better job. The second purpose was to guard against the danger that this work might become so academic in character that it would fail to render the specific service intended.

The third purpose was to insure that the funds appropriated would be used for the purposes intended by Congress and that they would not be diverted to support forms of general education which Congress believed were already adequately financed.

Furthermore, it is apparent that Congress recognized that vocational education is essentially an economic agency in that training for work directly affects the interests of many groups, such as employers, employees, and the general public. In order to secure equitable representations of all interests affected, Congress provided a representative board on which labor, the employer, and other interested parties were represented, and it conferred upon this board advisory, regulatory, and quasi-judicial functions. These intests of Congress are very clearly set forth in statements made on the floor of the House by the Hon. Irvine J. Lenroot and others on December 11, 1916, excerpts from which are attached to this letter.

OPPOSITION MET UP TO THE PRESENT TIME

In general, it may fairly be stated that the opposition which exists is largely the result of misinformation and misunderstandings as to the work of the Federal Board for Vocational Education. As a result of these misunderstandings and misrepresentations the report has been circulated that the board dominates State programs and dictates standards to individual States and local communities within those States. This is untrue. The standards required by the board are only those set up in the acts, and such interpretations as have been agreed to in conference between representatives of the board and official representatives of State boards. The board operates no schools directly, employs no teachers, and enters into the picture only so far as Federal funds are used. Any State is perfectly free to set up any kind of an educational program that it wants without any regard to any Federal standards or interpretations of the Federal board so long as Federal funds are not involved.

In the great majority of cases opposition arising through misinformation or misunderstanding has come from college representatives who have not participated in the program, many of whom are connected with privately owned or endowed institutions and foundations. These individuals have little first-hand information concerning the program and little or no actual experience in public-school work. In many cases educators at first indifferent or even actively opposed have entirely changed their point of view after having come in contact with the programs which have been developed in their States and local communities.

Sources of opposition: Among the specific sources of opposition are, first, those who oppose the act as such, without any regard to the form in which it is administered. This opposition has been based upon the grounds that any form of Federal aid is unconstitutional. Second, that any recognition of any difference between vocational education and general education is socially undesirable.

Third. Certain leading authorities in general education connected with the faculties of institutions which make a

specialty of training school administrators, have taken the position that vocational education is undemocratic because it closes the door of opportunity to some who might desire to go to college, and tends to create class distinctions because vocational education does not satisfy college-entrance requirements. One effect of their teaching has been to affect the attitude of many school administrators unfavorably toward the whole question of vocational education of less than college grade as a part of the public-school system.

Fourth. Some opposition has been expressed to the advisory and service activities of the board carried out through representatives of the board working in various States and communities at the request of the State authorities. This has come mainly from representatives of institutions of college grade who have felt that such advice and service should come from their institutions rather than from the Federal board.

Fifth. Objections to rulings of the board in its quasi-judicial functions. These have not been numerous. In certain cases, however, objection has been raised to the board's rulings because of a belief on the part of certain educational authorities that Federal funds should be placed at their disposal without any accompanying standards or restrictions of any kind as to the use of such funds.

As evidence that this type of opposition has not been important, it may be stated that while the national vocational education act specifically provides that any State may appeal to Congress from rulings made by the Federal board, no appeal has been made during the entire time that the board has been in existence.

Sixth. There has been some opposition to the standards set up in the act itself and to the interpretative rulings of the board. These objections are, in general, due to the fact that certain school administrators fail to see that the standards set up in general education and appropriate for that work are not appropriate for vocational education. Because of its practical character, vocational education calls for the employment of occupationally competent workers as teachers, the securing of time sufficient to insure that thorough education or training can be given to insure ability to make good on some definite job or employment level, and proper restrictions on the number of people trained for employment with regard to those already competent to do the work who are seeking employment and other necessary safeguards of that character. Such standards do not correspond to those set up in the general educational field and must be met in order to insure that the program shall accomplish what Congress expected it to accomplish.

Seventh. Some objection has also been developed with regard to the requirements in the act that the board shall annually ascertain that Federal funds have been used for the purposes for which they were appropriated. This objection has not been serious nor has it been widespread, but it has existed in certain cases, chiefly from a group of individual theorists having no official connection with the program.

REASONS FOR CONTINUANCE OF THE PROGRAM UNDER AN INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENT

First. The conditions which existed in 1917 and which led to the passage of the original act still exist to-day. In fact, these conditions have been aggravated by technological displacement and by more rapidly changing conditions.

Second. Such opposition as existed in 1917 on the part of general educators still exists to-day, possibly in a somewhat more intensified form, hence the need for the safeguards set up by Congress, including representative control, are even more necessary to-day than they were in 1917.

Third. The group which Congress had in mind to serve needs protection to-day as much and even more than it did in 1917. The belief by certain persons that this group should not be given vocational training at public expense is as strong to-day as it was in 1917. The safeguards set up by Congress are as necessary to-day as they were 14 years ago. The recognition of the need and the desirability of a protected special service to this group was so thoroughly recognized in 1917 that most employer organizations, the American Federation of Labor, and many other national organizations joined in advocating the act under independent, representative control. The legislation was passed by Congress in both Houses by unanimous vote. In passing this legislation, Congress recognized that a democratic system of education must provide varying opportunities to meet varying needs rather than one standard opportunity leading through the college to the professions.

Wherever the Federal board has worked in cooperation with State boards for vocational education, with national organizations of all kinds, with labor organizations, and with representatives of industrial organizations, the economic value of the service rendered has been acknowledged, as is shown by many statements in the files of the board. The policy of the board in utilizing the principle of conference with parties interested has almost invariably resulted in a settlement of any disputed points to the satisfaction of all parties concerned.

A review of the 14 years during which the board has been in existence has shown no case where the interested parties have protested against anything with which the board has been concerned in the way of the promotion of programs and aiding the States in the carrying on of the work. On the other hand, in the case of such organizations as the American Federation of Labor, the United States Chamber of Commerce, national manufacturers' associations, and many others, resolutions commending the work of the board have been voluntarily adopted on numerous occasions.

PARTISAN POLITICS DID NOT ENTER INTO THE CONSIDERATION AND PASSAGE OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT (SMITH-HUGHES ACT, FEBRUARY 23, 1917)

The national vocational education act passed by Congress February 23, 1917, was in no way a partisan measure. Those who have any misgivings should read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the years 1914 to 1917 and note the debates by many Congressmen of both major political parties and statements inserted in the RECORD by laymen, chambers of commerce, manufacturing associations, agricultural groups, and labor organizations in behalf of this law. From these it is thoroughly evident that at no time did political partisans endeavor to capitalize or claim party credit for the passage of the act.

The facts are that Senator Dolliver, of Iowa, and Representative Davis, of Minnesota, both well-known Republicans, championed the first bill. Senator Page, Republican, of Vermont, and Representative William B. Wilson, a Democrat, later Secretary of Labor in the Cabinet of President Wilson, sponsored the bill in its second stage.

Senator Hoke Smith and Representative Hughes, both Democrats from the State of Georgia, were members of the President's commission of 1914, this commission being created to make a study of the need for such legislation. Senator Smith was chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor in the Senate, and Representative Hughes chairman of the Committee on Education in the House.

When the vocational education act was being considered during the sessions of 1916 and 1917 many Members of the House and Senate, both Democrats and Republicans, vied with each other to advance the measure, and expressed their enthusiasm in its behalf. During the debate in the House Members complimented and praised Mr. Hughes.

Only two Members of the House—Mr. James Slayden, of Texas, and Mr. Finis Garrett, of Tennessee—questioned the advisability of its passage, and they feared it might interfere with certain State rights. On its final passage they did not vote against it.

The RECORD shows that on the final passage of the bill in the House the whole body was so elated that the Members arose en masse and vigorously applauded.

Never at any time were party lines drawn. There is no record of allusion to political party credit in any of the debates. Undoubtedly, the American people should be proud of the fact that this great educational, humanitarian measure passed Congress by a unanimous vote.

REASONS WHY CONGRESS CREATED AN INDEPENDENT REPRESENTATIVE BOARD TO ADMINISTER VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 16, 1916]

Resolution from outside organizations in regard to composition of board (64th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 53, pt. 5, p. 4178):

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, we have upon our calendar reported with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Education and Labor the bill providing for vocational education, which was prepared by the joint commission under a joint resolution last year. The bill will be brought to the attention of the Senate in the near future, and I wish to have printed in the RECORD certain resolutions that have been passed with reference to it.

The bill was submitted to the department of superintendence of the National Education Association; also to the American Home Economics Association; and also to the educational committee of the American Federation of Labor. All of these organizations have given, through committees, careful study to the bill, and they have indorsed it with one exception.

The bill as presented to the Senate provides for a board of control consisting of Cabinet members. The department of superintendence, National Education Association, and the American Home Economics Association each recommend that the board of control should be members selected outside of the Cabinet. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

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

Resolutions

[From department of superintendence, National Education Association, February 24, 1916]

Resolved, That the department reaffirms its approval of Federal aid to vocational education as proposed in the Smith-Hughes bill and now before Congress. It believes, however, that the work to be done is so important and so diversified as to require the creation of a Federal board to administer the act, who shall give their undivided attention to the subject and who shall be representative of the educational interests to be served.

[From American Federation of Labor]

Resolved, That the executive council of the American Federation of Labor indorse the Smith-Hughes bill for industrial education with the declarations made by the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education as contained in the quoted parts of the letter to Congress of January 27, 1916.

[From American Home Economics Association, February 25, 1916]

The American Home Economics Association, assembled in Detroit, reaffirms its approval of Federal aid to vocational education as provided for by the Smith-Hughes bill, recommended by the President's Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education and now before Congress.

The association believes, however, that the ends to be served are so important and so diversified as to require a Federal board the members of which shall give their undivided attention to the administration of the act and shall be representative of the interest to be served.

[From discussion in House of H. R. 11250 and S. 703 (64th Cong., 2d sess., vol. 54, pt. 1, pp. 720–721, December 11, 1916)]

Mr. Powers, in considering a section of the proposed bill permitting the Federal board to allot "any part of such appropriation to any United States department or bureau for the purpose of making any study or investigation, or any part thereof, under the provisions of the act," made the following comment:

In other words, if this board should be composed of educators as suggested, with the Commissioner of Education, of course, himself an educator, it would be within the power of the board to allot the entire $200,000, or any part of it, it might deem proper to the Bureau of Education to make these investigations. Those of us who are afraid that a Federal board would be appointed largely of educators believe that this section 6 should be so amended that the great industries of this country that the bill proposes to try to reach and help should have representation on the board, and that they should be called in from the fields of agriculture, and that the commercial interests should be represented. The purpose of the bill is to reach and prepare the students for useful employment. That is the idea of it; that is the foundation of it; that is the reason of its existence.

[64th Cong., 2d sess., pt. 1, pp. 175, 176, 177, December 11, 1916]

Mr. LENROOT. * * * I wish to discuss it now, rather than to wait until the bill shall actually come before us for consideration, because I think it is a matter of such importance that the success or failure of this bill when it is enacted into law will depend very largely upon how Congress shall deal with that fundamental point, and I sincerely hope that, between now and the time when this bill shall be actually considered by us, the membership of this House will give serious consideration to the matter that I propose to discuss. That matter is the method of the organization of this Federal board.

As Doctor FESS has stated, the Senate bill provides for an ex officio board composed of five members of the Cabinet. The House bill provides for a board consisting of five members, four of them to be appointed by the President of the United States, no more than two of whom shall belong to the same political body, and the fifth member, the Commissioner of Education, who shall ex officio be a member of the board. Now, to my mind, neither of these systems or methods will bring about the result that ought to be gained by the enactment of this bill. There are only two grounds upon which Federal aid for this purpose can to my mind be justified: One, to secure the establishment of practical standards of vocational education; second, to stimulate the States by Federal aid to accept these standards. I have no sympathy with the view sometimes expressed that the Federal Government should aid the States in carrying the burdens of vocational education. On the contrary, any State that to-day has any practical system of vocational education can well afford to continue it out of its own funds, for there is no expenditure that the State can make that will bring better or larger returns to it than a practical system of vocational education. But it is necessary to establish practical standards, and in order to secure the adoption of those standards it is necessary that Federal aid such as is proposed in this bill be given.

Now, the House bill provides that the Commissioner of Education shall ex officio be the chairman of the board; that four members shall be appointed by the President. And I am afraid that that is going to mean that the fixing of these standards and the control of this subject will be in the hands of general educators rather than in the hands of practical men. And I want to say very frankly that I do not believe general educators are qualified to fix standards for vocational education such as we ought to have in the United States. It is no reflection upon any general educator when I say that any more than it might be considered to be a reflection upon me if some one should say that I was not qualified to perform a surgical operation.

In the fixing of these standards we will agree that they should be practical standards. They should be standards such as, when adopted by the State, are going to result in training boys and girls for vocations. Is that going to be secured unless those standards are passed upon by practical men? If not passed upon by practical men, they will be fixed by an examination in the field, in the first instance, by trained men, it is true, college graduates, trained investigators in getting raw material, but who have never had any practical experience in industry or in trade. They in turn will send their reports in to the Bureau of Labor or other department, as the case may be. That raw material will be interpreted by experts who have never had any practical experience; and, finally, general educators through these channels will fix the standards, and they themselves are not practical men in these lines. So we have theory from beginning to end as against the fixing of standards by practical men. So it is my purpose at the proper time to offer an amendment providing, as the House bill provides, for five members of this general board, the Commissioner of Education to be a member ex officio, four members to be appointed by the President of the United States, but with the qualifications that one of those members shall be representative of labor, one of them representative of manufacturing, one representative of commerce, and one representative of agriculture. And I want to say, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that this method which I shall at the proper time propose is not only indorsed but it is urged by the United States Chamber of Commerce, by the National Association of Manufacturers, and by the American Federation of Labor.

* * * * * * *

Mr. LENROOT. Coming back to where I was interrupted, where I was stating that the method I proposed has the indorsement of the National Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the American Federation of Labor, I want to suggest that if upon any question the American Federation of Labor and the National Association of Manufacturers can agree, it is a matter of very serious consideration for the membership of this House. With reference to the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Members of the House no doubt have received a pamphlet from them where the Chamber of Commerce specifically asks for the amendment of the bill in the certain particulars that I propose to offer as an amendment here. The National Association of Manufacturers has adopted a resolution declaring that in their opinion that board should be made up of the interests specially to be advanced—labor, employment, and education. The American Federation of Labor in its report to the executive committee made at their annual convention last month used this language:

"We had hoped that the provisions of the act relative to the board would have been changed so that the Secretaries of the several departments of Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, and Labor would not have been delegated as the board. We felt that their duties are already altogether too onerous and too complex to have this additional responsibility thrust upon them. There is, in addition, a double danger in having department Secretaries serve as the Federal Board for Vocational Education—first, administrations and administrative officials are subject to quadrennial changes, and it has happened in the past that sometimes Cabinet members have been changed several times during an administration. This objection in itself should be sufficient for us to object to the Federal Vocational Education Board being so constituted. The second objection is a more serious one, namely, that of the possible injection of partisanship into the administration of this new field of educational effort.

"It is our opinion that this new board should be composed of representative men, but not partisan representatives of the administration in power. Its personnel should represent the great

fundamental activities of life, namely, agriculture, labor, commerce, industry, and education, and the local advisory boards should be equally representative, so that the human activities of the Republic could feel assured that experienced, tested men from their own vocations, such as labor, commerce, agriculture, industry, and education, should be fairly and efficiently represented.

"It is our opinion that when this measure is once launched it should be directed along proper channels at the start. If we permit politicians to direct its energies, there is a danger that it may become a mere political adjunct of the party in power. If we permit the present academic educational group of the Nation to dominate, the whole force and virtue of genuine vocational trade training will be in danger of being lost sight of, and the Nation's appropriations will probably be misdirected along minor lines of endeavor, such as manual training, amateur mechanics, and other trifling, impractical, valueless schemes. Neither can we afford to permit this great measure to be overweighted by any special trade, commercial, or vocational interests. The agriculturists should not predominate, neither should the commercial or even the labor and industrial interests. We should insist that the board be properly balanced to start with, and that the interest of each of the great divisions of activity should be fairly and properly conserved, and unless we are otherwise instructed by this convention we shall make endeavors to change the proposed law according to the lines herein laid down."

That, Mr. Chairman, is the view of the American Federation of Labor. Now, I submit that the views of the manufacturers and of labor, when they agree upon a proposition like this, are entitled not only to weight in this House, but in a matter of this kind ought, it seems to me, to control, rather than the views of the general educators, who very humanly desire to have for themselves all the power that they can get. It is no reflection, as I said a moment ago, upon the general educators that they desire this power; but if this is to be a workable and successful measure, as I hope it will be, we ought to do everything within our power to make it practical in every sense of the word.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 769–770, January 2, 1917]

Mr. BORLAND. Is not a board a rather clumsy method of doing business?

Mr. FESS. No; not if it is a small board.

Mr. BORLAND. There is a tendency to create more boards than we really need. In fact, I very gravely doubt—and it is my one doubt about this bill—whether we need this Federal education board; and whether it would not be entirely better and more efficient and appropriate to have it managed by the Federal superintendent of education or Commissioner of Education.

Mr. FESS. I think the work is so very comprehensive that it ought to have a board of managers well equipped for this particular work.

[From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 3426—Conference Report No. 1495, February 16, 1917]

The measure as it passed the Senate provided that the Federal Board for Vocational Education be composed of the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor, and the board was authorized to select an advisory board of seven members. A number of experts and specialists were also authorized to assist the board.

The measure as it passed the House provided for the appointment by the President of a representative of manufacturing interests, a representative of commercial interests other than manufacturing, a representative of labor, and a representative of agriculture to act with the United States Commissioner of Education as a board of five to administer the act, and provided for the employment of such assistants as might be necessary.

The provision agreed to by the conferees is a blending of the two proposals, so that the new system is to be linked with the Government by the designation of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, and the Commissioner of Education as ex officio members of the board, and the appointment by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, of a representative of the manufacturing and commercial interests, a representative of the agricultural interests, and a representative of labor to act with them as members of the board.

The House receded from its amendments to the bill, which had the effect of merely "authorizing" the appropriations, and the appropriations are definitely made in the bill as reported from conference.

COST OF REHABILITATING THOSE DSIABLED IN INDUSTRY OR OTHERWISE

One of the acts administered by the Federal Board for Vocational Education is the act passed in 1920 known as the act for rehabilitating those disabled in industry or otherwise. During the life of that act 48,502 persons have been rehabilitated and put to work at a total cost of $12,757,457, or an average cost of $263.03 per person. The Federal cost was $6,193,410.20. The States expended $6,564,046.98. These handicapped people were being kept prior to rehabilitation by some taxing district or otherwise at a cost of from $300 to $500 annually. The average age of those rehabilitated was 32 years. The life expectancy of a person 32 years of age, according to the American-Canadian Expectancy Table, is 68 years, or 36 years additional. Fixing the cost of keeping these people at $300 per annum each, which is the minimum, it would have cost some taxing district or otherwise to keep these 48,502 people $14,550,600 annually. Multiply that by 36, the number of years they are expected to live, according to the expectancy table, and you have a total cost of $523,821,600.

Now, what was done? The Federal board, in cooperation with the States, rehabilitated these people at a total cost of $12,757,457. So you have a net saving in that one transaction of $511,064,143; but that is not all. One of the mid-Western States during the last seven years has rehabilitated 1,391 persons. Their average earning power after being rehabilitated over what it was prior to injury was $699.97. If that average would hold good with the 48,502, and fixing their working expectancy at 30 years instead of 36, as used in the first calculation, the increased earning power of those rehabilitated would amount to $1,018,498,348.20. You have saved in the cost of keeping these people $511,064,143 and at the same time you have added to their earning power $1,018,498,348.20, making a total of $1,529,562,491.20 during the life of this act. You have saved enough money in this one transaction alone to pay all the cost of the Federal board in Federal, State, and local money in all of its many activities for a period of 47 years.

That is only one side of the picture—the economic side that the Congress has spent so much time in discussing recently. Now let us look at the humanitarian side. It so often happens when these unfortunate cripples or handicapped people are at the head of a home, with dependents, a wife and children. When the head of the home becomes incapacitated, the home is broken up, the wife is sent to the workshop, the children are farmed out. A home is broken up, an irreparable damage has been done to society. The humanitarian side is even greater than the economic side. I seriously doubt if the Government, either Federal, State, or local, can show such marvelous results as that part of the work now being carried on by the Federal Board for Vocational Education. Will the Congress continue this humanitarian and economic work, or will it consolidate, transfer, or merge it into some other executive department, board, bureau, or commission that knows nothing about it? I hope not. Can any other department do this work as well as it is now being done? I seriously doubt it.

I appeal to you who are interested in your States and are in need of this appropriation to stand with us of the cities who are willing and anxious to cooperate with you in maintaining this splended activity. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, with each passing hour is being demonstrated how futile the efforts of this Economy Committee have been to save some money for the Treasury of the United States. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] has just harangued you, trying to make you think that only a few people in this country are asking for economy. I say to you that the taxpayers of this country are demanding that there be a reduction in governmental expenditures, and the only people who are opposing it are those who are selfishly interested. Take the items before us at the present moment. Every one of us has been receiving all sorts of telegrams and letters opposed to it. I hate to vote in favor of reducing this appropriation for vocational training, but it is only a temporary proposition. [Cries of "Oh, no."]

Mr. REED of New York. It has nothing to do with the present emergency; not a thing. It is to be eliminated 10 years hence.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It has to do with the present emergency. We got along without this vocational education for a long, long time. It has been productive of good, and it may be productive of good again and will be, but I wish the Members of this House to consider that we are facing an emergency. If we are to balance this Budget, we must make sacrifices all along the line.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I will ask the gentleman to state to the House whether there is a graduated scale proposed in this bill

which, at the end of 10 years, will entirely eliminate this appropriation?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No. But if it were true, let me state the trouble with this entire business. I may as well state now what I have in mind. My idea is that if we keep up this 50 per cent business we will not only bankrupt the Government but we will bankrupt every State in the Union.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. I know the gentleman desires to be correct in his statement, but the gentleman is obviously in error about the provision with reference to which he has just spoken. It does not call for any reduction in the next fiscal year, and therefore will not affect the 1933 Budget at all, but it does contain a graduated reduction of the appropriation so as to wipe it all out in 10 years. It does not affect the present depression in any way whatever.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Suppose that is true.

Mr. WOODRUM. Well, it is true.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. And admit that it is true. I want to say that if ever there was a time in this world when the Congress of the United States should be awakened to the danger that we are in, by reason of the Government appropriating money, money, money, it is now. We are not only involving the Government of the United States in debt, but we are involving every State of the Union in debt.

Mr. Chairman, I rose not so much in opposition to this particular item, but on account of the principle that is involved here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended five minutes.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the debate upon this amendment is exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on the adoption of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska, to strike out the figure "1934" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "1937."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. HILL of Alabama for the amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: Page 15, line 14, strike out the figures "34" and insert the figures "37."

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, that it is dilatory and is for the simple purpose of securing time to address the committee. That has been repeated in a number of instances. There have been a dozen speeches, at least, in favor of striking out this section. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, because otherwise we will go on forever on this section.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Assuming all the gentleman says is correct, the Chair thinks the gentleman from Alabama has come within the rules.

Mr. DYER. It is evident the committee intends to strike out the section. I think we ought to be permitted to vote upon it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] has stated that this provision to eliminate the appropriation for vocational education was put into the bill to meet the present emergency; yet when we examine the language of the bill, we find the provision does not even commence to become effective until one year from July 1 next.

When we consider that this Government has a $4,000,000,000 Budget annually and that the appropriation for vocational education is some $7,000,000 annually we find that if the provision remained in the bill and the appropriation was wiped out, it would be a saving to the Federal Government of less than two one-hundredths of 1 per cent.

Mr. ESLICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. ESLICK. May I give the figures of such savings by vocational training in regard to agriculture?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman briefly. He is such a devoted friend of education and is always so able that I hope the gentleman will state for the benefit of the House one or two of the most important figures and let me incorporate all of them in the extension of my remarks.

Mr. ESLICK. In a 10-year period the boys in vocational training in my State deposited $3,823,084.06, a net saving over and above the contribution made of $2,383,485.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF. As I understand it, this economy bill is before the House for the purpose of bringing about a balanced Budget at the end of the fiscal year 1933.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. It is all predicated on that proposition.

Mr. WOODRUFF. May I ask the gentleman if this particular provision in this bill in any way contributes one penny to that purpose?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Not one red cent does this provision in this bill contribute to that purpose.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield to permit the committee to state whether or not it is agreeable to have this section stricken from the bill?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. In reply to the gentleman from Oklahoma, if the committee wants to strike this provision from the bill, all that is necessary is for some member of the committee to make a motion to strike it. Every opportunity has been given for that purpose.

Mr. HASTINGS. I appeal to the gentleman's colleague to ask him if he will not do that.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this vocational education was pioneered by that great leader of thought in this country, Theodore Roosevelt, and it was brought into being under the leadership of that other great leader of thought, Woodrow Wilson. [Applause.]

Under the stimulus given vocational education by Federal aid the work is being carried on among children and among men and women in literally thousands of schoolrooms throughout the country. Millions of children and millions of men and women are engaged in vocational education in agriculture, in trades and industries, in home economics, in rehabilitation, and in the most important fields of human labor. The appropriations of many State governments for vocational education are contingent upon the Federal appropriation, and the States have spent thousands of dollars for school buildings and equipment, relying upon the receipt of the annual Federal appropriation. For the Federal Government to now cease this appropriation would be to break faith with these States and would perhaps in a number of States be a death knell to vocational education.

The provision in the bill destroying the appropriation would deprive thousands of farmers throughout the land of education on farm subjects which run the whole gamut from farm accounting to the conservation of the soil. It would deprive these farmers of an education which makes for the emancipation of the farm home through getting larger returns from smaller areas and fewer laborers, and thereby making it possible for the farm women to spend their time on home-making problems and the children to be free to attend school and prepare themselves for life and its battles. The provision would disorganize the program in

evening and day schools of home-making classes composed of mothers and housewives who are striving for better health conditions, more adequate food, better living conditions, and greater happiness. It would disorganize the thousands of chapters of the Association of Future Farmers of America, composed of high-school boys who are to be the agricultural leaders of the future and who are being trained in scientific and practical agriculture.

It would close the door of opportunity to thousands of men and women who were denied the advantages of education and training in their youth and who now are struggling to make themselves better, more useful, and more intelligent citizens. The provision would deny thousands of men out of employment due to new machinery and new technology the opportunity to train and prepare themselves for work in other lines of endeavor. It would even deny the deaf and blind in our institutions that education and training which they must have to prepare themselves for life and its battles. There is no effort here to eliminate the great subsidies paid by our Government to the shipping interests and the other great interests of this country. This Congress voted an extension of the debt of Germany to the amount of $250,000,000 which in the opinion of many is but the first step toward the cancellation of all our foreign debts. Can it be that this House will now deny the small sum of some $7,000,000 to be used throughout the country for vocational education? I appeal to the membership of the House to strike from the bill this provision eliminating the vocational education appropriation and let us take a stand for the people—the people who too often are forgotten.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement from the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ESLICK]:

May I not quote the record of vocational education in Tennessee, showing what a blessing and profit it has been to the boys of my home State? Since July 1, 1918, the Government has spent there $853,179.55 on vocational education; the State has spent $586,-419.37, or a total of $1,439,598.92. This money has been paid to teachers and in supervising training.

From July 1, 1921, to June 30, 1930, the boys taking vocational training in the high schools of Tennessee had from their labors on supervised farms a net income above expenses of $3,823,084.06. Take from this contributions, both State and Federal, leaves the large sum of $2,383,485.14 as a net profit. This is the only branch of the free schools in Tennessee where a boy can earn when he learns.

One other statement, in the last three years the Tennessee Association of Future Farmers of America, who are students of vocational training, have deposited in savings accounts $198,630.17 and have invested in farm land and livestock $706,515.63. Vocational education is doing a great work for the youth of the country. This bill destroys it beginning with 1934 and I am unalterably opposed to the destruction.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer as an amendment to that motion that all debate close in 30 minutes.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, it has been stated that the provisions of section 303 of this amendment will completely eliminate at the expiration of 10 years all appropriations for vocational education. Those who have made that statement are under a misapprehension. The provisions of section 303 reduce in equal amounts over a period of 10 years the permanent annual appropriations for vocational education, but do not in any respect interfere with or reduce the appropriations made annually for vocational education.

The committee in inserting section 303 in the bill was doing nothing more nor less than carrying out the recommendation of a board which had been appointed to investigate the relationship between the Federal Government and the States in so far as education is concerned. That board reported in express language that vocational education and the contributions by the United States for that purpose should be gradually diminished so as to leave the field entirely to the States.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I decline to yield for the moment.

The board in its report stated that the vocational education act, the act authorizing and making appropriations for this purpose, in effect made the States in conducting their educational activities in this field completely subversive to the United States. The States could not obtain the money appropriated for these purposes unless they complied with the regulations laid down by the board. The commission which had been appointed to investigate this subject stated clearly that such subversion on the part of the United States was not in accord with sound principles of education.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I have declined to yield, I will state to the gentleman.

And so the commitee, when it inserted this provision in the bill, did nothing more nor less than to carry out the recommendations of the commission authorized to investigate the general question.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman inform us who paid the expenses of this commission in making its investigation?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I have not the faintest idea who paid for the investigation.

Mr. REED of New York. One of the large foundations paid for it and had an ulterior motive.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Now that the gentleman has yielded to the gentleman from Alabama, will he yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman name the members of this commission?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I can not name them.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Were they not connected with universities, and did they not receive large annuities?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. The members were appointed by the President of the United States.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Who made up the personnel?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. The personnel consisted of university presidents.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Name them.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I have not here the names of the members. It was a board of some twenty-seven members, as I recall it.

Mr. PARSONS. Was that the board of education that consisted of 52?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. No; I think not.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Was the Secretary of the Interior on that board?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. As I recall it, the Secretary of the Interior was on the board.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Who financed the report and paid the expenses of the board?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I do not know who paid the expenses of the board. The only information I have is that the board made a thorough study and investigation and submitted this report.

Mr. CANNON. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the board was paid from private funds furnished by the Rosenwald Foundation?

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PALMISANO: On Page 15, line 8, strike out the entire section 303 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"To suspend on June 30, 1933, the further operation of vocational education as provided by the act of February 23, 1917, and to suspend also vocational rehabilitation as provided by the act of June 2, 1920."

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Several Members objected.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: Page 18, line 11, strike out the period and insert the following: ", or to the printing and binding of farmers' bulletins under the Department of Agriculture."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, there was so much confusion that we could not hear the amendment read. I ask unanimous consent that it may again be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I feel that when any provision in the economy bill seriously affects any Government department or bureau that the chairman of the subcommittee which makes appropriations for that department ought to advise the Members of the House as to what effect it has. Therefore, in the discharge of that duty, I state to this House that if this reduction of nearly $5,000,000 in the printing appropriation goes into effect there will not be one cent with which to print a single Farmers' Bulletin for the year 1933. Therefore we will have none to distribute and there will be none for the farmers to receive.

Let me call your attention to this fact: Senators and Members of the House distribute about 13,000,000 of these bulletins to farmers every year; the department distributes 2,500,000 every year, and 273,000 are sold by the Government every year. The receipts from these bulletins and other publications of the Department of Agriculture amount to $75,000 a year. The members of this committee ought to do one of two things: They should either provide for the printing of these bulletins and their free distribution, or provide that the Department of Agriculture may print them and sell them to the people.

What position would you be in next year when you get requests from farmers for these bulletins and you could not supply them? Over 2,000,000 farmers write for these bulletins every year, and what position would you be in if you had to tell them they could not be purchased at the Government Printing Office and you could not distribute them because the Congress had not provided for their printing, even though their average cost is only 1½ cents each.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. There was such a commotion I did not understand the gentleman's amendment. We can not understand what the gentleman is trying to do.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have offered an amendment exempting the cost of printing farmers' bulletins from the provisions of the economy bill, just the same as the economy bill exempts the printing fund of the Patent Office.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. This will also exempt the bulletins which are used in the cities because the term "farmers' bulletins" is a misnomer. There are just as many farmers' bulletins distributed in the cities as there are in the country districts, and for a very useful purpose. [Applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is true. They go to the cities the same as they go to the country districts. In my district a great number of requests for these farmers' bulletins come from the cities.

Mr. SCHAFER. I represent a city district, and I use all of my allotment. I could use two or three times as many more if I could get them. My constituents appreciate these valuable publications.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Unless this amendment is adopted and if this economy bill goes through, the gentleman will not have any.

Mr. SCHAFER. I am going to vote for the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. This section would cut $5,000,000 from the printing appropriation. All of the departments are compelled to print their administrative forms, and it will take all of the money to print these administrative forms, so that no farmers' bulletins can be printed. I have investigated it; I have consulted with the department and gone into it fully, and I tell you that will be the result. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the ground that the amendment is not germane and on the further ground that on its face the amendment shows it is not an economy but provides for an additional expenditure on the part of the Government.

The provision under consideration is limited to printing and the printing of one function of the Government, the Patent Office. It is fundamental that where there is a limitation applying to only one function you can not extend it by applying it to a second function.

Further as to the point of order that the purpose of the amendment is not economy but expenditure. It is obvious on its face that this proposal is not intended to have the prior provisions of this paragraph apply but to exempt them. The prior provisions would make it mandatory that the printing must be within a circumscribed amount. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas seeks to lift that amount and that the $200,000 which was carried in the present appropriation bill shall not be affected by these economy provisions as reported by the Economy Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No. If the preceding paragraph of this bill is in order this is in order.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order. I am not for the amendment, but I think the amendment is in order.

The Chair will observe that the bill provides for certain reductions in the way of printing and binding, and leaves it up to the Director of the Budget as to how the funds for printing shall be distributed among the several departments. Of course he will distribute a reasonable proportion of the money available to the Department of Agriculture. The cost of printing farmers' bulletins is included. The proposed amendment has the effect of excluding the farm bulletins from their proportionate cut under the section. It seems to me the amendment is clearly in order.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

Even if the exceptions were not in the bill regarding the exempting of the Patent Office printing, the amendment would still be in order. Otherwise we would be confronted with the proposition that the bill presented by the Economy

Committee could not possibly be amended in any respect where the result of the amendment would be to reduce the amount of savings which the provisions of the bill are seeking to make, and all the amendments we have heretofore adopted would be out of order because they tend to lessen, in some respect, the total amount of savings which the bill started out to make. Therefore it is proper to offer an amendment which lessens the amounts of the cuts carried in the bill, but which does not increase the amounts authorized by existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARBOUR. That does not mean the title.

The CHAIRMAN. It only means section 304.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute before the motion is put.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion of the gentleman from Arizona has preference.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, which I submit is always in order, that I may be allowed to speak one minute before the motion is put, because there is involved here the most vital prerogatives of this House and we should amend this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, in the exercise of his discretion, will put the request, although the Chair thinks the motion of the gentleman from Arizona has precedence.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, what is the subject matter of the gentleman's statement?

Mr. STEVENSON. I want to call the attention of this House to the fact that, with respect to the appropriation for printing, this limitation will make it absolutely impossible for the Members of the House to have the RECORD properly printed and impossible for them to have the printing done which is absolutely necessary to run the Houses of Congress, and I want to amend it.

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

The motion was rejected.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEVENSON: Strike out of line 20, "$9,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000,000"; in line 23 strike out "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,500,000."

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, there are two amendments here, of course. I am only proposing to increase the limit $1,000,000.

The printing last year cost $14,546,000, and this bill proposes to limit the amount that can be appropriated to $9,000,000, a cut of one-third.

All of you are interested in this proposition, because all of you want to get your documents, all of you want the departments to have proper printing done, and all of you want the RECORD properly printed.

The distribution of this fund last year amounted to $2,500,000 for the printing of the congressional proceedings proper, including the hearings and all that kind of thing.

You and I have been importuned, and I am holding down the printing of the hearings and the printing of a great many other things, and it is very disagreeable for me to do it. My colleagues are asking to have charts printed and asking to have duplicates of hearings printed and all that kind of thing, and I have been endeavoring to hold them down. However, this bill proposes to hold down the printing for the Congress, including all its activities, to $2,000,000, when it has been running $2,500,000. I am moving to amend that by fixing the amount at $2,500,000.

Mr. SANDLIN. If the gentleman will permit, this year the cost will be $3,000,000, and $1,000,000 more will have to be appropriated to take care of the printing.

Mr. STEVENSON. It will certainly take at least one-half million dollars more.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Does not the gentleman think we can cut out the printing of a lot of documents, such as committee hearings? This will not interfere with the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at all, or interfere in any way with printing the proceedings on the floor of the House.

Mr. STEVENSON. If the gentleman were in the position I am, with the calls I have every day to print extra copies of hearings before this committee or that committee, and to put in extra charts and extra illustrations and all that kind of thing, which I hate to refuse my colleagues, but which I am having to do, he would realize that it is very hard to prevent the expenditures for printing of hearings.

Now, what were the items last year? Miscellaneous publications, $55,000; hearings proper before the committees, $215,000. This leaves $2,000,000 for everything else. If you cut out all the hearings, you would not have quite enough money out of this $2,000,000 to do the printing. When you scan the list that Congress has had printed, in so far as the $2,500,000 appropriation is concerned, it is the least you can get through with, and you will probably have a deficit at the end of the year then.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Binding is very expensive. Could we not cut some of that out?

Mr. STEVENSON. It may be expensive in some instances, but that is a matter Congress regulates, and it has a right to have the matter it has printed bound according to its desire, whether expensive or not. Now, gentlemen, I am only moving to increase this $1,000,000, and that cuts off four and a half million dollars. I do not think we will get through with it, but will have a deficit at the end of the year, and I trust that another body will have a whack at it, and they believe in printing and they furnish a lot of it, and we can not help it.

I am only asking for decent consideration for the rights of Congress to have printed and bound what is necessary. I am permitting a cut of one-third when I offer this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 19, strike out sections 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, and 313 down to and including line 8 on page 23.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I think I can point out some very good reasons for striking out these provisions of the bill which would discontinue the Army and Navy transports and the Panama Railroad Steamship Line.

I propose to confine myself to the Army Transport Service, though what I say is applicable also to the Navy Transport Service and to the Panama Steamship Line.

The Army Transport Service was established in 1898, at the time of the Spanish-American War. It was established because the private steamship companies could not render adequate service to the Government. Since that time the Army Transport Service has continued to operate efficiently and economically. This provision in the bill will not save money to the Government; it will cost money. If we discontinue the Army and the Navy transport systems and the service of the Panama Steamship Line, it will cost the Government more money than these provisions in the bill will save.

I want to submit for your consideration some figures in relation to the cost of the Army Transport Service for the fiscal year 1931. It cost to operate the sum of $3,838,583.58. If we add to that 3 per cent for depreciation of equipment and 3.6 for interest on the original cost, we find the total

cost of operation of the Army Transport Service during the fiscal year 1931 to be $4,868,764.91.

If that same service had been rendered by the commercial lines and the regular commercial rates had been charged for transporting the same passengers and freight, it would have cost the Government $7,403,797.16, so that the operation of the Army Transport Service really saved the Government $2,535,032.25 for the fiscal year 1931.

I hold in my hand an estimate of the cost of the voyage of the Army transport *Republic*, which sails to-day from the Army base at Brooklyn to San Francisco by way of the Panama Canal, to Hawaii, Manila, back to San Francisco, through the Panama Canal, and returning to the base at Brooklyn.

These figures have been carefully prepared. They show that the total cost of this round trip of the Army transport *Republic* will be $300,000. If that same service was purchased from commercial companies and commercial rates were charged, it would cost the Government $716,155.62. Where, then, is the economy in discontinuing this service that has been rendered so efficiently since the Spanish War in 1898? What can we expect from these companies if we discontinue the Army Transport Service and turn this business over to commercial lines? That question was asked before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the War Department when representatives of the commercial steamship lines appeared in support of a similar proposal. They were asked what kind of accommodations would be furnished the enlisted men, and we were told that the men would be carried in the steerage. American soldiers will be sent to the Philippines, to the Orient, and to the Hawaiian Islands in the steerage with people of other nations, people of different races. Why, there would be international complications before the transport reached the Farallon Islands, 20 miles off the Golden Gate. Then here is another consideration. The commercial lines when they leave port and get 12 miles out at sea open their bars.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to object to the gentleman's request, but will he not extend his remarks?

Mr. BARBOUR. This is the only time that I have spoken on this bill, and I hope it will be the only time until it is passed.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Alabama should let the gentleman from California go on for five minutes. He has made a study of the subject, and is the former chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on Army matters.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Very well.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, when one of these commercial steamships, flying even the American flag, gets 12 miles out at sea, it opens its bar. On the Army and the Navy transports liquor is forbidden, and it is a good rule and a good regulation, when you have several hundred men, most of them enlisted men, on board for a long voyage.

Another consideration to which I direct your attention is that if we put our enlisted men into the steerage of these commercial ships, what will become of the secrecy of our military operations? They will be accessible to the representatives and agents of every foreign country. All kinds of information will be gathered from them as they are sailing on these ships.

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

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Is it not a fact that this is the only big nation in the world that maintains a transport service such as ours?

Mr. BARBOUR. I do not care if it is. Because other nations do not maintain such a service is no reason the United States should not. We do lots of things in this country better than they are done in other countries. I understand that to-day Japan maintains its own transport service. That is the information that I have.

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

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. On pages 8901 to 8905 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 25, 1932, the gentleman will find full and complete statements of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy opposing the abolition of the Army and Navy transport services, from the standpoint of economy, from the standpoint of national defense, and the morale and best interest of the enlisted men. If our American troops are to be carried down in the hold the way we were carried during the World War by private steamship companies, God help them, and I say that from my own actual experience. I sincerely hope that the gentleman's amendment will be adopted, and that we will continue to maintain the Army and Navy transport services, which are just as essential as an arm of our national defense as the ammunition for the guns.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, in line with the statement just made by the gentleman from Wisconsin, this is no new proposition. At various times in the history of these transport services, this raid has been made on the service by the commercial steamship companies. It was made back in 1920, when Newton D. Baker was Secretary of War and Woodrow Wilson was President of the United States.

I have here a carbon copy of a report that was submitted by Secretary Baker to President Wilson when this question was then raised. I shall not take the time to read the whole report, but I will give you a few of Secretary Baker's conclusions. He found against the discontinuance of the transport service, because he said that transportation is an essential part of military movement; that our ships are highly specialized for the carrying of troops and supplies and that commercial ships are not; that commercial ships are not adapted to rendering this essentially military service; that sound military policy requires complete control of military movements. He further found that the ships are economically operated, and he recommended to President Wilson that the transport service be not discontinued. On May 15, 1920, President Wilson wrote to Secretary Baker acknowledging receipt of the report and saying "the judgment expressed in your letter is my own judgment." The matter also came up when William Howard Taft was Secretary of War, and he reported adversely upon it. It is an old question that is brought up every so often when the commercial steamship companies raid the Army and Navy transport service in order to get control of that little business, which is a special business and a special service that these ships render.

We have been generous to the American merchant marine. The Congress has passed laws that are indeed liberal to the American merchant marine. We grant them liberal loans for the building of new ships and make very liberal subsidies for the carrying of the mails. We may grant them more, if necessary, to properly maintain and operate an American merchant marine, but this Congress should say to the commercial steamship companies of this country that they must keep their hands off the Army and the Navy and our national defense.

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

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. DELANEY. Is it not a fact that the adoption of the gentleman's amendment will mean an economy to the Government of about $2,000,000?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes; if we adopt the amendment. There is no excuse for this provision in the bill, in the name of economy.

Mr. DELANEY. As the gentleman said a little while ago, this is the only country which maintains an Army transport service. Is it not true of the prohibition situation, that this is the only country which maintains a prohibition service?

Mr. BARBOUR. As far as I know, I think that question answers itself.

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

Mr. FREE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Unfortunately the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] has included in his motion to strike out several paragraphs in this bill. I wish to address myself to the paragraph 312 in regard to the Panama Railroad Steamship Line. If this Congress desires to really save money and do away with something that is obnoxious, it will pass favorably upon this section 312.

The Panama Railroad Steamship Line was organized originally to carry supplies to the canal. When the canal was completed, it continued in operation and began operating in opposition to private lines carrying private business. It even extended its lines down to Central and South America; and when this was stopped, it did the un-American thing of contracting for the carrying of freight to Central and South America and carried this freight as far as the canal in its own vessels and entered into contracts with foreign lines to carry the freight on beyond. Here we have a Government line entering into contracts with foreign lines that compete with American lines in the transportation of goods to Central and South America. If you will do away with this service, you will get the same service and you will save $360,000 a year.

The total business of this line in 1931 was $1,870,000. Of that amount $1,263,000 was purely private business. The total business for the Panama Canal Commission, including the carrying of employees, was $384,911 or about one-fifth of its total business. The total freight carried was 163,000 tons, and only 27,000 of that was for the canal.

It admits for 1931 a loss of $244,000, but for freight carried for the Panama Canal Commission they placed a charge of $8 a ton, whereas private companies will haul that for $5.70 a ton. So they credit themselves with $8 a ton for the freight they carry to the canal. They must charge the Government for their services what the private lines would charge, so they charge $5.70 on that, and then they charge for commercial freight at the rate of $7.50 per ton. The private concerns will do all of this for $5.70 a ton. Private lines will handle the freight that is carried for the Panama Canal Commission at a saving of $74,000 a year.

Another vicious thing about it is that this line receives from the Government for carrying mail, $42,273, when, as a matter of fact, we are already paying subsidies to lines that cover the same routes, and whose boats go without mail, in order that this line can get $42,000 a year to try to make up the deficit that exists in the operation of their line.

The losses to the Government are as follows: There is an admitted loss which they put on their books of $244,000 a year. There is a loss of $74,000 in carrying the freight of the Panama Canal Commission, for which it charges $8 a ton, whereas private companies charge $5.70 a ton. Then we have absolutely thrown away $42,000 in carrying the mails, which other lines are ready and willing to carry and are paid to carry.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREE. No; I can not yield.

The claim will be made that this line is conducted for the employees and that they get low rates. They do, and there is a little pap handed out to Members of Congress, free transportation, because those people are politically minded, but I do not believe any Member will vote on this matter because he gets a free trip to Panama. If the Government allowed $30 to each employee, each way, to private companies, the Government would save $210,000 a year in transportation. The Panama Canal employees receive already, in addition to their pay, 25 per cent additional. To illustrate what that means, an employee with a salary of $2,000 receives $400 additional a year, and then it is argued that this line should be maintained to give them cheaper transportation back to the States every two years. One-half the revenues of the Panama Canal is paid by American shipping, and this money is used to pay losses to a competing Government line run on an un-American basis, which assists foreign shipping lines instead of aiding American-owned lines.

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

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Barbour amendment, to strike out section 308.

Mr. Chairman, I am against the entire Barbour amendment. I believe in leaving these committee provisions in the bill. I have heard talk about national defense, and I heard my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER], tell about when he went to France. We did not go to France on transports. They did not have them available. We went over on fruit steamers and we were down in the hold and the gentleman from Wisconsin knows—he was a private, as I was—that if we went over on transports we would still have been in the hold.

Mr. SCHAFER. I went on the *Orduna* in July, 1917. This boat was a passenger steamship, and I would not send my dog over in the steerage where we were quartered.

Mr. CONNERY. But the gentleman was down near the water.

Mr. SCHAFER. Well, I guess below the water line, and Uncle Sam paid the regular passenger rates, and the men were herded, quartered, and fed like dogs. If the gentleman wants this kind of treatment for the soldiers, sailors, and marines he can have it. I do not want it.

Mr. CONNERY. In a transport the officer would be up on deck in his stateroom and the men would be down in the hold just the same.

Mr. SCHAFER. Far better to be in the hold of a transport with decent quarters, conditions, and rations than in the hold of one of the private steamship lines mingling, sleeping, and eating with the peoples of Asiatic countries.

Mr. CONNERY. There is no choice between those kinds of holds. They are all the same. [Laughter.] The only time we use these transports is in time of peace. The transports are supposed to be used in time of war to transport troops to the battle front. They did not use these transports in time of war. They used the privately owned vessels.

Now, I am in favor of the merchant marine. I am in favor of doing anything which will build it up and follow the example of England and the other nations which have their merchant marine ready to convert into transports when needed, to carry troops wherever and whenever they want to carry them.

I believe we should have a merchant marine and then in time of war turn the ships into a transport system and turn them over for the use of the Army and Navy.

This is one proposition on which I am in favor of the proposal of the Economy Committee. I am also going to be in favor of consolidation of the Army and the Navy and stopping this jealousy between admirals and generals, and let one man run the war when war comes along, so that the private and the gob will not have to go out and be killed while some general or some admiral is trying to find out whether the Navy should go out or whether the Army should go out. I am going to favor that consolidation. I believe it will save $100,000,000. That is real economy from my point of view.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it so happened on yesterday that the Quartermaster Corps opened bids for the Army Transport Service next year. One of the companies that bid was a certain fruit company. In their bid they stated that all their steamers were under foreign flags except one tanker.

If the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] is not adopted, so far as the Army is concerned, it will be necessary to increase the Army appropriation for the next year $3,000,000. For instance, the lowest bid received to transport a trooper from San Francisco to Honolulu is $65. The cost by Army transport is $15. From San Francisco to China the lowest commercial rate to the Army is $105. The cost by Army transport is $35. The commercial rate to the Army from New York to Panama is $45; the Army transport rate is $14. From New York to San Francisco the commercial rate to the Army is $75; the rate by Army transport is $40. From San Francisco to Honolulu the commercial rate to the Army is $65 as against a cost by Army transport of $15.

In other words, gentlemen, by adopting the Barbour amendment we can save $3,000,000. Not only that, but the hospital facilities on the Army transports are far better than they are on commercial boats. For instance, on the *Chateau-Thierry*, on which many of you have been, there is a 30-bed hospital, including mental ward, 10 bens; isolation ward, 4 beds. It has an operating room with all modern equipment, a dispensary stocked with medicines, one Army surgeon, and five hospital attendants. The hospital is located on the boat deck, with deck space available for convalescent patients.

On commercial boats the hospital facilities usually consist of four beds with no provision at all for restraining mental patients, with one doctor and no hospital attendants; and all these men would be down in the steerage. I beg of you gentlemen to support the Barbour amendment.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES. I yield.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. The bill provides that the Secretary of War shall dispose of all property in addition to the ships used in connection with the transport service. Can the gentleman give us an idea of some of the other property that would be disposed of?

Mr. JAMES. That would mean that in the ports of New York and San Francisco the docks and piers that should serve the Government in case of war for the transport service would be turned over to somebody else.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Yes; it would mean, among other things, depots that cost $72,405,480.10, and the whole matter should be stricken out.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is the very purpose, I will say to the gentleman, of this whole provision in this bill.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The gentleman is not quoting the bill correctly. We have amended that provision in the bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am absolving the gentleman from Alabama of having anything to do with this, but I am saying to the gentleman from Michigan that this whole thing was started by a bunch of rats in New York who want to sell these piers, and somebody fell for it, and this amendment is here. Does the gentleman from California know anything about that?

Mr. FREE. What?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. You heard me.

Mr. LEA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES. I yield.

Mr. LEA. What would happen if these millions of dollars' worth of ships and piers in the possession of the War Department were thrown on the market at this time?

Mr. JAMES. We could not get any market for them at this time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLANCY: Page 20, line 6, after the word "continuance," insert "The term 'property' as used in this section shall not be considered to include the docks, piers, warehouses, wharves, and terminal equipment and other rights transferred to the Shipping Board by the President under authority of section 17 of the merchant marine act, 1920."

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE], the chairman of the committee, for the consideration he gave me in eliminating the joker in section 308, which I will not designate as a steal, because I do not want to reflect upon the integrity of any Member of this House; but I do say that if that joker had been inserted by a lobbyist that lobbyist, on a 10 per cent commission, would have received from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000 as his fee.

I was the first to reveal this joker to Mr. McDUFFIE and to the War Department.

Col. Frederick H. Payne, Assistant Secretary of War, said that the main purpose of abolishing the Army Transport Service was to give private interests a chance to get these piers at a tremendous bargain and Government sacrifice in New York City, in Boston, in San Francisco, in Manila, and Honolulu. Colonel Payne said Al Capone never planned as big a steal nor a bolder job.

INVESTIGATE PRESENT LEASES

There may be something rotten in Denmark now in regard to the lease of these piers, but because of lack of time I can not go fully into that now.

AN OMNIBUS GRAB BAG

Gentlemen rise here and cry to high heaven to support this alleged economy bill. They blindly appeal to us as Republicans; they appeal to us as Democrats, and they cry to us as lovers of the flag to support this sacred cow.

What is an omnibus bill? It is nothing but some bad measures and some good measures thrown into a carry-all bill. The only way you can get support for the bad measures is to trade with a Member who wants to put his pet measure in. With regard to this particular economy bill, one member of the committee is interested in a tariff item in the Senate, and if he is promised support for that he consents to other measures in this bill. Another member is interested in a certain plan. If he gets that, he consents to much of the rest of the bill.

There are bad provisions in this bill and good measures. Let us weed out the bad and put through the good provisions.

THE JOKER DISCOVERED

I discovered this very vicious joker compelling the sale of piers and terminals, and my point was granted, and I want to compliment the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE], who will soon offer an amendment to strike out this joker.

I insist, in view of remarks made during this debate, that Mr. McDUFFIE is absolutely honorable and did everything possible to help kill this joker and protect the people's interest by rewriting the section and offering a committee amendment. The gentleman from Alabama said at first he did not think the language of section 308 meant what I charged, but then upon study he admitted it.

The War Department says that the sale of these piers, used in connection with those vessels—which would be thrown on the market at panic prices, at from 5 to 10 per cent of their value—would mean a loss of $100,000,000; in Brooklyn alone, $50,000,000.

Mr. BYRNS. The committee had an amendment curing that.

Mr. CLANCY. I just said that.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman from Tennessee is out of order.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I insist I am not out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

HISTORY OF PRICELESS PIERS

Mr. CLANCY. The United States Government obtained four piers and the Brooklyn Army base at the time of the World War mainly through condemnation proceedings. I am informed the total cost was about eight millions of dol-

lars, but these piers have become enormously valuable since, and are worth, according to the estimate of the War Department, over fifty millions of dollars.

They occupy a wonderful position in the greatest harbor in the world—New York Harbor. They have deep water, which some of the New York piers have not, and even as gigantic a ship as the *Leviathan* and also the biggest German ships can dock there.

They are not located up the river as many of the New York piers are, but are down the harbor considerably, and thus the tremendous traffic, particularly of the smaller boats and ferries, is avoided and the danger of collision is largely averted.

Moreover, these piers are singularly free of fog. Fog is prevalent in New York Harbor from time to time and causes delays which run into enormous financial losses through the inability to dock boats. Still further, fog is the chief cause of collisions in New York Harbor, which is very disastrous when they occur, because even if they do not cause the destruction of the ship they may cause such damage that the ship will have to go to dry dock and be laid up for a longer or a lesser period and thus prevent sailings. When a ship which is loaded with passengers and freight and is leaving the harbor for its voyage abroad suffers a collision, the result is particularly devastating, as it means a costly unloading of the cargo and passengers and the making of costly new arrangements.

PECULIAR GOVERNMENT LEASES

In 1921 the Shipping Board insisted upon getting piers 3 and 4 of the Brooklyn Army base transferred permanently. Piers 3 and 4 were loaned to the United States Shipping Board and they, in turn, leased them to the Atlantic Tidewater Terminals for a rental of 55 per cent of the gross receipts with $160,000 minimum. The Shipping Board obtains about $210,000 per year from Piers 3 and 4.

The Atlantic Tidewater Terminals Corporation leases Pier 3 to the Roosevelt, a purely American line, for about $250,000 to $300,000, which is my guess. They leased Pier 4 to the Steamship Terminal Operating Co., which is a Jarka interest, and who, in turn, lease it to the North German Lloyd Line for about $350,000 to $400,000 per year. Jarka was a former boss of stevedores for German lines in New York Harbor.

If the Shipping Board, which has all the facilities for handling leases, leased directly instead of through these sublessees, the United States Government would probably gain several hundred thousand dollars more per year.

From the above leases it is clear that the Atlantic Tidewater Terminal Corporation is making a large profit which the United States Government might make for itself through its ownership of the piers.

It is also probably that the Jarka company, known as the Steamship Terminal Operating Co., is making a large profit which should rightfully go into the United States Treasury. Why all this system of leases and subleases, when there is a large and capable Government division, known as the United States Shipping Board, which could handle these leases directly instead of peddling them out to persons who probably make a barrel of money out of the arrangement?

DEALING WITH FOREIGN LINES

Moreover, the United States Shipping Board was established to aid and develop the American merchant marine and to fight its bitter and unscrupulous competitors in the foreign merchant marine.

I know that the North German Lloyd Steamship Co. enjoys the very highest reputation, and I have never been informed that it indulged in sharp practices in its competition with American ships.

I am a member of the House Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries Committee and know that all our efforts have been to build up the American merchant marine and gain our own ships as many advantages as possible.

Our committee established a ship-subsidy fund of about $250,000,000 to help build and maintain and operate American ships on the ocean, and we were very careful to write language in the legislation and guard the fund so that none of it should go into foreign boats or foreign lines or aid in the building of or operation of foreign lines.

Yet here we have at the United States Army base at Brooklyn a system of subleases whereby a foreign line uses our docks and bases. It is true it does so on a lease at a rental which is presumably high. Undoubtedly the foreign line is made to pay to the limit of the pound of flesh; but if the United States Government wishes to make that arrangement with the foreign line, why does it not do so directly, and why does it allow tens of thousands of dollars of that rental to fall into the hands of the Jarka interests and the Atlantic Tidewater Terminal Corporation?

As a member of the House Merchant Marine Committee, I am going to go further into this matter of leases, which has just been tipped off to me within the past few days.

RETAIN GOVERNMENT TRANSPORT LINES

I now take the position that we should kill all the provisions of this so-called economy bill which provide for the sale and junking of the Army, Navy, and Panama Transport Services.

From what I have said already, it is evident that there is enough indication of sharp practice and scandal to suspect the whole proposed destruction of the Army, Navy, and Panama Railroad transport services.

Proposals of abolishing these Government maritime services have been made time and again within the past 10 years.

They have been rejected by three Secretaries of War, three committees of Congress, by the chief coordinator, and by former President Coolidge.

These emphatic actions of honest and intelligent high officials of the Government should make us proceed very slowly to junk or sell these services now.

Only a few months ago we had to use transports to send troops to China. We have to use them very frequently to send troops to the Latin American countries when rebellions break out. We may have to use transports within a few weeks after they are sold or junked under this so-called economy bill.

It may be that the Panama Railroad transport service does compete with private industry, but that is true only to a slight extent.

I believe that the Army and Navy transport services do not compete seriously with private business and that they are engaged practically entirely in Federal Government business.

Therefore, I will vote for the Barbour amendment to strike out sections 308 to 313, inclusively, and this striking out will preserve the Army, Navy, and Panama Railroad transport services.

If the time has come to change our minds and abolish one or more of these services, then we should proceed through the regular congressional committees of the House covering these activities. We should hold hearings pro and con and arrive at a just and intelligent and economical and patriotic conclusion.

We can not arrive at such a conclusion in the terrific rush and hustle and bustle of consideration of this omnibus economy bill, which was made by logrolling and by trading good and bad measures.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that part of the section of the bill be read, the amendment on the Clerk's desk which the committee intends to ask be inserted in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the committee amendment affecting

this particular matter may be read by the Clerk for information. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, section 313:

Under sections 308 and 309, neither the Secretary of War nor the Secretary of the Navy shall sell or otherwise dispose of docks, yards, wharves, depots, terminals, or real estate in connection therewith, except that either may lease such properties for periods of not to exceed five years and at rentals which will provide a reasonable return on the cost thereof. The net proceeds from the sale or lease of property by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy under sections 308, 309, and this section shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that has just been read should completely satisfy the gentleman from Michigan and other Members with reference to the desire of the committee to protect the property of the United States. There is no desire upon the part of this committee to make any sacrifice by reason of doing away with the Transport Service, but I want to tell you why it should be done away with. We never had a transport service in this country until the Spanish-American War. We are the only country on the face of the earth that has one. It did not amount to a damn during the late war. There was but one vessel belonging to the Transport Service that went overseas, and it never came back. The transport service of every government is a part of the merchant marine, and we are derelict now because of the fact that we have not the character of transport service which we should have, and we should be building up our merchant marine so that we could have a proper transport service.

Remember that we are the only Nation on earth that has a transport service except the transport service that is given by reason of the fact of the merchant marine. That is true of England, France, and every first-class power on the face of the earth, and General MARTIN knows that.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Will the gentleman permit a statement?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. We are the only Nation, too, that has prohibition, are we not?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Oh, yes; but that is aside from this question. The merchant marine of this country is being subsidized by the Government for the purpose of building up something that is worth while, yet we are putting the Government of the United States in competition with the merchant marine.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman used as a premise for abolishing the Army and Navy Transport Service the fact that we are the only Nation of the world that has that service. If we are going to follow the gentleman's same line of reasoning, since we are the only Nation in the world that has prohibition, does the gentleman say we should abolish prohibition?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Let us talk about the question that is before us. However, the gentleman from Wisconsin said he was put down in the hold. He was put down in the hold because of the fact, if it were a fact, that we did not have a merchant marine then. We did not have any, and it was to the shame of this Nation.

I want to say to you that the Army is trying to insist upon keeping this thing going in spite of the fact that they are losing more than $3,000,000 a year, and in doing that we are competing with merchant marine vessels of this country, which we are subsidizing. We are paying out money on the one hand to the merchant marine of this country and then putting Government vessels in competition with them.

I will tell you what ought to be done. We ought to have a merchant marine in this country that would be prepared, in case of war, to take care of our soldiers as they should be, and will be, if you will do away with this transport system.

In case of war the Army would not have the transport business for one single minute. It would go to the Navy, and the Navy is in favor of doing away with this system now. They know they can not keep up a transport service that is worthy of the name. Of the 13 transports we had during the war, only one went over and that was loaded with marines. They thought if anybody was going to get lost, lose the marines. The transport never came back. They made a nice refrigerating arrangement out of it.

True to form, the Army, after it gets hold of a thing, never wants to give it up, and they have the temerity to say to us that they can operate this business cheaper than private companies. They also tell us they have a manufacturing establishment in Philadelphia making clothes, and they say they can make clothes cheaper than the commercial people can do it. They have never surrendered a single thing and never will if they can help it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one-half minute so I may ask a question.

Mr. DYER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on the amendment has been exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken.

The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment because it is covered by the McDuffie amendment.

Mr. DYER. Is the McDuffie amendment pending?

Mr. McDUFFIE. The McDuffie amendment was read as a part of the bill.

Mr. SCHAFER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman gags every other Member of the House on this important matter and I shall have to gag him. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer the committee amendment which has been read, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. TABER. I yield for that purpose, Mr. Chairman.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, strike out section 313 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 313. Under sections 308 and 309 neither the Secretary of War nor the Secretary of the Navy shall sell or otherwise dispose of docks, yards, wharves, depots, terminals, or real estate in connection therewith, except that either may lease such properties for periods of not to exceed five years and at rentals which will provide a reasonable return on the cost thereof. The net proceeds from the sale or lease of property by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy under sections 308, 309, and this section shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. RAMSEYER and Mr. LAGUARDIA rose.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this language is in the amendment, word for word, as it was offered the other day.

Mr. McDUFFIE. It was a part of the bill.

Mr. RAMSEYER. It is a part of the amendment and it so appears in the RECORD, word for word.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I agree with the gentleman, but some gentleman here thought it was not a part of the bill.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The bill is not the amendment. The amendment is the language which the gentleman offered the other day.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may submit a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the Chair inform the committee whether we are considering the bill as printed and known as H. R. 11597, or the bill that was submitted by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE] for consideration?

The CHAIRMAN. We are considering the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama on behalf of the Economy Committee. There are some differences between it and the printed bill to which the gentleman has referred.

The Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER].

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Do I understand we are considering a bill which is on the desk which contains something that is not in the copies of the bill that the Members have?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. RAMSEYER. So far as these particular provisions are concerned, that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York that the full text of the bill we are now considering as offered by the committee was printed in full in the RECORD upon the day it was offered. The Chair is further informed that there are some minor differences between that and the original bill that was reported by the committee.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I have a perfecting amendment to offer to this part of the bill just referred to by the gentleman from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to offer an amendment.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman from New York yield so that I may submit a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. TABER. I yield, if it does not come out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. It will come out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. TABER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 22, line 21, after the word "cost," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "said contracts to continue over a period of at least 10 years"; on page 22, line 25, strike out the figure "25" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "65"; and after the word "the" insert the word "now."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of putting the Government in business, but there are some major activities, such as the Post Office, the Panama Canal, the Army and the Navy, that the Government alone is in a position to carry on.

It was found necessary when the Panama Canal was built that we should take over and operate steamships to carry the men to their work and back to this country, and also the materials that were used in the canal.

The Panama Railroad was taken over by the Government of the United States at the time the canal was built. This operation of the steamships is used primarily for carrying material and supplies down to the canal and carrying the employees to the canal, and the Panama Railroad, and back and forth, at a rate approximately of $30 each way for each employee and members of their families, and freight at 75 per cent of the published tariffs.

If they were required to pay more than that most of them on the wages they receive could not afford to make the trip, and could not keep in shape.

In this bill it is proposed that these employees who now go back and forth in decent quarters, travel in the steerage at rates which are more than double and in some cases more than treble what they are now paying.

It provides in the bill that in the first place they shall get 25 per cent less than the published rate, but it does not say "now published rates." So I have offered an amendment which will make it "now published rates."

I have offered an amendment that if this language goes into effect, the rate for passengers shall be 65 per cent below the published rate, because that is what they are now getting from the Panama Railroad.

The Panama Railroad in normal times is operated without a loss of any kind. In 1928 and 1929 it showed a profit. We are able to operate it at a profit in normal times. There was a loss of $245,000 in 1931, when everybody suffered a loss.

The Government is paying mail subsidies of seven and a half million dollars in 1932 and $9,000,000 for 1933 for ships operating to the Canal Zone. The Panama Railroad does not carry any first-class mail.

These subsidy vessels would not take second and third class mail, but load their junk on the Panama Railroad Co. steamships.

Mr. LEA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LEA. Three thousand employees annually go back and forth from the United States to the Isthmus.

Mr. TABER. Three thousand nine hundred.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry: A few moments ago the membership of the House were advised that we were considering the economy bill effecting a consolidation, and then we were advised that a certain provision did not appear in the bill but was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I rise to ascertain when we may expect a consolidation of the two bills?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BANKHEAD). That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I move that at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves that all debate on this section——

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my motion.

Mr. CLANCY. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLANCY. The chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. McDUFFIE, and a member of the committee, Mr. RAMSEYER, say that the McDuffie amendment was incorporated in the bill as printed. That is not the fact. I am informed by the Clerk that it is due to an error of the Government Printing Office. It does not appear in the bill, and I want to preserve the McDuffie amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I say again, as I said before, that if there is anything that should be in this bill that is not in it to protect the Government, I want it put there. In reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] as to whether the Government is operating these transports at a profit, every figure offered by their own department shows that they are operating at a loss. I will show you how they show a profit. It is like a father who buys a farm for his son, paying for the farm, paying for all of the necessary equipment to run it, and then expecting the boy to show a profit at the end of the year without paying for anything connected with the conduct of the farm. Let me impress this thing upon your minds. A great deal of talk has been had, and will be had before we get through, I expect, to the effect that it will cost more by private concerns to bring the men and women who are working down there up to the United States. They come from there to the United States upon the theory that because of the cli-

mate they must come back here at least once every two years.

Under the bill the commercial establishments must furnish a rate 25 per cent lower than they furnish to the ordinary public, and in addition to that we are paying these people who are down there at the present time 25 per cent more than we will be paying them here for doing the same kind of work, upon the theory that we are expecting them to come back here every two years. That is to say, suppose a person in this country is getting $1,200 a year for a certain service. Down there he will be getting $1,600 for the same service. The additional $400 is to make it possible for him to come back here and pay whatever it may cost him to get back.

Mr. PARKER of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New York. The theory of the $400 extra pay on a $1,200 service is not to bring them back, but the theory is that they are down there from a Temperate Zone in a Tropical Zone where their health is impaired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. If the gentleman will read the debates at the time, he will find that the reason for the additional 25 per cent is because the man who is down there is expected to come back here, and it was given him for that purpose. There is nothing of the kind mentioned by the gentleman from New York. We have been talking long and loud about getting your Government out of business, and yet we are keeping it in business all of the while. Each one of these transports is competing with commercial business, which we have been trying to build up by the establishment of an American merchant marine.

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

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. HART. Does not the gentleman think that we ought to get out of the cotton and the grain business also?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I expect so; but we have this thing before us now, and let us get out of one thing at a time. I will go with the gentleman on that proposition, but because we are not out of that cotton and grain business is no reason why we should not get out of this.

Mr. SWING. What I am concerned about is in time of a national crisis, such as happened at Shanghai, how would we function under this bill about getting our troops from Manila to Shanghai in a hurry?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Fortunately for the United States Government, a transport was there at that time. If it had not been there, one of the Dollar Lines would have taken the soldiers the next day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the Taber amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD) there were—ayes 65, noes 30.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. McDUFFIE and Mr. TABER to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 123, noes 59.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Section 313, after the word "lease," insert "at public auction to the highest bidder," and at the end of the section insert, "*Provided*, That there shall be no renewal clause or right in said lease."

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. As far as I am concerned, and I am not prepared to speak authentically for the whole Economy Committee, I think the members of the committee are agreeable to the amendment.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does the gentleman understand that the McDuffie amendment which was presented a little while ago and adopted is now in the bill or is not in the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the most vicious thing in this bill is now before us. Mr. Chairman, I have used some pretty harsh language, and I do not modify it or take back a single word, but in all fairness I want to say that as soon as the committee discovered that there was danger of something having been put over on them they prepared this amendment, which is now part of the bill, and it is due to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE] to say that. But the House ought to know that there has been some pretty slimy lobbying going on.

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

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, I have absolved the gentleman.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I want the gentleman to absolve the committee.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will not absolve any of the lobbying that has been going on.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This whole transport elimination was inspired by some shipping interests in New York City. They were to divide the spoils—one-half the outfit to get the freight and the passenger services to Panama and Hawaii, and the other to take over the leases. There was a slimy lobbyist around the corridors of this building, reeking with liquor, and I know what offices he was in, and that resulted in this provision being put in the bill. If the provision stands, we are protected by the McDuffie amendment, with my amendment to it which simply provides that the property is to be leased at public auction and to the highest bidder, and that we are to have no renewal clause in the lease.

The gentleman must not forget that pier values in New York City run into millions and millions of dollars. The eyes of certain great shipping interests, who are now getting large subsidies from the United States Government, are on that property. They are not satisfied with getting the subsidies, but they want to take this valuable property and they want to get this Government business that the Panama Steamship Co. and the Army and Navy transport services are now operating at a great saving to the taxpayers. The Panama Steamship Co. is economically and efficiently managed, and some of these subsidized political ship companies could learn a great deal from the little Panama Steamship Co.

Mr. SWING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. SWING. Why auction off these valuable vessels at a time when there is no market for them and nothing but the lowest possible bid can be received for them?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We are not going to sell these properties at all. The amendment prevents that. If the sections are not voted out of the bill, the properties could only be leased, and at auction, and only for a short term. Of course, I hope to vote out all sections which would kill these splendid Government services.

Mr. SWING. Absolutely.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is my amendment accepted?

Mr. McDUFFIE. As far as I am concerned, there is no objection to the gentleman's amendment, but the gentleman has been pretty severe in his language with reference to this committee.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Not with reference to the gentleman.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I want the gentleman to straighten himself out. If the gentleman is talking about any slimy lobbyist coming to me, I want to know it, and I want to know it right now.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I say they were around this building, and I will say I do not think the committee has any knowledge of what was being attempted in this provision of the bill.

Mr. McDUFFIE. And the entire committee corrected it as soon as it was brought to their attention.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am giving you credit for it.

Mr. McDUFFIE. And the committee never once thought that it had to do with anything except things other than real estate and depots.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the gentleman's amendment must be corrected in so far as he proposes to have——

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I do not think the Members of this House who are running this job ought to go down in the well of the House and talk among themselves without the balance of the House knowing what is going on.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman's amendment proposes to insert a provision about public auction after the word "lease." The word "lease" occurs twice in the proposed section. I assume the gentleman refers to where it occurs first?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And the amendment is modified accordingly?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am as much opposed to putting the Government in business as anybody in this House; but here is a proposition where the Government is not in competition with anybody. The Government is doing its own business. The fleet of the Panama Canal is just as essential to the operation of the canal as the canal itself. There are over 11,000 men in the Canal Zone. I ask the attention of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], who said we were giving them 20 per cent because they wanted to come home. That was not the theory for that additional money. I happened to have been chairman of the committee which authorized that increase. The increase was made on the theory that no man from this climate could go and live in the tropics without coming home at least once in two years to preserve his health.

Mr. MANLOVE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER of New York. No; I can not. It is infinitely worse for the wives of the employees.

We have passed a separate retirement bill for those people, recognizing the fact that men who live in the Temperate Zone can not go to the tropics and perform service there and last as long as they would if they were performing service in the climate in which they were born. Now, if this provision is retained, it will impair the operation of the canal. It may be true, as the gentleman from Indiana said, although I have not the figures, as I did not realize it was coming up to-day, that ships of the Panama Canal are operated at a slight loss. That may be true; but the entire operation must be taken together—the canal, the railroad, and the ships. Aside from the depression in 1930 and 1931, the Panama Canal, taken as a whole, has paid the United States Government a profit.

Mr. LEA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER of New York. I yield.

Mr. LEA. As I understand, the only large deficiency in the Panama Canal was last year, during the extreme depression.

Mr. PARKER of New York. Yes.

Mr. LEA. During the last 10 years the average deficiency has not been over $60,000; and if the employees paid only about half the fare that is charged by private ships, there would be no deficiency.

Mr. PARKER of New York. But let me impress upon the membership of the House, although I do not presume it will have any effect, that for the last 18 years I have been either chairman of the committee or a member of the subcommittee dealing with the Panama Canal, and this transportation service is just as essential to the operation of the canal as the canal itself.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER of New York. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Is not the real truth of this matter to get ahold of these docks more than anything else?

Mr. PARKER of New York. I am not accusing anybody of anything. I am stating the plain facts regarding the operation of the canal.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. But I am asking the question. Is that not the truth?

Mr. PARKER of New York. That I do not know.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER of New York. I yield.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Is it not a fact that for the past several years the Panama Railroad Co. has paid an annual dividend to the United States Treasury of 7 per cent on its capital stock?

Mr. PARKER of New York. That is perfectly true.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. And there have been no appropriations made by Congress for the operation of the railroad, the steamship line, or any of its subsidiaries?

Mr. PARKER of New York. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PARKER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on sections 308 to 313 close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman from Indiana has already spoken. They are gagging us. The gentleman has spoken three or four times. They are going to close debate in five minutes, and are going to give the "gaggers" the five minutes under their own motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken. The gentleman from Indiana has already spoken.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, my only purpose in speaking now——

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARKER] has consumed the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana can be recognized if he makes a motion to strike out the last word.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Then that is my motion. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, 52 cities represented in Chicago within two weeks have asked this Congress to take the Government out of business, and the thing they emphasized more largely than anything else was this transport proposition. Every chamber of commerce in every State of the Union that has acted at all upon this question has asked us to do the same thing.

Mr. PARKER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; I do not yield.

Are we to be responsive to the will of the people, or are we simply to be subservient to the demands of the Army? I have been here for 18 years, and I am getting pretty tired of seeing the Army hold everything it has.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is out of order. The gentleman is not discussing his motion, which was to strike out the last word.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, "Army" is the last word. Therefore the gentleman is in order.

Mr. SCHAFER. I would like to have a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman from Indiana is out of order. He is not discussing the motion under which he so adroitly obtained recognition for about the third time he has spoken on this section. His motion was to strike out the last word. The last word is "receipts." The gentleman is certainly speaking out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana will proceed in order.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Then I am glad to proceed in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. For just a question.

Mr. BLANTON. As the head of his party, can he not control one of his obstreperous Members over there?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I admit that I can not control him. If you can, exercise your ability. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. PARKER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; I can not yield.

Gentlemen, this Committee on Economy has spent eight weeks trying to save some money to the Government of the United States, and incidentally, trying to benefit the Government of the United States or those who make up the taxpayers of this country. The taxpayers of this country are asking you to take the Government out of this business, and we are the only government on the face of the earth that is in it.

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

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. HART. What about the Mississippi-Warrior service?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It is just as bad as this, and the Government ought to be taken out of it.

It is said that the Government is making a profit, but that is by reason of the fact it does not count anything for capital investment, anything for wear and tear, anything for depreciation, anything for interest, anything for insurance; and that is what we are paying to-day to this transport service, in violation, if you, please, of every business principle on earth.

So there is no justification for keeping it, and, as I said before, we are the only nation that is keeping a transport service, and we are doing it in detriment, if you please, to the Army itself and to the Navy itself.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. If the abolishment of the Army and Navy transport system is so essentially necessary, why does the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War strongly oppose its abolition from the economy standpoint, from the national-defense standpoint, and from the standpoint of service to the red-blooded American enlisted men in their establishments?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I did not yield for a speech from the gentleman on the other side.

If you will examine the facts, this committee spent days and days in going into this thing, and the evidence shows that we are losing from one million to two and a half million dollars a year in the operation of this business in addition to having this concern in competition with the merchant marine of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate is exhausted.

Mr. DAVIS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to say anything upon this question, although I am very much interested.

I am very strongly in favor of economy. Governmental expenditures must be drastically reduced. I am in favor of goting much farther in many respects in effecting reductions in Government expenditures than this bill goes, although I wish to commend the Economy Committee for the arduous and splendid work it has done in many particulars.

However, the purpose and intention of this committee was to effect economies and not to act as a legislative committee otherwise. I object to some provisions that have been drafted into this bill, which are not in the interest of economy and which will not effect any savings but are purely legislative proposals, which certain interested parties have been seeking for years and years to get through, but which could not be enacted when presented before the committees and the Congress upon their merits. [Applause.]

The proposal to dispose of these Army and Navy transport services and to permit private ship lines to perform this service for the Government comes within that class. [Applause.] As already stated, lobbyists of certain shipping interests have been here industriously working in behalf of such legislation all this session.

They are not for the proposal from any standpoint of economy, but in order that private shipping lines may make a big profit off the Government in transporting the troops and supplies for the Government.

I want to say to you, in the light of 12 or 13 years' study of the subject from time to time, that the proposal to abolish the Army and Navy transport services is neither in the interest of economy nor efficiency, but just the reverse. Instead of effecting economy, in my opinion it would cost the Government $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 annually.

This is no new proposal. During the Taft administration private shipping interests attempted to have the Army and Navy transport services abolished, but President Taft and his Secretary of War recommended against it. Then, during the Wilson administration, the private shipping interests renewed their efforts, and President Wilson requested Secretary of War Newton D. Baker to investigate the subject, which he did and strongly recommended against the abolishment of the services, and President Wilson concurred in his conclusions.

I am advised that the Military Affairs and the Naval Affairs Committees have likewise investigated the subject and reached the same conclusion.

The Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries has had before it bills to abolish these services; this committee has conducted exhaustive hearings, heard everybody on both sides desiring to be heard, and in every instance since I have been a member of that committee, after the hearings before that committee, even the sponsor of the bills was not bold enough to ask that the bills be reported out of the committee. They just died of their own weight. The committee always reached the conclusion that it would not only make for inefficiency but would cost the Government a large amount to abolish these services and pay private lines for the transportation of our troops, supplies, and munitions to and from our various possessions.

I am not in favor of the Government engaging in business in competition with private business where it can be avoided. My position upon that is well known to you colleagues who have been sufficiently interested to note my position; but the Army and Navy transports do not engage in private business, and I want to say to you that the transport service is just as essential to our Army and Navy as are the war vessels. [Applause.]

During the last war there was infinitely more need for transports, and they were infinitely more valuable, than were the war vessels and rendered much greater service.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The facts are that in the last war we had but one transport of the Army that went across the ocean and it never came back.

Mr. DAVIS. The gentleman from Indiana has made several speeches and he and I do not agree upon the facts, much less upon our conclusions. [Applause.]

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The information we have is that we had only one transport in the last war, that it went across the ocean and never came back. We also have information to the effect that we could not carry our soldiers on transports.

Mr. DAVIS. And what did we do? We had to go into the open market and pay five or ten times the value of the vessels in order to use them as transports. [Applause.]

It is true that we had but a few small transports when we became involved in the World War. The need of additional transports was so imperative for the transportation of our troops, munitions, and supplies that we had to quickly purchase and charter ships at exorbitant war prices.

During the World War, we paid out over $200,000,000 in charter hire of ships alone. We engaged in the most prodigious shipbuilding program in the history of the world. This program cost upwards of $4,000,000,000. We put into service 2,500 vessels.

That experience is all the more evidence why we should not dispose of the few Army and Navy transports we now have, which are no more than are needed in peace times, and which would certainly afford a nucleus if we should become involved in another war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. Chairman, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the fact that the largest proportionate savings provided in the pending economy bill are those relating to the United States Shipping Board and Merchant Fleet Corporation, which specifically effect a saving for the next fiscal year of more than a third of the present expenses of these organizations and ship operations. As stated in the bill, this is represented by a reduction of $367,000 in salaries of personnel and in the reduction of the cost of the expenses of operation of Shipping Board services of $1,938,240, making a total of $2,305,240. The bill reduces by $367,000 the amount already carried in the independent offices appropriation bill for personnel for the next fiscal year, and provides for the transfer from the operating funds of the Fleet Corporation to the General Treasury the sum of $1,938,240.

The bill further provides for the reduction of the members of the Shipping Board from seven to four and the reduction of their salaries from $12,000 to $10,000, and further provides that no official or employee of either the Shipping Board or Fleet Corporation shall receive a salary in excess of $10,000.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries, I called into conference the chairman of the Shipping Board and the president of the Merchant Fleet Corporation and explained to them that the financial situation was such that drastic economies should be effected in their organizations, and that they knew best where such economies could be effected with the least injury to the public service.

These officials agreed to cooperate and upon my request prepared and submitted to me specific details as to where and how such economies could be effected. Thereupon I called the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries into session and invited the entire membership of the Shipping Board and the officials of the Merchant Fleet Corporation to be present. I laid the plans before the meeting, and they were readily approved by the committee. The members of the Shipping Board and the president of the Fleet Corporation were called upon individually, and they all approved the plans. The members of the Shipping Board also agreed to and did adopt a formal resolution approving the plans and agreeing to carry them into effect.

Then we laid the plans before the Economy Committee, which readily approved the same, and the chairman of the Economy Committee requested me to draft the appropriate provisions, which was done under the direction of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRIGGS], and myself, all members of the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries. Such provisions were incorporated in the economy bill as drafted and as heretofore explained and have been adopted by the House without any change whatever.

I here insert two letters received by me from the chairman of the Shipping Board, explaining these reductions and economies, and advising of the formal approval thereof by the Shipping Board.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD,
Washington, April 16, 1932.

Hon. EWIN L. DAVIS,
Chairman Committee on
Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS: In accordance with understanding had between the board and your committee at conference yesterday, there is transmitted herewith statement of economies which have been authorized and are now in process of accomplishment by the Merchant Fleet Corporation indicating total savings of $1,938,240, together with supporting data, as requested by the committee.

In addition to the above the Shipping Board can effect the following economies in connection with personnel of the Fleet Corporation assigned to the board, as follows:

Bureau of Research	$30,000
Bureau of Law	103,000
Bureau of Traffic	9,000
Bureau of Construction	5,000
Bureau of Operations	20,000
	167,000
Engineering experiment-research fund	200,000
Total savings on behalf of Shipping Board	367,000

The grand total of indicated savings which can be effected between the Fleet Corporation and the Shipping Board is $2,305,240.

This represents the amount which under present conditions can be saved, with a prospect that additional savings can be effected when a further survey may be had of possibilities under the reduced operating force.

This report has not been formally agreed to by the board, but such action will be had on Monday, the 18th instant.

Very truly yours,

T. V. O'CONNOR, *Chairman.*

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD,
Washington, April 18, 1932.

Hon. EWIN L. DAVIS,
Chairman Committee on
Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS: Referring to letter of April 16, 1932, regarding economies which can be effected by the Shipping Board and the Fleet Corporation, I beg to advise you that the board this morning ratified and approved the letter as delivered to you.

The board particularly desires to call your attention to an additional figure of saving which can be effected if all the lines are sold amounting to $443,945. * * *

This additional figure does not include the advantage to the Treasury of the 25 per cent down payment in cash which would accrue from the sale of the lines the first year. This cash would amount to $1,255,477.56.

To summarize: Whereas our letter of April 16 shows total savings by the board and Fleet Corporation of $2,305,240, we may go farther and say that there will be in addition to that $443,945 and $1,255,477.56, making a total figure of economy through the retrenchment and sales program submitted of $4,004,662.56.

Very truly yours,

T. V. O'CONNOR, *Chairman.*

Under this plan the board consolidated the four shipping services operating out of the Gulf of Mexico, and they already have a satisfactory offer for the purchase of the entire consolidated service, which the Shipping Board has approved. The bidders have filed a certified check as evidence of good faith. If this sale is effected, the second letter from the chairman of the Shipping Board explains the large additional savings which would be effected.

In addition, the plans embrace a consolidation of two services operating out of Hampton Roads, and the Shipping Board has received a satisfactory offer for this consolidated service. This would result in a large additional saving.

This would only leave two Shipping Board services, for one of which the Shipping Board has a tentative offer.

The sale of these services will result in a large additional reduction of personnel and other expenses, besides those specifically provided in the economy bill, and should result in the liquidation of the Merchant Fleet Corporation and further reduction in the personnel of the Shipping Board.

May I be permitted to suggest that if all the congressional committees had proceeded in like manner with respect to the activities of the Government over which they had legislative supervision, very large savings could have been effected?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Barbour].

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, may we have that amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McDuffie) there were—ayes 175, noes 32.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Vinson of Georgia: Page 14, line 11, strike out all of section 301.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I trust the members of the committee will give careful consideration to the amendment I have just offered, because this is a very vital section of this bill.

This bill is designed to save money. This section, on the contrary, is a very extravagant and pernicious section. It permits the departments to obtain 15 per cent of the annual appropriation and spend it without Congress having any voice in the matter; in other words, you permit the various departments to have 15 per cent of the amount of money we appropriate and spend it as they see fit instead of spending it in the way Congress has directed.

Just to show you what would happen, a few days ago we appropriated $325,000,000 for the support of the Navy. Under this provision the Navy Department can take $48,000,000 of that amount and spend it as it sees fit, upon the approval of the Director of the Budget.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Oh, the gentleman has not read the section or he would not make such a statement.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman will read the provision he will see that I am absolutely correct.

Mr. RAMSEYER. It may be transferred from one activity to another activity in the same department.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And it can not be over 15 per cent that is transferred from one bureau to another; but my statement is absolutely correct that Congress loses control of 15 per cent of the amount of money appropriated to each and every department of this Government.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Does the gentleman know that in the Department of Agriculture this provision has been permanent law for years and that that department can make such transfers?

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLLINS. It never has been the rule in the Department of Agriculture except within bureaus in the department. They can not transfer from one bureau to another.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is absolutely correct. If this provision stays in the bill, instead of being in the interest of economy, it is in the interest of extravagance, because no longer will Congress have the right to itemize the appropriations and say how each and every dollar shall be spent. We will confer upon these departments this right, which is a thing that the Navy Department and the War Department and every other department have been seeking for years—to say how the money shall be allocated instead of having it allocated by the Congress.

Has the time now come when Congress no longer wants to exercise its right and its jurisdiction with respect to the distribution of the various appropriations? This is not in the interest of economy, but is in the interest of extravagance.

Let me illustrate further. We itemize every dollar that is spent in the Navy and we say that so much money can be used to buy automobiles. If, in the judgment of the Navy Department, it is desired to do so, under this provision they could take 15 per cent of the $48,000,000 and buy such automobiles as they saw fit to purchase.

We appropriate in the Department of Agriculture bill $125,000,000 for good roads. If, in the judgment of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the department, it is proper, they can take a portion of 15 per cent of the total amount appropriated to the department for good roads and use it to kill grasshoppers or the boll weevil or the Mediterranean fruit fly or for any other purpose it may see fit.

Let me say further that this is what the departments have been fighting for year in and year out. They want to have the right to say how the money shall be distributed instead of submitting an itemized statement to Congress each year.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. Is it not true, also, that if a bureau or department should have a surplus, instead of that money being covered into the Treasury it would be immediately transferred to some other bureau and used?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Why, of course.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman who has just left the floor has misunderstood the purport of section 301. It is true that it permits a 15 per cent shift in appropriations, but the gentleman overlooks the fact that not more than 15 per cent can be added to any one appropriation. It would be an impossible thing to take $48,000,000, for instance, from any given appropriation and add the $48,000,000 to any other appropriation.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, it is limited to 15 per cent as between one item and another, but the $48,000,000 would be 15 per cent of the total appropriation, and that amount is lost control of by Congress and they could distribute the $48,000,000 as they saw fit.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The gentleman knows very well that nothing of the sort will be done. No Cabinet officer would take $40,000,000 from any one appropriation and give it to any one bureau, or, for that matter, to groups of them. That is pure nonsense, because you can only add 15 per cent to any one bureau, and there is no place where you could put $48,000,000. The gentleman also said that they could take that money and buy automobiles, if they wanted to do so. That statement is absurd on its face.

I wish you would look at the situation as it actually exists. The Senate has made a 10 per cent flat reduction in many appropriations, and has done so more or less blindly. This has left some bureaus practically high and dry. It has left other bureaus with more money than is indispensably necessary for them to function. The only way the matter can be handled and adjusted upon a sensible and businesslike basis is to allow some transfer of appropriations, and leave it in the discretion of the head of the department. Unless this is done, we are going to have chaos in the departments and the efficiency of the Government service will be destroyed.

This provision applies only to 1933. It is an effort to correct, so far as possible, a situation which has been created by indiscriminate cuts without much reference to the bureaus effected or the merit of the respective activities. There must be some method adopted that will permit some of the most essential activities to function. If cuts have been made injudiciously or if they have been made without reference to merit or if they have been made blindly, manifestly there must be in the hands of some one some degree of discretion to transfer these appropriations from one bureau to another to temporarily tide them over until Congress can remedy the situation. There is not any danger that a large amount of money is going to be transferred from one bureau to another.

You have had such a provision with respect to the Agricultural Department for years. The Secretary of Agriculture has been able to transfer 10 per cent of an appropriation from one activity to another. It has never been charged that this privilege has been abused. It has worked admirably, and been in the interest of efficiency and good government and resulted in a better balancing of the activities of the department. I should not favor the provision under ordinary circumstances, and the only reason it is proposed for 1933 is because of the character of the cuts made.

Of course, every provision of this kind, giving discretion to a department, is susceptible of some abuse, but if we are not able to trust anybody in the matter of appropriations, in view of the cut made at the other end of the Capitol, you are going to have plenty of trouble in all of the departments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I have felt very keenly about this section, because I know that the departments of this Government for many years have wanted to do this very thing—to secure interchangeable control of at least a portion of the appropriation.

While I regret to differ with the Economy Committee, I am opposed to letting the heads of departments and the Director of the Budget legislate with reference to these appropriations. [Applause.] We carried on the war involving billions of dollars, and no such interchangeability was undertaken or placed into law. There was a bill introduced during the World War seeking to put several billion dollars under the control of the War Department, but Congress overwhelmingly voted it down and made appropriations from time to time in the usual form.

Now, gentlemen, let me tell you, as the gentleman from Georgia says, this means extravagance. It does not mean economy.

Let me tell you what could happen. We have an appropriation of $108,000,000 for public buildings in the Treasury Department. Congress cut the Coast Guard appropriation a million dollars from the Budget estimate against the recommendation of the Treasury Department. If this section becomes law the department could take from your public building fund and practically restore that cut in the Coast Guard appropriation. That could be done by the head of the department, if approved by the Budget, who was frank enough to say a few days ago, "What is sacred about a new post office in times like these?" This remark would indicate that there might not be much hesitation about transferring $16,000,000 from the public building appropriation to other Treasury Department purposes.

But that is not all. Congress has limited the amount for prohibition to something over $10,000,000 for the Department of Justice. If this provision is inserted the Department of Justice might take 15 per cent of other appropriations and increase the prohibition enforcement sum a million and a half dollars.

That is not all; in the Agriculture Department there is $109,000,000 for public roads, and if this provision becomes a law it might be possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to take $15,000,000 and distribute that among other operations in that department.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman read the section and tell us how he can take $15,000,000 and transfer it to other activities?

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman from Iowa understands that as well as I do. Of course he is not going to take $15,000,000 in one operation, but he could increase appropriations of every bureau in his department and use the 15 per cent of that appropriation, and that is just what I object to.

Congress is in session, and, gentlemen, you should keep your hands on these appropriations. I do not want to see the public-building fund used for any purpose other than what Congress intended. [Applause.]

That is not all. Take the War Department. The War Department appropriation bill has not yet been reported. The Budget estimate for rivers and harbors amounts to $60,000,000. Flood control amounts to $32,000,000. If this provision becomes the law, the Secretary of War, if he sees fit, can take either all or a portion of 15 per cent of $92,000,000 and distribute it among other bureaus in his department, and it is that to which I object.

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

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This Economy Committee has had its ups and downs for eight weeks. It started out with one chairman and ended up with another. Still the words ring in my ears as we left the Economy Committee the last time. This member says, "I do not like that" and another member says, "I do not like that," but the way it sounds in my ears now is that there was a general understanding that we would come in here and try to stand together.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman will not accuse me of entering into any such agreement.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I am not quoting anybody and I am accusing the gentleman of nothing.

Mr. BYRNS. I want to deny that I promised the committee or anybody else that I would stand for this thing. I do not propose to be put in that attitude before the House.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I am not saying that the gentleman did. If he says that he did not, that settles it with me.

Mr. BYRNS. That is true.

Mr. RAMSEYER. All right; but this committee has been kicked around by different groups. Now the committee gets a kick from one of its own members. There is no use of our getting excited about this. Evidently the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] does not know that we are in an emergency. The country is in a condition such as it never faced before. This is emergency legislation; it is for one year only; and it is to enable the departments to function, to meet situations such as was created in the Interior Department appropriations when this Congress cut the appropriation flat 10 per cent without designating what activities in that department were to be affected, and unless the heads of departments, with the approval of the Director of the Budget, have a right to make some transfers, some functions of government may break down altogether. This does not authorize the heads of departments to take 15 per cent off one appropriation and add it to another, but it does provide that no appropriation can be increased over 15 per cent. You can not take 15 per cent from public roads or rivers and harbors. What can be done is, that if some appropriations are deficient, you can take from others; but the increase of the particular appropriation can not be over 15 per cent. That is a distinction that is important and which the gentleman from Tennessee overlooks. Let us read this language which the motion seeks to strike and get it right. There is no use of getting excited about this. We ought to look at this calmly and remember that we are confronted by a serious situation. We are cutting here and cutting there, right and left, and going at it blindly in some cases.

All this does is for the fiscal year 1933 to authorize the heads of departments, with the approval of the Director of the Budget, to make transfers from one appropriation to another appropriation in the same department, but to any particular appropriation to which the transfer is made, it can not be increased over 15 per cent. Oh, yes; the gentleman from Tennessee, a great dry advocate, had to throw out a sop to you wets warning you that you better look out or else they would increase the appropriation to enforce the prohibition law.

Mr. SCHAFER rose.

Mr. RAMSEYER. No; I do not yield. Let me read:

To any other appropriation or appropriations under the same department or establishment, but no appropriation shall be increased more than 15 per cent by such transfers.

The inference from the gentleman's speech was that here is the public-roads appropriation—$100,000,000 or more—and that you could take away $15,000,000 and put it somewhere else. That is not in this provision at all. The committee, out of an abundance of caution, wrote in a proviso requiring that—

A statement of all of the transfers of appropriations made hereunder shall be included in the annual Budget for the fiscal year 1935, and a statement of all transfers of appropriations made hereunder up to the time of the submission of the annual Budget for the fiscal year 1934, and all contemplated transfers during the remainder of the fiscal year 1933 shall be included in the annual Budget for the fiscal year 1934.

That is, that between the 1st of July and the 1st of November of this year it must show in the Budget how much has been transferred and what they contemplate transferring during the remainder of the fiscal year. That keeps the Congress advised. This is simply to meet an emergency situation, and it is for one year only.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this title and all amendments thereto do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLLINS) there were—ayes 107, noes 26.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRENCH: Page 14, line 15, after the word "Columbia," insert "the appropriation bill for the support of which may not have been sent to conference between the Senate and the House of Representatives."

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona) there were—ayes 77, noes 55.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LAMNECK: Page 17, line 16, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 304. No moneys heretofore appropriated for State aid shall be expended during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, except the amount appropriated for vocational education."

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the amendment is not germane. The section is out. There is nothing left of the bill about State aid of any kind.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WARREN). The Chair thinks that, this being under the miscellaneous provisions, the amendment would be germane. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SWING: Page 15, lines 3, 4, and 5, strike out section 302.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SWING. I do not understand that debate has been closed upon the entire title.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is in error.

The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LONERGAN: Page 24, line 24, add a new section:

"* * * *Provided*, That in the consolidation or merging of Shipping Board activities, employees originally appointed as a result of civil-service examination, or by transfer from such civil-service status in another department, be given preference for retention in the consolidated or merged board or bureau over employees who have no such civil-service status."

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOWMAN: Page 28, line 23, strike out all of section 322.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: Page 17, line 24, after the word "Government," insert "and $225,000 for farmers' bulletins."

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is not germane. It is increasing an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is germane. The situation is entirely different from the former amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. The Chair thinks the gentleman has now brought the same within the rules of germaneness. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCHANAN) there were ayes 62 and noes 78.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. WILLIAMSON as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were ayes 112 and noes 100.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: Page 26, line 4, strike out all of subsection (i) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation is hereby abolished effective June 30, 1932, and its activities, authority, powers, and operating funds are hereby transferred to the United States Shipping Board, except $1,938,240 of such operating funds which shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane. This is simply an amendment transferring the Merchant Fleet Corporation to the Shipping Board, and it is clear there is no apparent saving on the face of it, and no economies are involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the committee for two minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRENCH: Page 14, line 12, insert a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 301. Not to exceed 15 per cent of any appropriation for the Interior Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, may be transferred, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to any other appropriation or appropriations under the same department or establishment, but no appropriation shall be increased more than 15 per cent by such transfers: *Provided*, That a statement of all transfers of appropriations made hereunder shall be included in the annual Budget for the fiscal year 1935, and a statement of all transfers of appropriations made hereunder up to the time of the submission of the annual Budget for the fiscal year 1934, and all contemplated transfers during the remainder of the fiscal year 1933, shall be included in the annual Budget for the fiscal year 1934."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAMSEYER) there were ayes 54 and noes 103.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—REORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 401. In order to further reduce expenditures and increase efficiency in government it is declared to be the policy of Congress—

(a) to group, coordinate, and consolidate executive and administrative agencies of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

(b) to reduce the number of such agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head;

(c) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort; and

(d) to segregate regulatory agencies and functions from those of an administrative and executive character.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 402. When used in this title—

(1) The term "executive agency" means any commission, board, bureau, division, service, or office in the executive branch of the Government, but does not include the executive departments mentioned in title 5, section 1, United States Code.

(2) The term "independent executive agency" means any executive agency not under the jurisdiction or control of any executive department.

POWER OF PRESIDENT

SEC. 403. For the purpose of carrying out the policy of Congress as declared in section 401 of this title, the President is authorized by Executive order—

(1) to transfer the whole or any part of any independent executive agency, and/or the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of an executive department or another independent executive agency;

(2) to transfer the whole or any part of any executive agency, and/or the functions thereof, from the jurisdiction and control of one executive department to the jurisdiction and control of another executive department; or

(3) to consolidate or redistribute the functions vested in any executive department or in the executive agencies included in any executive department.

SEC. 404. The President's order directing any transfer or consolidation under the provisions of this title shall also designate the records, property (including office equipment), personnel, and unexpended balances of appropriations to be transferred.

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 405. (a) All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by or in respect of any executive agency or function transferred or consolidated with any other executive agency or function under the provisions of this title, and in effect at the time of the transfer or consolidation, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer or consolidation had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any department or executive agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of any transfer of authority, powers, and duties from one officer or executive agency of the Government to another under the provisions of this title, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the head of the department or executive agency or other officer of the United States to whom the authority, powers, and duties are transferred.

(c) All laws relating to any executive agency or function transferred or consolidated with any other executive agency or function under the provisions of this title shall, in so far as such laws are not inapplicable, remain in full force and effect, and shall be administered by the head of the executive agency to which the transfer is made or with which the consolidation is effected.

STATUTORY AGENCIES

SEC. 406. Whenever, in carrying out the provisions of this title, the President concludes that any executive department or agency created by statute should be abolished and the functions thereof transferred to another executive department or agency or eliminated entirely the authority granted in this title shall not apply, and he shall report his conclusions to Congress, with such recommendations as he may deem proper.

DISAPPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE ORDER

SEC. 407. Whenever the President makes an Executive order under the provisions of this title, such Executive order shall be transmitted to the Congress while in session and shall not become effective until after the expiration of 60 calendar days after such transmission: *Provided*, That if Congress shall adjourn before the expiration of 60 calendar days from the date of such transmission such Executive order shall not become effective until after the expiration of 60 calendar days from the opening day of the next succeeding regular or special session: *Provided further*, That if either branch of Congress within such 60 calendar days shall pass a resolution disapproving of such Executive order, or any part thereof, such Executive order shall become null and void to the extent of such disapproval.

REPORT TO CONGRESS

SEC. 408. The President shall report specially to Congress at the beginning of each regular session any action taken under the provisions of this title, with the reasons therefor.

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

I would like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill. Can the chairman advise the House what he intends to do with respect to a recess or an adjournment this evening?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I want to do what the House wishes to do. [Applause.] I have already learned my lesson along that line. I should like very much to see the committee work until 5 o'clock and then recess until 7.30 this evening.

Mr. BACHMANN. I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that many of the Members on this side would like to recess from 5 to 7.30.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMSON: On page 31, line 15, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and," and insert a new paragraph after line 15, as follows:

"4. To designate and fix the name and functions of any consolidated activity or executive agency, and the title, powers, and duties of its executive head."

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has the approval of the Committee on Economy. It is simply a perfecting amendment offered for the purpose of making sure that the President will have the authority to carry out the purposes of the bill. The amendment gives him authority which he probably has now, but which ought to be made certain, namely, that the President, in consolidating activities, has the right to give the consolidated activity a name, and to designate the title, powers, and duties of the person chosen to administer its functions. That is the only purpose of it. It should be adopted in order to complete the section.

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

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I yield.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I think that power is already granted in the language as it is, but if the gentleman prefers having additional language to that effect I am not going to object to it.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. His power now is implied. This amendment makes it clear that he has the necessary authority to carry out what the committee has in mind.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. As I understand the amendment, it authorizes the President to fix the duties of any new combination agency that he may create. It might mean an additional expense rather than an economy.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Is the gentleman familiar with the language of the amendment?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the Clerk read the language of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. JONES. In other words, he can fix all the powers, duties, and obligations of the new agency. He can transfer any executive or nonstatutory agency or division, or group them under a new head, and then clothe them with additional powers.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Oh, no.

Mr. JONES. He can. Of course, it might be subject to disapproval.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The gentleman has not read the title, or he would not make that statement.

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes; I have. The gentleman evidently has not thoroughly considered the broad powers of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota, especially in connection with the terms already in the bill.

The President may make an Executive order under section 407. Sixty days elapse. It then becomes effective. Then under the added power of the amendment under consideration added powers may be given.

Mr. McDUFFIE. If the gentleman will read the definitions under section 402, I am sure that what the amendment comprehends will be clear in his mind.

Mr. JONES. I do not agree with the gentleman from South Dakota. It seems to me it gives blanket authority when read in connection with the other provisions of the title.

I think an effort should be made to eliminate rather than to create new agencies.

Mr. McDUFFIE. That is what we tell him to do.

Mr. JONES. I offered an amendment a while ago to authorize the abolishment of the United States Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation. They have two organizations, a United States Shipping Board and an Emergency Fleet Corporation. Why have both? Why not eliminate one? They have a division of law and a bureau of law. You might as well have a bureau of fisheries and a bureau of fish. Those things should be consolidated.

The portion of this section which authorizes consolidation and elimination is all right; but if I read the amendment correctly in connection with previous and subsequent language, you would authorize him to create a bureau and to transfer the duties, fix the powers and obligations of that bureau. Is not that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I think the gentleman is wrong. I call his attention to the language of section 406, which expressly prohibits him from abolishing or transferring the functions of any executive agency or department which has been created by law.

Mr. JONES. Where does the gentleman find that language?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. That language is in section 406, on page 33. I think the gentleman is in error. If he will read section 406, he will find that whenever, in the opinion of the President, an executive department should be abolished or the functions of that department or agency should be transferred, when that department or agency has been created by statute he can do nothing more——

Mr. JONES. That is limited to statutory agencies. That does not apply at all to the different agencies that may be created under the other definitions and which may not be statutory agencies in any sense. Section 407 transfers legislative power by virtue of the lapse of time. Then linked with this amendment, I fear that additional duties may be conferred.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 93, noes 14.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMSON: On page 33, line 15, after the word "transmission," insert a comma and "unless Congress shall sooner approve of such Executive order or orders by concurrent resolution, in which case said order or orders shall become effective as of the date of the adoption of the resolution."

Mr. McDUFFIE. Before the gentleman proceeds, may I state that that is not a committee amendment. The committee objects to that amendment very seriously.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I did not announce that it was a committee amendment. The Chair may have assumed it was such from the fact that I am a member of the committee. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of the amendment, I may say to the gentleman from Alabama, if he will listen to me, is to make it possible for an Executive order to become effective if both Houses shall pass a resolution approving of the Executive order. Suppose the President sends an Executive order reorganizing a certain department. Why should not the Senate and House be permitted to pass a concurrent resolution approving that Executive order so that it may go into effect as of the date when Congress passes the resolution? Under these circumstances there is no reason why it should wait for a period of 60 days if Congress should determine otherwise.

Mr. McDUFFIE. If I caught the reading of the amendment, it provides for a joint resolution to veto the action of the President?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Not a joint resolution.

Mr. McDUFFIE. That is what I understood from the reading of the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. It does not change the language in any way. If the gentleman will look at the point where the amendment comes in——

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. This does not in any way limit or affect the two provisos. The House may disapprove the order, in which case it becomes null and void. The only effect is to permit affirmative action by both Houses, if they see fit to take such action, so that the order may go into effect at once without being delayed for a period of 60 days.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I yield.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The provision in line 15, after "provided," remains unchanged. This is only for the purpose of expediting the order if a joint resolution approving it passes both Houses. Of course, if one House rejects it, that ends the matter.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Could not the order go into effect without waiting the entire 60 days? The gentleman's idea is that it can not be effected until after the expiration of 60 days.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Oh, no.

Mr. McDUFFIE. If both Houses say they want it to go into effect prior to the expiration of 60 days, this amendment permits it to do so?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes; and that is all it does.

Mr. McDUFFIE. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLADAY: Page 33, strike out section 406 and section 407.

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion these two sections are the most important sections in this bill. A great many of the proposed economies we have considered so far in this bill are temporary propositions and are effective for only one year. The sections dealing with the consolidation of bureaus and departments provide for a permanent program; and if any economies are effected, they will continue in the years to come.

On the 19th of February of this year I introduced a resolution giving the President of the United States the power to abolish, combine, and consolidate commissions, boards, departments, bureaus, and divisions of the National Government. The provisions of my resolution are included in the bill we are now considering. The economies possible under the terms of my resolution, as contained in this bill, are curtailed by the two sections my amendment would strike out, as these two sections require that any consolidations that the President may make must come back for the approval of Congress.

During the three days this bill has been under consideration I have wondered how many Members of this House are actually in favor of effecting permanent economies in government. The President, according to newspaper reports, has expressed a desire for authority to consolidate certain departments, claiming that if he had such authority, economies in government could be effected.

I am in favor, in the face of the emergency that confronts this country, of giving such authority to the President.

Under the provisions of the two sections struck out by my amendment the President has but little authority except upon the approval of Congress. Whatever he does must come back here for the approval of the Congress, and has there ever been a better illustration of the difficulty of Congress agreeing upon economies than we have witnessed during the last three days? There is a great difference of opinion in this House, and this is the trouble we have with every effort we make to effect economies. There is a difference of opinion, a difference of interests; and the net result is that on account of those conditions, we are not able to effect the economies we should.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLADAY. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman would not deny Congress the right to assert such differences and have the membership of this House pass upon them?

Mr. HOLADAY. In the interest of economy, I would.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is to strike out sections 406 and 407 of Title IV.

Section 406 provides that whenever, in the discretion of the President, an executive department or an agency should be abolished or the functions of such a department or agency, created by statute, should be transferred to some other department or agency, the President shall submit his recommendations to the Congress for approval or disapproval by the Congress.

There is a reason for having inserted this language in the amendment. This reason is that Congress can not delegate to the President authority to abolish an executive department or an agency created by statute. To do so would be to delegate to the President authority to legislate. This clearly can not be done under the Constitution.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Does not the gentleman think that power is given to him in section 407, where you are legislating by negation?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. No; the gentleman is in error. Section 406 applies only to those departments or agencies which have been created by statute, with respect to which the President thinks certain things should be done.

Section 407 has to do with the elimination or transfer of bureaus or agencies which have not been created by statute. With respect to them it provides that the President may, by Executive order, arrange for their elimination or their transfer, and it provides further, that such Executive order shall not become effective unless Congress, within a period shorter than 60 days, shall have positively approved of such Executive order, or unless within 60 days either House of Congress shall have vetoed or disapproved the Executive order.

The provisions of section 407 are confined only to those executive departments and agencies which have not been created by statute.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. What has the gentleman to say about delegating the power of Congress, in section 604, page 44, where you delegate the power not to the President, but to a Cabinet officer to consolidate, eliminate, restrict, and create?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. If the gentleman will wait until we consider title 6, I will discuss that question with him.

Mr. SCHAFER. Is the gentleman in favor of giving this superman this broad power?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I decline to yield further.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is not the distinction this, that the bill provides for reorganization by Congress, whereas the other is vesting power in the Executive to reorganize?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Certainly. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois in effect would delegate to the President legislative powers which can not be delegated by Congress. In the second place, it would deny to Congress the right to disapprove any Executive order the President might issue with respect to a bureau or agency not created by statute. For that reason I am opposed to the amendment, and I hope it will not prevail.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I agree fully with the position of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOLADAY] that, if we ever have a reorganization of the various departments of the Government really worth while, we must give the President the necessary authority to do the job. The debate on this bill and the action of the House during the last few days are evidence anew of the correctness of that statement. I did not intend, however, to take the floor to discuss his amendment, and would not have done so, except for the positive statement by the gentleman from Arizona that such authority could not be delegated to the President. He made the statement so positively that it seemed to me that it ought not to go unchallenged. I admit that it is a disputed question. My understanding is, and I have given the subject some study, that all lawyers do not agree about it, but some very good lawyers say the passage of legislation giving the President the power to reorganize and consolidate the departments and activities of the Government as contemplated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOLADAY] would be in itself sufficient repeal or amendment of the statutes which created those activities to authorize or permit the President to make the consolidations and reorganizations without reference to any further action by the Congress.

I merely rose for the purpose of making this statement so that the RECORD would show that there is more uncertainty about the question than the rather definite statement of the gentleman from Arizona would indicate. At most it can only be said that it is a disputed question.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Since the committee appears to have given this matter much consideration and is in agreement as to their title, surely the gentleman is not desirous of raising a controversy about a legal question that might be argued from different viewpoints.

Mr. MAPES. I am not trying to raise any question, but I do not want the RECORD to show that a statement that a disputed question was really not disputed was allowed to go unchallenged. I tried to interrupt the gentleman from Arizona while he was speaking to raise the question, but did not succeed.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I assume the gentleman would concede that there is hardly any legal question that has not two sides.

Mr. MAPES. Oh, I do not want to go into any fine hair-splitting discussion of this matter. I am not now discussing the policy of giving the President such authority. I may add, however, that eight years ago the Solicitor of the Department of Commerce investigated the matter and rendered an opinion that the President could be given this authority.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I did not undertake to make a positive statement.

I was simply giving what seemed to me to be the opinion of the Economy Committee.

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

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If Congress created these departments in the first instance, why should Congress absolutely surrender the right to have any views in respect to their policy?

Mr. MAPES. As a matter of policy the gentleman is entitled to that opinion, but I say that the Solicitor of the Department of Commerce eight years ago rendered an opinion that Congress could delegate this power to the President.

While I am on my feet I should like to add that I think this title as reported by the committee is a distinct step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough. The elimination of the two sections, as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, would improve it greatly.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this title close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. This proposition is very important as well as interesting, particularly in these times when there is a tendency on the part of parliamentary government to delegate powers to the executive. I believe that Title IV is as far as we can safely go under our form of government, if Congress is to retain the powers and rights and prerogatives specifically given to it under the Constitution. The amendment suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOLADAY] to strike out these two provisions would be an absolute delegation of legislative power. I do not say that such a delegation would be abused, but I do say that it would be a most unsafe precedent to establish. I have consistently resisted the delegation of legislative powers to the Executive. Under Title IV, as it now stands, all it does is suggest to the President to make specific recommendations, and he can do that now. It is then up to Congress to act, if it cares to do so. The only change—and I do not like it, although it is in the bill—is that either branch of Congress can veto or reject the President's recommendations in 60 days. If we fail to do that, then the President may put the changes into effect. As far as I am concerned, being a fundamentalist and very conservative in my belief in and attitude toward the Constitution, I would not even go that far, because I believe in our representative form of government; I believe in parliamentary government. I prefer the procedure under existing law that Congress act on its own initiative or on recommendation of the President, and that until Congress does legislate affirmatively, no law is enacted.

Sometimes our form of government is cumbersome, sometimes it is costly, but it is representative government, and the price of popular government must be paid. I think it would be most unwise at this time to strike out section 407 particularly, and give this blanket authority to the President. I would not give that to any executive.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and an authority on the Constitution.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. From the gentleman's investigation of the change in governmental structure, have not these changes arisen usually when people have acted in crises like this, or under stress have violated the basic laws of government?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Always; and always to their regret and own destruction. We learned in our study of law that hard cases should not be permitted to make bad law. Do not permit bad conditions to destroy good government! This is what Congress will do if we sit idly by and say that we are helpless, that we can not bring reorganization about, and therefore here must give blanket authority and legislative powers to the Executive. It is not the personality of the Executive that enters into it. It is a violent change and such a surrender that we are not justified in sanctioning. That is why I do not like section 106 of the bill, that permits the Secretary of the Treasury to receive from constitutional officers a refund of part of their salaries in place of a reduction, which the Constitution specifically prohibits. That is bad. I wanted to move to strike that out, but I was foreclosed. We should not do indirectly that which the Constitution says we can not do directly. We should not do by coercion or by shaming or coaxing that which the Constitution says we can not do by legislation. I believe section 106 is highly improper, and I am confident it will be stricken from the bill before the bill finally passes both Houses of Congress.

For the same reasons I can not favor any bill or part of a bill which would delegate legislative powers to the Executive.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to strike out sections 406 and 407.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a separate vote on sections 406 and 407.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks for a division of the question. The question is on the motion of the gentleman to strike out section 406.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs upon the amendment to strike out section 407.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRITTEN: On page 30, line 16, add a new subsection, as follows:

"Subsection (e). That each Saturday of each week of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, is hereby declared to be a legal public holiday, to the same extent and in the same manner as Christmas, the 1st day of January, the 22d of February, the 30th day of May, the 4th of July, and labor's holiday are now made by law public holidays."

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order, that the amendment is not germane to the section or to the title.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the section applies to a declaration of policy. Certainly a declaration for a 5-day week can be construed properly as a declaration of policy. It is in line with the desires of the President of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As a matter of information, before we leave this

title, I am still somewhat bothered about the question raised awhile ago. If I understand it aright, the President may recommend changes in statutory agencies, or he may make absolute orders changing nonstatutory agencies, or consolidating them. That, of course, is subject to the approval of Congress. One is a recommendation to Congress and the other becomes effective if Congress fails to act. The question I wanted to ask some member of the committee to answer is whether under the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON] to authorize the President to designate the power and authority of any of these consolidated agencies, the President may not, after these have been created, then confer any power that he sees fit on that agency. In other words, suppose that under the nonstatutory agency the President should create a consolidated agency, or should consolidate two agencies, then, under the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota, he may thereafter confer any power or authority that he desires upon that agency. I think if the gentleman will read the amendment, he will see it provides that the President may fix the power, authority, and duty.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Under section 407 there is an abdication and delegation of power to the President of the United States to legislate, and if section 407 becomes law it will be the first time in the history of the Congress that such power was ever given to any President of the United States.

Mr. JONES. It is in connection with section 407 that I raise the question. He is given the authority; and then, under the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota, the President may clothe that agency with any power he sees fit.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The amendment, in my judgment, does not give the President any authority which does not already exist.

Mr. JONES. Why did he offer it, then? He offered it under the powers of the President.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No. Under this bill he can take two similar agencies, whether they be in one department or whether in two separate departments, and group them together under one head. In other words, the work and functions of two separate agencies, two similar agencies, can be put together under one head.

Mr. JONES. And then he may clothe them with any power he sees fit, under the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Well, these are administrative bureaus, in any event.

Mr. JONES. They may even become statutory bureaus. After they have been changed they are changed. They may become statutory or at least legalized bureaus—legalized by inaction of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No, no. Under section 406 he can not change the function of a statutory bureau.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. STEVENSON. If he consolidates two agencies, he could confer any power that is conferred upon those agencies, and which those agencies enjoy, but he could not go outside and import new powers.

Mr. JONES. Well, he can, under the amendment. If not, then the amendment means nothing.

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not think so. It will be confined to the range of powers that those agents have.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman may be right were it not for the amendment just adopted, but it makes changes in the meaning of the existing provisions when read in connection with them.

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

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

CREATION AND ORGANIZATION

SEC. 501. There is hereby created at the seat of Government an establishment to be known as the Public Works Administration. There shall be at the head of such administration an officer to be known as the Administrator of Public Works, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall hold his office for the term of six years. Such administrator shall receive a salary of $10,000 per year, payable monthly, and under the direction of the President shall have the control and management of the various bureaus, agencies, activities, and services that the President may under this title transfer to and consolidate in the Public Works Administration.

CONSOLIDATION OF PUBLIC WORKS BY PRESIDENT

SEC. 502. (a) The President is authorized, by Executive order, to transfer to the Public Works Administration, and to consolidate and coordinate therein, the whole or any part of all bureaus, agencies, offices, activities, and services, whether now existing in any executive department, independent establishment, or as an independent activity, having to do or that are concerned with the architectural, engineering, surveying, designing, drafting, construction, and/or purchasing activities of the Government relating to public works, and/or that are engaged in the making of plans, specifications, contracts, and/or the supervision of public construction, and the transfer of any activity to the Public Works Administration shall carry with it such property, fixtures, records, and files as may be necessary to the proper functioning of such activity under the administrator, but no provision of this act shall be construed to authorize any transfer, consolidation, coordination, or change in the duties and responsibilities of the Chief of Engineers, or of the Corps of Engineers, or of the officers of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, with respect to rivers and harbors, navigation, flood control, and other civil functions and activities, all of which shall remain as now provided for by existing law.

(b) The Administrator of Public Works shall utilize the services of the Corps of Engineers, or the officers of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, whenever and wherever practicable in all other public works, construction, and activities. The Secretary of War, upon the request of the Administrator of Public Works, may continue, as under existing law, to detail officers of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army for duty in such other public works, construction, and activities, to the end that the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and the officers of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army may be used whenever practicable in such other public works, construction, and activities, and when so detailed with the consent of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers shall be under the supervision and direction of the Administrator of Public Works.

(c) The Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy Department shall remain as now provided by existing law, and no provision of this act shall be construed to authorize any transfer, consolidation, coordination, or change in the duties and responsibilities of the said bureau and the chief thereof, or the officers and engineers therein. The Secretary of the Navy, upon the request of the Administrator of Public Works, may detail officers and engineers of such bureau for other duties in such public works, construction, and activities; and the Administrator of Public Works shall utilize the services of such officers and engineers whenever practicable; and when so detailed with the consent of the Secretary of the Navy the said officers and engineers shall be under the supervision and direction of the Administrator of Public Works.

(d) All officers of the United States Army and/or Navy detailed as aforesaid to serve in the Public Works Administration shall retain their military and naval rank and succession and receive the compensation, commutation, and emoluments provided by law in the case of Army and/or naval officers of the same rank not detached from the regular service; and such payments shall be made out of funds appropriated for use of the Public Works Administration.

(e) All strictly military, naval, and national-defense construction, improvement, maintenance, and administration shall be and remain in the Army and Navy under the Secretary of War and under the Secretary of the Navy, as now provided by existing law.

(f) The provisions contained in this title shall not apply to the power and authority now vested in the Architect of the Capitol and the United States Supreme Court Building Commission.

(g) All authority, power, and duties now vested by law in the head of any executive department, independent establishment, or office in and over any bureau, agency, office, officers, or branch of the public service, or in respect of any function or service transferred to the Public Works Administration under this title, or in or over any contract or business arising therefrom or pertaining thereto, shall be vested in and exercised and performed by the administrator.

(h) All valid contracts and agreements entered into by any bureau, agency, office, officer, or branch of the public service, and in force at the time of transfer to the Public Works Administration, shall be assumed and carried out by the administrator.

(i) Under the direction of the President, the Administrator of Public Works shall have the power, by order or regulation, to con-

solidate, eliminate, or redistribute the functions of the bureaus, offices, agencies, activities, and services transferred, under the provisions of this title, to the Public Works Administration and to create new ones therein, and, by rules and regulations not inconsistent with law, shall fix the functions thereof and the duties and powers of their respective executive heads.

(j) No consolidation, elimination, redistribution, or coordination of the bureaus, offices, agencies, activities, or parts or functions thereof, as provided by this title, shall be effected, and no new ones shall be created under the authority of this title unless such action shall either in itself or in relation to the entire Public Works Administration be clearly productive of economy in public expenditures.

(k) Whenever any Executive order of the President or any order or regulation of the administrator is issued under this section, the President shall thereupon transmit to the Senate and House of Representatives a copy of such order or regulation, except that if the Congress is not in session at the time of such issuance, then the copy of the order or regulation shall be transmitted at the commencement of the next regular or special session of the Congress. Unless an act disapproving the order or regulation issued is enacted within 60 calendar days after the receipt of the copy of the order or regulation by both Houses, the order or regulation issued shall take effect on the day following the expiration of such 60-day period. If the session during which the copy of the order or regulation is received terminates in less than 60 days after the receipt of the copy by both Houses, an act disapproving the order or regulation may be enacted at any time within 60 calendar days after the commencement of the next regular or special session of Congress; but if such an act is not enacted, such order or regulation shall take effect on the day following the expiration of such 60-day period.

APPOINTMENT OF EMPLOYEES

SEC. 503. (a) The Administrator of Public Works may appoint, in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws, from time to time such assistants, architects, engineers, and experts in design and drafting as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

(b) The personnel on duty at the time of the transfer of any bureau, agency, office, activity, or service shall be transferred to and given appointment in the Public Works Administration, subject to such change in designation and organization and reduction in personnel, salary, classification, or otherwise, as the administrator may deem necessary.

(c) Such of the employees as have a civil-service status at the time of transfer shall retain that status. The salaries of such employees shall be fixed in accordance with the classification act of 1923, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, ch. 13; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 5, ch. 13).

EXISTING LAW AND REGULATIONS UNCHANGED

SEC. 504. (a) All laws relating to such bureaus, agencies, offices, activities, and services as are transferred to the Public Works Administration, so far as the same are applicable, shall remain in full force and effect, except as herein modified, and shall be administered by the administrator.

(b) All orders, rules, and regulations in effect with respect to any activity at the time it is transferred shall continue in force until modified, superseded, or repealed by the administrator.

(c) All unexpended appropriations in respect of any bureau, agency, office, activity, or service transferred to the Public Works Administration shall be as available for expenditure by the Public Works Administration as though said administration had been originally named in the law authorizing such appropriations.

SERVICES FOR OTHER DEPARTMENTS

SEC. 505. (a) Whenever any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency or activity of the Government shall be in need of any service or matter coming within the purview of the functions of the Public Works Administration, such department, establishment, agency, or activity shall make appropriate request in writing to the Administrator of Public Works, who shall forthwith place his administration at the service of the department, establishment, agency, or activity making the request.

(b) All estimates for public work and construction coming within the purview of the Public Works Administration at the time such estimates are made shall be made by the administrator and all appropriations for public work and construction shall be made directly to the administration: *Provided*, That said administrator shall make a book charge against the executive department, independent establishment, or agency of the Government covering the cost of any services, public work, or construction performed for such department, establishment, or agency. The amount thereof shall be reported promptly to the department, establishment, or agency for whom services, public work, or construction has been done, and such department, establishment, or agency shall enter the cost of such services, public work, or construction upon its books and the amount of such cost shall be treated as a part of its expenditures in making its annual report to the President and/or the Congress.

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 506. (a) Quarters for the Public Works Administration shall be provided by the Public Buildings Commission.

(b) It shall be the duty of the administrator to standardize designs, plans, and specifications, so far as practicable and desirable, with a view to effecting the utmost economy consistent with suitable construction.

(c) The administrator, at the close of each fiscal year, shall make a report in writing to the Congress, which shall be printed. Such report (1) shall give an account of all moneys received and disbursed by him and the administration, and shall state for what purpose and on whose account expenditures have been made; (2) shall describe in detail what has been done under section 502 of this title, and shall insert a chart showing the set-up of his administration; and (3) shall make such recommendations with respect to legislation and other matters as to him shall seem appropriate.

(d) The Administrator of Public Works is authorized to make such rules and regulations, in accordance with law, as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this title into full force and effect.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, against all of Title V, which seeks to create an entirely new department of government; that it exceeds the authority that was given the Committee on Economy; that the Committee on Economy had no authority whatever to propose to create such a new administration of government.

I want to call attention to the fact that if this Title V is passed in this bill it will be organic law that will authorize whatever personnel that may be required, new personnel. That may be 2,500 new employees, or 5,000 or 10,000 extra employees, and at whatever salary the administration sees fit to grant them, because there is no limitation whatever in this committee proposal. We are for abolishing bureaus and are not for creating new ones.

I call attention to the fact that this proposal to create an entirely new Administration of Public Works is different entirely from the title which seeks to consolidate departments. For instance, the title which consolidates the War Department and the Navy Department shows on its face that it effects an economy. It consolidates two departments. This effects economy on its face, and is clearly within the purview and authority of the Committee on Economy. I am heartily in favor of that proposal, for it will save $100,000,000 a year, but this is a proposition that undoubtedly will cost the taxpayers of this Nation much money. This provision of the bill does not abolish all of the bureaus that are supposed to be taken over by this Administration of Public Works. It leaves many of them still functioning, and this will be a duplication of effort and of expense and an increase in high-salaried employees, something that we have been trying to stop.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Just what is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. That this provision exceeds the authority that this House gave the Economy Committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has the gentleman read the rule under which this amendment is offered?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; of course; but I do not remember its exact provisions. And I have read the resolution that authorized the creation of the Economy Committee, which is the fundamental law under which the committee acts, and that did not authorize the creation of any new bureaus.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That was not the question that I asked the gentleman. Being somewhat familiar with the rule, I will state to the gentleman that the rule under which we are operating specifically gives to this committee the authority to offer this amendment despite any of the regular rules of the House with reference to germaneness. What has the gentleman got to say to that?

Mr. BLANTON. I believe that is a sockdolager. I had overlooked that, so I withdraw the point of order. But we ought not to permit the creation of this new department of Government, and we ought to vote it out of the bill when we reach the proper stage to do that.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONNERY: On page 35, line 23, after the word "practicable," insert "to assist in an advisory or supervisory capacity."

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of most of the provisions contained in this bill with reference to the Public Works Administration. My sole purpose in offering this amendment is to safeguard labor. The language in the bill at this point reads:

The Administrator of Public Works shall utilize the services of the Corps of Engineers or the officers of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army whenever and wherever practicable in all other public works, construction, and activities.

Under this language it might be possible to delegate the Corps of Army Engineers to build a post office in your home town and thus put labor out of work.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course, I need not tell the gentleman I am in sympathy with his amendment, but I would suggest that we had better strike out all of section (b).

Mr. CONNERY. I am willing to have the Army engineers work in an advisory capacity.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But what happens to our architects and our engineers? That is their profession, they are organized, and they cooperate with labor and labor gets a squarer deal from them than they do from these Army or Navy engineers.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman is correct. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by moving to strike out all of paragraph (b) beginning in line 20, page 35, and running to line 11 on page 36.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CONNERY. I have brought my idea before the committee. I do not want the Government to come into competition with private contractors or private architects. Especially I do not want the Government to come in competition with our workers. I am particularly interested in the workers and that was the main purpose for offering my amendment. There is a provision in this bill which takes care of flood control and dredging through the Army engineers. We are not interfering with that, but I do not want Army engineers to erect buildings that would be erected by private architects, laborers, and mechanics.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. At the present time they let outside contracts 25 per cent above the Army engineers. They do that now, and you have your own architects here who are building the post offices for the Government.

Mr. CONNERY. I understand that, and the gentleman can see what I am after.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I understand what the gentleman is attempting to do.

Mr. CONNERY. It is to prevent these Army engineers and Navy engineers from coming into competition with private engineers and architects, especially labor.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I think the gentleman is laboring under a misapprehension as to the number of Army engineers engaged in civilian work. There are only 137 engaged in rivers and harbors work, while there are over 1,000 civilian engineers employed all the time. The number of Army engineers now engaged is very small.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then, why the necessity for this section?

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. I want to call the gentleman's attention to lines 16 to 25, on page 36. There the same provision is made for the Navy.

Mr. CONNERY. I understand, and I had in mind offering an amendment covering the language on that page also. Mr. Chairman, my sole idea is to protect labor. I offer this amendment at the request of the members of the American Federation of Labor, and I hope the committee will adopt it.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. What is the phrase the gentleman uses?

Mr. CONNERY. "To assist in an advisory and supervisory capacity."

Mr. ARENTZ. The gentleman wants to prevent the use of enlisted men in construction work?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; in the construction of post-office buildings, and buildings of that kind.

Mr. ARENTZ. Then why does not the gentleman specifically provide for that?

Mr. CONNERY. That is what my amendment provides. I want to prevent the use of enlisted men in the construction of post-office buildings, because we must remember enlisted men were used in the construction of barracks. That is my idea.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts is unduly alarmed.

Mr. CONNERY. I hope I am; but I would like to make sure that labor is protected in this provision.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I shall try to make clear, if I can, just exactly what subsection (b) does. The rivers and harbors work is excluded entirely from this bill. The only purpose of subsection (b) is to permit, at the request of the administrator of public works, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy to detail such engineers of the Army and of the Navy as the administrator of public works desires for his purposes in doing a certain kind of construction. The committee thought that in some cases it might be desirable to use these Army engineers in the construction of dams and possibly in the construction of roads, which are going into the Public Works Administration in all probability. If the administrator desires to use Army engineers in that capacity he can request the Secretary of War to detail those engineers to the Public Works Administrator. While so detailed they are under the Administrator of Public Works, but subject to recall by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy at any time.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Is this language as to public works identical with the public works bill reported by the almost unanimous vote of the Expenditures Committee?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I do not think there is any change in the bill whatever. I think the gentleman will find it identical with the bill which the committee reported out.

Mr. SCHAFER. We ought to be positive that it is the same if we are going to take any responsibility for voting in favor of the provision because our committee reported it out.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. It is identically the same bill as the one reported by the Committee on Expenditures.

Mr. SCHAFER. And the perfecting amendments put in the bill in executive sessions of the Expenditures Committee are in this public-works section of this bill?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Absolutely.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. They are all in Title V of the economy bill which we are now considering.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With respect to the observations of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY], is it not true that neither this subparagraph nor the next has anything at all to do with the actual construction work; that is done by contract, and this provision will not interfere with such construction?

Mr. CONNERY. It can do it under the language here.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. All public buildings are let to contract, and after they are let to contract the contractors furnish the usual service of architects and everything else connected with actual construction. That is not interfered

with. With the smaller buildings, such as post offices, the plans and specifications are made in the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury and construction let out to bids.

Mr. CONNERY. Under this language they will not be compelled to let it out to contract. They can do it, if they wish, with Army engineers.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Of course, and in the Bureau of Reclamation, for instance, the Government now does a large part of its own construction in certain cases. If they desire they could call in Army engineers to aid them in such construction work, but there is nothing in the bill that indicates or proposes, much less requires, the Government to do its own construction.

Mr. CONNERY. But the language refers to the Corps of Engineers. I am not worrying about the officers, I am thinking of the men in the corps. If you put in the words "in a supervisory capacity" then you confine it to the officers.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I have no particular objection to that, but, of course, the officers of the Corps of Engineers are the only ones who can be detailed for work in the public-works administration as the language stands.

Mr. THATCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes.

Mr. THATCHER. The first part of this provision is mandatory and not permissive.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes; and from my standpoint is objectionable. I think the word should be "may" in place of "shall" in line 20, on page 35.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONNERY) there were—ayes 23, noes 50.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this title do now close.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McDUFFIE: On page 35, line 12, strike out the word "act" and insert in lieu thereof the word "title," and on page 36, line 13, strike out the word "act" and insert in lieu thereof the word "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREEN: On page 39, beginning in line 19, after the word "works," strike out the remainder of page 19 and all down to and including line 9, on page 40, and insert:

"Is hereby authorized and directed to employ by contract, and at the established rates of compensation, outside professional or technical service of competent persons, firms, or corporations, for the architectural and engineering designing and planning of such Federal buildings as are now or may in the future be placed under the jurisdiction of his department, without reference to the classification act of 1923, as amended, or to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

"That such employment shall be based at all times on the highest grounds of proven professional ability in order that our Federal architecture may truly represent our national genius and keep pace with the rapid development of the arts of architecture and engineering. Architects or engineers shall not be employed without prior submission to the Secretary of the Treasury of satisfactory evidence of their qualifications and experience.

"That wherever circumstances warrant, such services shall be contracted for by the employment of the ablest architects and engineers resident in the general sections of the country wherein such Federal buildings are to be erected.

"At the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, the employment of outside architects or engineers may be omitted in connection with public buildings of a total cost for building and site of not more than $50,000.

"That all such individuals, firms, or corporations shall render their services subject to the approval and under the direction of the Administrator of Public Works, whose duty it shall be to act for the Government in all matters regarding sites, the allotment and subdivision of space, the control of technical detail, the letting of contracts, and the supervision of the erection of said Federal buildings"—

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. Instead of effecting economy the amendment would increase the cost of government.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WOODRUM). Does the gentleman from Florida desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, the bill provides for the creation of a Department of Public Works, and this amendment to that provision of the bill provides that they are to have local architects and local engineers do the public work for the Government in Federal construction, rather than to let the bureaus do it. It is absolutely germane, because it qualifies the employment of those who will perform the work for the bureau or the new Department of Public Works. It is clearly in order. There is one place where the amendment reads "Secretary of the Treasury," when it should read "Administrator of Public Works." I shall offer that amendment to the amendment, which, of course, would be a perfecting amendment.

It is clearly in order, Mr. Chairman, because it is the same subject, it is the same purpose, but provides the manner in which the purpose of the bill shall be carried out. It provides for local engineers and local architects to be employed and directs that the Public Works Administrator shall employ them instead of continuing the bureaucracy that is now going on in this branch of the Government.

Mr. SWING. As I understand it, the gentleman is merely offering his bill which has heretofore been introduced.

Mr. GREEN. Yes. The bill that has been considered by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and indorsed by the architects' organization or institute. It is clearly in order and should be adopted.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. What action was taken in the committee on the bill?

Mr. GREEN. The committee has held hearings and it has been referred to the Committee on Economy. It has not been acted upon by the committee—it is under consideration. It is indorsed by the profession, and I think is in order on this bill. Its adoption will bring about further economies in Federal construction, and will, I believe, bring better and more satisfactory Federal construction.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill creates a Public Works Administration, and was first reported by the Committee on Expenditures of the House, and, at the request of that committee, was included by the Committee on Economy in the omnibus bill.

The Committee on Expenditures deals with reorganization problems with a view to economy, very much as the Economy Committee. But the Committee on Expenditures has no jurisdiction to change existing law, except so far as is necessary to effectuate the consolidation or reorganization contemplated. The amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] contains legislation of substantive law that has nothing to do with reorganization. It provides that public work shall be let out by contract to private parties. The proposed amendment goes beyond the jurisdiction of the Expenditures Committee and also of the Economy Committee. In place of dealing with reorganization and consolidation, it provides a method for handling public construction and completely changes existing law.

I want to call attention to another point which makes it objectionable from the standpoint of germaneness. That is that it would result in unduly increasing the expense of Government contracts. You would be compelled to employ outside local architects, when we have architects in the Treasury Department.

It is well known that in all cases where private architects are used the expense is from two to three times as great as it is when the architects or engineers in the Government service are used. Clearly no economies appear on the face of the amendment, and unless economies would result it is not germane. It seems to me that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that the proposed amendment strikes out subsection (b) in section 503, and subsection (c), which makes provision for the transfer of

employees and bureaus which would be coordinated, and thereby let them out and increase the expense?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. That is true; and it substitutes in their places people outside of the civil service entirely.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the economy argument I want to say that it was developed in the hearing before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds upon this subject that this bill if put into effect would result in economy over the existing practices, because in obtaining local architects and local engineers, the employment of skilled ones only would be had and would result in economy.

It was developed in the hearings that frequently architects and engineers from a distance were employed to carry out work in other cities, and in that case the economies would not be effected, but involve great expenditure. Also the bureaus often have, I believe, more employees than are necessary. By letting local architects and engineers do the work each project would be separately carried out, and, of course, would be paid for individually, thus causing a saving over the annual employment plan now had by the departments.

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

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The amendment to be germane would have to show on its face that it effects economies, and the gentleman will admit that it does nothing of the sort.

Mr. GREEN. I do not admit that, because it does effect economies. Within six weeks after this plan is put into effect there will be great economies in the Department of Public Works.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I regret to differ with the gentleman from Florida upon the matter of economy. It is my privilege to be a member of the same committee which considered this bill, to which the gentleman from Florida refers, for two weeks. On the contrary, it showed definitely and positively that economy would not be effected.

Mr. GREEN. Did not all of the architects and engineers appearing before the committee contend that economies would be effected?

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Yes; but to the contrary the Government officials contended there would be no economy.

Mr. GREEN. Oh, certainly; the Architect of the Treasury and his bureau employees said that economies would not be effected. The passage of the legislation would have abolished their positions and salaries, but the architects and engineers, not so fortunate as to be on the Federal pay roll, were unanimious in their contention that the legislation would bring about economy in Federal building.

It will bring about the ultimate use of local building material and local labor, and that is what we want and what the country needs. It will decentralize an existing Federal bureau and effect economy. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. This title in the bill, Title V, deals with public-works administration, and the particular section to which the amendment is directed undertakes to set out a specific and definite method for the employment and use of existing governmental personnel in the interest of economy. The gentleman's amendment undertakes to set out an entirely different method. Any method which calls for the employment of outside personnel, however desirable it might be, how much it might appeal to us as an employment measure, the Chair is constrained to think is not germane to the section to which it is offered, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. McDUFFIE. 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. WARREN, 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. 11267, the legislative appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein an address delivered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by Hon. MARY T. NORTON during Lucky Strike hour, National Broadcasting Co., station WRC, April 28, 1932:

ADDRESS OF HON. MARY T. NORTON, OF NEW JERSEY

I consider it an honor to address this vast unseen audience and desire to express appreciation to the sponsors of the Lucky Strike hour for affording me this privilege.

Congress has recently been working on a problem called "Balancing the Budget." This problem is very interesting to most of us who were members of the preceding Congress, when, under Republican leadership, nobody seemed especially interested in balancing anything—least of all the Budget. Appropriations were supported for every type of unnecessary expenditure from a $75,000 post office in a little town of a few thousand inhabitants to paying huge sums of money to certain wealthy individuals and corporations as rebates on taxes.

Now, suddenly, upon the Democrats assuming control of the House, we are told the Budget must be balanced. Nobody seems able to answer the question why it is so important to do this unpleasant task now in this most depressing of all depression years, when nobody seems able to balance their own Budget; but the fact is everybody around Capitol Hill seems to have become "Budget conscious" to so great an extent that it is now an epidemic.

I believe in balancing my own Budget so far as I can. Therefore, I am naturally in favor of doing the same thing for Uncle Sam—but there are certain lengths to which I would not go. One is to deprive a faithful employee, who has served me in the good years, the necessities of life, because of my lack of wisdom in not providing for the "rainy day" that always follows the day of sunshine. Only the most abject poverty could justify my doing so, and surely no real American believes that the Treasury of the United States can not sustain its obligations and provide decently for those faithful employees who, when prosperity and large salaries were the subjects discussed everywhere, stood four-square for their country by refusing to be stampeded into leaving their posts to go into industry.

During and subsequent to the war Federal employees did not receive a living wage. Not until 1923 were they granted any real increase. During all this time private industry not only increased salaries greatly but paid bonuses in stock and otherwise. It is true that industry has now decreased salaries, but the salaries now paid are greater than are those paid by the Government for the same type of work.

There is so much misinformation regarding Government salaries that I shall endeavor to present to my audience the true story. As a matter of fact, the average pay of all employees is about $1,440 per year. This is divided as follows: 17 per cent receive less than $1,000; 37 per cent less than $1,500; 57 per cent less than $2,000; 84.6 per cent less than $2,500; and 95 per cent less than $3,000 per year. There are a few $10,000 positions and a relatively small number from five to ten thousand.

From these figures you can readily understand that a straight cut of 11 per cent applied to all Government employees would save only about 5½ per cent of the national deficit.

This economy bill is now before the House. At last night's session, while failing in our efforts to defeat the proposed wage cut, we were successful in raising the exemption from $1,000 salaries to $2,500 salaries—taking care of the "little fellow." However, if a teller vote could be recorded, many of those who voted for the decrease would not have dared to do so.

Aside from the small amount of money this may bring to the Treasury, the loss in morale can not be estimated.

The President's plan for enforced furloughs in the Government service, which was defeated to-day in the House, certainly could not provide additional funds. If this were carried through, it would have meant the employment of from 25,000 to 30,000 additional people to substitute for regular employees. How on earth could this be considered economy? It would only cause confusion and inefficiency.

What we require to-day more than anything else is courage and confidence, and surely it does not take any amount of intelligence to understand that both will be destroyed by threatening the country with a general wage reduction. When people lose their courage, they lose their greatest asset; only God can help them then.

While on this subject of wage reduction, it may be well to call your attention to the fact that the pay roll of the recently appointed Reconstruction Finance Corporation—and, of course, this bureau is not under civil service, merely patronage appointments in the hands of the Republican administration—amounts to $500,000 a year, with Utah leading in the number

of special considerations. Not much economy there! I might mention, too, that these salaries will not be interfered with in the event that the real employees of the Government suffer a decrease.

What a stupid method of bringing back prosperity. Curtailing the buying power of about 900,000 people. So much for that kind of economy.

Now let me say a word about the tax bill, which everybody seems to resent and we Democrats were obliged to pass in the House because of the reckless extravagance of 12 years of Republican rule or rather misrule.

We can not escape the conviction that conditions during the past two years have been such as would destroy the courage of even an extreme optimist; and we regret that the House has been obliged to pass a tax bill in order to keep our country solvent.

Those of us who voted for this bill were impelled to do so not only by the urgent necessity for such legislation but because we placed the welfare of the country above every other consideration. In doing so we did not believe that we would be called upon to tax our fellow countrymen to the limit and then vote a decrease in wages.

A much easier and less painful method of taxation was and is available, one that would undoubtedly have been acclaimed by the Nation as a whole. I refer to the bill which would alter the odious Volstead law, so as to permit the working people of this country to enjoy a harmless glass of beer and would at the same time bring millions of dollars to our Treasury in taxes.

May I say that the so-called bear raids we have been reading so much about in the press are peaceful Sunday-school picnics in comparison to raids that have been made upon our Treasury Department in the name of the ignoble experiment that has been misnamed prohibition. The law itself, thrust down the throats of a war-occupied electorate by an unholy alliance of reform racketeers and misguided impractical zealots, has done everything but prohibit. It has transformed a law-abiding citizenry to one that either scoffs at all law or regards violations thereof with indifference. It has dragged our once revered Federal courts from the pedestal of dignified tribunals of justice, respected and feared by the lawless, to the status of police courts. It has brought us the murderous gangster, the kidnapper, the extortionist, and the bootlegger. Its harvest has been one of constant seemingly never-ending evils. And its cost—not reckoned in moral liabilities—has been staggering.

My purpose in addressing you to-night is to beg you to think. The greatest trouble in our country to-day is that we have lost the art of thinking straight; of asking why; of placing responsibility where it belongs. In my opinion, the responsibility for the tax bill; the responsibility for being obliged to balance the Budget is clearly up to the Republican Party. That party holding the reins of Government during 12 years, the greater number of which witnessed our greatest prosperity; the party that spent nearly $62,000,000 a year to stimulate foreign trade with the net result that our foreign trade is exactly in the same position it was in 1914. What can justify this enormous expense to the taxpayer? What has become of the stimulation?

Sound foreign trade policies are essential to the economic welfare of every nation, but the maintenance of a bureau that has become a "white elephant" should cease, even though that bureau is the "fair-haired child" of President Hoover. The child has cost Mr. Average American too much money—and the building that cost our Government nearly $18,000,000 can not be justified when the employees in that building are now to be penalized because of this unnecessary extravagance.

The Democratic leadership in the House has a bare majority. It is trying to find a way out to serve the people of a distressed country. It has been obliged to put through legislation to help a bad economic condition. It has many handicaps because of the load of Republican debts which must be met, but it is not discouraged.

We appeal to the citizens of our beloved country to trust us, and we shall promise to find a way out of this endless misery. We want your confidence, your cooperation, and we ask you to elect a Congress this year that will give us a clear working majority and a President who will know how to lead.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of vocational education and to present a brief analysis of its uses by the State superintendent of public instruction of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, as my colloquy with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] indicates, I am opposed to section 303 which, beginning in 1934, reduces the Federal contribution for the development of vocational education under the several acts of Congress, and shall vote for the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to eliminate the section, which will have the effect of continuing the appropriations by the Federal Government for vocational education.

This is one of the most important contributions which the Federal Government makes in aid of the several States.

The most complete and careful analysis I have seen of the benefits of these appropriations is contained in a letter which I received from the State superintendent of public instructions of Oklahoma which, with the permission of the House, I attach hereto.

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Oklahoma City, April 16, 1932.

Hon. W. W. HASTINGS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HASTINGS: The President and the House Economy Committee propose to suspend payment to the States for one year, under the terms of the Smith-Hughes and George-Reed Acts, for vocational education in agriculture, trades and industries, and home economics. Doubtless, you have been deluged with letters and telegrams protesting this move.

Do not confuse civilian rehabilitation, county agents, home demonstration agents, and 4-H club work with vocational education as provided under the Smith-Hughes and George-Reed Acts, These services are not affected by the proposal mentioned.

For the past 15 years the State of Oklahoma has made appropriations in good faith, expecting a permanent allotment annually from the funds created by these acts. The State appropriations are made on a cooperative basis; therefore the withdrawal of Federal funds for one year would destroy the program in this State.

The withdrawal of the Federal allotment to this State would mean—

In vocational agriculture—

(1) Depriving 5,000 adult farmers from receiving organized instruction in problems which confront them locally, including living-at-home readjustment.

(2) Depriving 4,000 farm boys from continuing their training in vocational agriculture, through whose efforts 68,000 acres of home farms were terraced.

(3) One hundred and thirty specially trained teachers of agriculture will be thrown into unemployment in this State.

(4) Would destroy 15 years of effort in developing an efficient training program for future farmers.

(5) Would deprive 130 local communities in this State of funds necessary to provide a systematic and efficient training program.

In vocational trades and industries:

(1) Would destroy educational opportunity for 4,906 boys and girls who are now going to school half time and working half time. They would be out of school entirely.

(2) Would destroy educational opportunity for 3,107 men in training supplemental to their daily employment.

(3) Would destroy educational opportunity for 200 boys who are now taking trade preparatory training.

(4) Would deprive 22 industrial centers of this State from funds necessary to carry on a training program of trade and industrial education.

(5) Would destroy 15 years of earnest effort in building an efficient program of industrial training for those engaged in industry.

In vocational home economics:

(1) Would deprive more than 30,000 home makers from receiving vital instruction in problems relating to the home.

(3) Would handicap the follow-up of the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection in placing its findings and recommendations in every home in the Nation.

(3) Would remove one of the strongest forces for building up the home, which strikes at the foundation of society.

Should vocational education be suspended for one year, as outlined by McDUFFIE's committee, it would make impossible the reviving of vocational education in Oklahoma for many years to come. We realize full well that Congress must retrench, and the vocational program is willing to take its share of the retrenchment; but to suspend operation of the vocational program as provided by the Smith-Hughes and George-Reed Acts would be ruinous to the program we have developed through 15 years of cooperative effort.

We earnestly solicit your assistance and careful consideration of the interest of the farm people, home makers, and industrial workers of Oklahoma.

Very truly yours,

JOHN VAUGHAN,
State Superintendent.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—OUR 4-H CLUBS AND EXTENSION WORK

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, the most prized and valued asset of our great Nation is its youth. Great are the problems confronting this Nation. The solution of these problems is largely to be placed at the door of the present generation of our young people. They need a thorough training in order to meet these responsibilities.

The 4-H clubs of this Nation provide a splendid training, not only in good citizenship but in the practical duties

of life about the farm and about the home. Anyone who has had the privilege to attend the meetings of 4-H clubs as I have, and have seen the exhibits of the varied experiences these boys and girls are getting, could not but be impressed by the fact that here is something of real and tangible value that is being given the boys and girls of this country through agricultural extension. Frankly, I do not know of any other activity of the Department of Agriculture that gives so much direct benefit to the people of this country as this type of extension service. I venture to state that if you were to give to the farm homes of this country the right to choose which of the activities of the Department of Agriculture should be cut out, this activity would be one of the last voted out.

This is an emergency economy measure that we are considering. I am strongly in favor of taking full steps to bring about this much-needed economy. I have voted to reduce my own salary and will vote for the major portions of this and other bills to reduce and deflate Government expenses. I firmly believe that from this depression, as tragic as it is, will come a great good to this country in the form of a universal demand to reduce taxes, Federal, State, and local. I realize that the big portion of the taxes paid by the farmers of this country, as well as by the small home owner in the city, is paid to support local, county, and city government. Yet we can set a good example by cutting our own expenses as well.

However, I see no reason why in the name of economy we should here to-day take hurried action to begin in 1934 to discontinue over a period of 10 years this form of extension work that is to-day giving benefit to almost every farm home in America. If this work should be discontinued, we should at least have full consideration of the matter in the regular manner before the Committee on Agriculture. There is plenty of time before 1934 to do this.

Therefore, I urge you, my colleagues, to strike this section from this bill. If I have not convinced you of the value of this extension work, at least vote to strike this from this bill so that it can be brought before us in the regular way, and fair consideration given the whole matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—THE ECONOMY BILL

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of every economy that can possibly be effected, but the section of this bill which proposes the elimination of all appropriations for vocational education is not economy but destructive parsimony. I am especially sorry that the President has seen fit to urge that this be done.

The generation of which you and I are a part, as well as that of our sons and daughters, has already suffered needlessly from this panic to an extent bordering closely upon the limits of human endurance. By this measure we are now proposing to further penalize the coming generation by taking from the children of the farmer the one thing which will enable them to compete in a life so complex that many have come to despair of a continued existence.

This proposed economy does not come from any desire to save the farmer a single penny, and those of you who go back to your farmer constituents and tell them of your wonderful record in saving him from burdensome taxes ought also to tell him that for every hundred million dollars that you have saved it will save him personally exactly 15 cents. It is not a trade that is likely to impress the farmer.

When it becomes necessary to chisel and pinch the pennies for children's education in order to balance the Budget, those from whom you are taking the pennies ought also to be told why it is necessary. Nearly twice the amount that it is proposed to save by this entire measure will, before the end of the present fiscal year, be taken from the Treasury in the form of loans to industry.

I have no facts to deny that it is necessary to provide this money to industry, neither am I in possession of any facts which assure me that it was necessary to supply it. We are told behind closed doors that unless we supplied $2,000,000,000 to banks and industry the whole country would collapse. It appears that now that the interests demanding these $2,000,000,000 have secured what they want, that all of the advantages which government has afforded the poor man must collapse, anyway. We have denied food to the hungry, and it now appears that we shall deny an opportunity to children for education that they may better fit themselves for the burdens which shall come to them in the form of a national debt a large part of which is now being created because we refuse to put the burden where it belongs.

The blame for an ill-conceived economy measure should not be placed upon the members of the Economy Committee, who have worked so arduously in bringing in this bill. They have done the best they could, no doubt, in the limited time which they had.

The whole program is an effort to patch up the deficiencies of the present administration. On July 1, 1931, our deficiency amounted to approximately $1,000,000,000. Only the Congress has the power to remedy such a situation, either by effecting economies or increasing taxation, or both. Why, then, with a billion-dollar deficit facing us nearly a year ago, did the President not call the Congress into session so that sufficient time might be had to effect real economies? Why are we compelled to consummate in eight weeks a program which the President by his refusal to call Congress into session refused to consider important.

If the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is a good institution, and I grant that it is, why were we not permitted to legislate such a corporation into existence a year ago? We certainly could have saved thousands of banks that have failed since that time because no such agency existed.

Why were we not permitted to free credit as provided for in the Steagall-Glass bill a year ago? If it is good now, it would have been better then. Why is every measure that we have been forced to enact an emergency measure? There can be no other answer than that "these measures are emergency measures because the time for well-considered legislation has expired, so we must act quickly; it is an emergency."

It is now proposed that an emergency exists so grave that it is necessary to take the one means which many of our children have for an education away from them. It took years of fighting to secure national appropriations for vocational training. Are we to throw it away because a President who had ample time to act in the interests of true economy deliberately threw away his opportunity and then comes to us at the last minute with a plea not for economy but for destructive parsimony?

I am not going to vote to deny the children of this country an education to save the very rich people of this country from paying increased income taxes, for the great proportion of our Federal income is from the income taxes of the corporations and the rich individuals. That is where it ought to come from. The farmers and laborers do not pay it and ought not to. I am for protecting the poor and the helpless.

ENSIGNS IN THE LINE OF THE NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill H. R. 8083 providing for the appointment as ensigns in the line of the Navy of all midshipmen who graduate from the Naval Academy in 1932, for printing under the rule.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. BANKHEAD, by direction of the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution for printing under the rule:

House Resolution 205

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 11051, a bill to provide for the leasing and other utilization of the Muscle Shoals properties in the interest of national defense and of agriculture, and for other purposes. 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 Military Affairs, 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

bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, when does the gentleman intend to bring the rule up?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I can only state to the gentleman what the tentative arrangement is with reference to that. If I am wrong in the statement I trust the majority leader or the Speaker will correct. My understanding is—and that is the understanding of those who are very anxious for the consideration of this bill—that the rule for its consideration will be offered at the conclusion of the pending bill.

Mr. SNELL. Is the gentleman going to put that in ahead of the other appropriation bills, when we are in a hurry to get through with the session?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think that is the program.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it the intention of the leaders of the House to have this rule considered on Monday and displace the Consent Calendar?

Mr. RAINEY. We will not displace that calendar.

The SPEAKER. The rule provides for the Consent Calendar on Monday next, and no one can change that rule.

Mr. STAFFORD. Many members of the Committee on Military Affairs who are opposed to the bill are interested to know when the rule will be brought up for consideration.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. Does the rule provide that the two hours' debate shall be confined to the bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the earliest time at which the rule would be brought up would be Tuesday next?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House now stand in recess until 7.30 o'clock p. m.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. There has been some suggestion that we might perhaps agree to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow and avoid an evening session to-night.

Mr. McDUFFIE. If that is the wish of the House, I shall be very glad to comply with it.

Mr. SNELL. We have been driven very hard this week and men's nerves are pretty well on edge. I think you will accomplish more if you will adjourn the House now and meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow than if you attempt to run through until 10 or 11 o'clock to-night.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

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

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

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

S. 4401. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6662. An act to amend the tariff act of 1930, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3270. An act for the relief of Daniel S. Schaffer Co. (Inc.).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order previously made, the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, April 30, 1932, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, April 30, 1932, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON LABOR

(10 a. m.)

To provide farming opportunities for certain destitute and unemployed persons (H. R. 11055 and H. R. 11056).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. EVANS of Montana: Committee on the Public Lands. H. J. Res. 341. A joint resolution providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States and Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 1153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BANKHEAD: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 205. A resolution for the consideration of H. R. 11051, a bill to provide for the leasing and other utilization of the Muscle Shoals properties, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1169). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5770. A bill for the relief of George Tatum; with amendment (Rept. No. 1154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PARKER of Georgia: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1825. A bill for the relief of William M. Stoddard; with amendment (Rept. No. 1155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2445. A bill for the relief of Clarence R. Killion; with amendment (Rept. No. 1156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MONTET: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6461. A bill for the relief of Frank D. Whitfield; with amendment (Rept. No. 1157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MONTET: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9175. A bill for the relief of Clifton C. Cox; with amendment (Rept. No. 1158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCHAFER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 589. A bill for the relief of Ernest Linwood Stewart; with amendment (Rept. No. 1159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1567. A bill to reimburse Dominic Fracapane for injuries sustained in an accident with a Government-owned motor truck; without amendment (Rept. No. 1160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BACON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4040. A bill for the relief of Horace G. Knowles; without amendment (Rept. No. 1161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4067. A bill for the relief of John Pitkanen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1162). Refered to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCHAFER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7040. A bill for the relief of Sadie Bermi; with amendment (Rept. No. 1163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7761. A bill for the relief of M. J. Lobert; with amendment (Rept. No. 1164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9435. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Fain; without amendment (Rept. No. 1165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCHAFER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10113. A bill authorizing adjustment of the claim of Joseph E. Bourrie Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10170. A bill authorizing adjustment of the claim of Joseph T. Ryerson & Son (Inc.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 11717) providing for the transfer of the duties authorized and authority conferred by law upon the board of road commissioners in the Territory of Alaska to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11718) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate foreign commerce by prohibiting the admission into the United States of certain adulterated grain and seeds unfit for seeding purposes," approved August 24, 1912, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11719) for the relief of William Givens; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 11720) granting an increase of pension to Florence M. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11721) providing for a survey of the port of entrance of Tillamook Bay in Oregon; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MAY: A bill (H. R. 11722) granting a pension to Emaline Gambrel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 11723) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLK: A bill (H. R. 11724) granting a pension to Joseph M. Harr; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 11725) to authorize the presentation of the medal of honor to Dr. Samuel G. Boyce; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHANNON: A bill (H. R. 11726) for the relief of Helen Marie Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11727) granting a pension to David Huffman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TURPIN: A bill (H. R. 11728) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Deiter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YON: A bill (H. R. 11729) granting a pension to John Rance; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11730) granting a pension to Martha Kimmy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH of California: Resolution (H. Res. 207) to pay Helen Glynn, daughter of Theresa C. Glynn, six months' compensation and an additional amount not to exceed $250 to defray funeral expenses of the said Theresa C. Glynn; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7235. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Royalton Township Taxpayers Association, of Niagara County, N. Y., urging reduction of Federal expenditures; to the Committee on Economy.

7236. By Mr. BRUNNER: Resolution of Colfax Gardens Civic Association, approving H. R. 316, known as the Huddleston bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7237. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of 189 citizens of Rhode Island, protesting against reduction of Federal salaries; to the Committee on Economy.

7238. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the aeries of southwestern Washington, Fraternal Order of Eagles, approving and acclaiming a plan of home ownership and the creation of Federal home-loan banks under the supervision of the United States Government, to provide funds for home building on suburban tracts for the little fellow, or refinancing city homes, and the rate of interest on these loans shall not be more than 4½ per cent per annum; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7239. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the officers and men of engine company No. 2 of the city of Yonkers, N. Y., protesting against any curtailment of privileges and reduction of salaries of Federal employees; to the Committee on Economy.

7240. Also, petition of the Fleet Reserve Association, Branch No. 26, New York City, J. H. Van Slycke, secretary, urging the complete payment in cash of the soldiers' bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7241. By Mr. GRANFIELD: Petition of citizens of Springfield, Mass., urging the immediate payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7242. By Mr. HALL of North Dakota: Resolution of the Commercial Club of Wahpeton, N. Dak., protesting against a discontinuance of the appropriations for vocational education; to the Committee on Education.

7243. By Mr. JAMES: Telegram from L. C. Broyell, Alice Olson, Dorothy O'Brien, Art Uren, Daniel P. Monahan, Lawrence Hartley, Hilding Swanson, and Albert Christianson, opposing pay cuts as embodied in Economy Committee's pay cut bill; to the Committee on Economy.

7244. Also, telegram from Richard M. Jopling Post, No. 44, Marquette, Mich., through George A. Hager, adjutant, opposing any reduction of benefits for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7245. Also, telegram from Lodge No. 782, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Houghton, Mich., through P. Stinmetz, secretary, opposing any form of sales tax that will impose further burden upon workers of our country, and also opposing reduction of salaries of Government employees; to the Committee on Economy.

7246. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of Order of Railway Conductors of America, Division No. 563, Willmar, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 9891; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7247. Also, petition of Post No. 59 of the American Legion, Montevideo, Minn., protesting against any reduction in compensation or hospitalization benefits for disabled service men; to the Committee on Economy.

7248. Also, petition of Minneapolis Typographical Union, No. 42, protesting against the printing by the Government of stamped envelopes for private use; to the Committee on Printing.

7249. Also, petition of Minneapolis Typographical Union, No. 42, protesting against cuts in salaries of Government employees; to the Committee on Economy.

7250. Also, petition of presbytery of Mankato, at convention at Pipestone, Minn., protesting against any change in the present prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7251. Also, petition of Lizzie A. Bigham, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Russell, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 9986, Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7252. Also, petition of American Legion Auxiliary, Maynard, Minn., urging immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7253. Also, petition of American Legion Auxiliary, Maynard, Minn., urging enactment of the widows and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7254. Also, petition of Hamlin Local No. 103, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Lac qui Parle County, Minn., urging passage of the Frazier bill, S. 1197; the Wheeler bill, S. 2487; and the Swank bill, H. R. 7797, and protesting against the Federal gas tax, commodity tax, and sales taxes of any variety; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7255. Also, petition of 36 residents of Alexandria, Minn., urging immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7256. Also, petition of Benson Post, No. 1403, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Benson, Minn., urging enactment of the widows and orphans' bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

7257. Also, petition of rural-mail carriers of Litchfield, Minn., protesting against reduction in maintenance allowance to rural letter carriers; to the Committee on Economy.

7258. Also, petition of Minnesota Department, United Spanish War Veterans, protesting against any legislation reducing pensions or benefits to veterans; to the Committee on Economy.

7259. Also, petition of Benson Post, No. 1403, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Benson, Minn., urging immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7260. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of C. R. Percival, Hope D. Waltz, J. J. Tharp, and numerous other citizens of the city of Columbus, Ohio, petitioning Congress to enact such legislation at this time as is necessary to curb the activities of the growing monopolistic organizations known as the chain-store system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7261. Also, petition of Mary Tharp, Don W. Craig, W. R. Jenkins, and numerous other citizens of the city of Columbus, Ohio, petitioning Congress to enact such legislation at this time as is necessary to curb the activities of the growing monopolistic organizations known as the chain-store system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7262. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of citizens of the nineteenth congressional district of Pennsylvania, opposing any proposed reduction in salaries of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7263. By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: Petition of 15 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging support of House bill 7117 for the repeal of section 15a of the transportation act of 1920 (the recapture clause); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7264. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Ruth M. Earles, legislative chairman, American Legion Post and Auxiliary, No. 142, Jamaica, N. Y., opposing reduction of appropriation as contained in the economy bill for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Economy.

7265. Also, petition of Ancell H. Ball, New York City, opposing the income and inheritance taxes and favoring a sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7266. Also, petition of E. H. Outrebridge, New York City, favoring the passage of the Bachman bill, H. R. 1967; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7267. Also, petition of William A. Leonard Auxiliary, No. 422, American Legion, Flushing, Long Island, N. Y., opposing the reduction of appropriation for hospitalization and compensation for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Economy.

7268. Also, petition of United Commercial Travelers of America, Jamaica Council, No. 460, favoring the passage of House bill 8688; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7269. Also, petition of Luckenbach Steamship Co. (Inc.), New York City, favoring the passage of House bills 8688 and 10236; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7270. Also, petition of Columbia Typographical Union, No. 101, Washington, D. C., opposing section 207, title 2; to the Committee on Economy.

7271. Also, petition of the home-loan resolution of the Fraternal Order of Eagles of southwestern Washington, referring to home ownership and the creation of Federal home-loan banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7272. Also, petition of Frank B. Irvin, 104–158 Ninetieth Avenue, Richmond Hill, Long Island, N. Y., and 37 other citizens of the Greater City of New York, favoring legislation to regulate motor trucks engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7273. By Mr. SHOTT: Letters from 44 citizens of Mullens, Bluefield, Princeton, and Tralee, W. Va., opposing as detrimental to the bituminous-coal industry and therefore the coal-carrying railroads, the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7274. Also, letter from W. L. Cole, E. M. Campbell, J. H. Sawyers, and J. W. Hare, of Cliff Yard, W. Va., opposing as detrimental to the bituminous-coal industry, and therefore to the coal-carrying railroads, the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7275. Also, resolution of the Warrior Safety Club, of Warriormine, W. Va., composed of 514 employees and signed by G. D. Davidson, president, and Z. S. French, secretary, opposing passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7276. Also, letter signed by Roy Willard, B. C. Courtney, H. H. Coleman, Frank Harmon, Garnet B. Stevens, jr., and Jeff Lockhart, representing 42 shop employees on the Norfolk & Western Railway, Iaeger, W. Va., opposing the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7277. Also, resolution adopted by the Williams Pocahontas Mine Safety Club, of War, W. Va., signed by H. E. Ewing, president, and P. A. Pilkenton, secretary, opposing the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7278. Also, resolution adopted by the Sprague Safety Club, Sprague, W. Va., with a membership of 273, opposing the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7279. Also, resolution of the Price Hill Safety Club, Price Hill, W. Va., representing a membership of 111, opposing the passage of the bill known as the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7280. Also, resolution of the Gilliam Safety Club, Gilliam, W. Va., representing a membership of 120, opposing the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7281. Also, resolution adopted by the Cranberry Safety Club, of Cranberry, W. Va., representing 300 members, opposing the passage of the Davis-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7282. Also, resolution passed by the Skelton Safety Club, Skelton, W. Va., with a membership of 250, opposing the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7283. Also, resolution adopted by the Gauley Mountain Safety Club, of Ansted, W. Va., with a membership of 281, opposing as detrimental to the bituminous-coal industry the passage of the Davis-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7284. Also, resolution adopted by the Earling Mine Safety Club, Earling, W. Va., with a membership of 200, opposing the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7285. Also, resolution adopted by the Mahan Safety Club, Mahan, W. Va., of 180 members, opposing the passage of the Davis-Kelly coal control bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7286. By Mr. SWANSON: Petition of B. R. Hammond and others, of Walnut, Iowa, favoring the honest dollar bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.