7480. Also, petition headed by E. E. Murphy, of Port Orange, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7481. Also, petition headed by Rev. J. H. Williams, of Clarksdale, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7482. Also, petition headed by George H. Wanamaker, of New Hyde Park, N. Y., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7483. By Mr. BELL: Petition and resolution of the Kansas City Restaurant Association, relating to extension of the National Industrial Recovery Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7484. By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: Petition of L. Jensen, president, and Edward D. Rydeen, secretary-manager of the board of directors of the Cooperative Creamery Association, of Clearbrook, Minn., praying for the passage of legislation taxing all oleomargarine not less than 5 cents per pound; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7485. By Mr. DARROW: Memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, opposing the Wagner labor-disputes bill; to the Committee on Labor.

7486. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the California Newspaper Publishers Association, relating to the recently adopted policy of the United States Post Office Department permitting circular advertising, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7487. Also, petition headed by A. Bainsence, of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring House bill 5541, by Congresswoman VIRGINIA E. JENCKES, relative to the prominent display of the United States flag on all public buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

7488. Also, petition headed by Perry G. Wingate, of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring House bill 6995, by Congressman SMITH of Washington, relative to the Spanish War Veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

7489. Also, resolution of the Fresno County Chamber of Commerce, relating to throttling the development of flax plantings in the State of California, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7490. Also, resolution of the board of supervisors, county of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif., requesting Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, War Department of the United States, to immediately inaugurate and make study of flood-control problems of Federal Government and county of Los Angeles, and to propose and promote appropriate public-works projects for control of flood and storm waters; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7491. By Mr. LUCKEY: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the Congress of the United States to exempt fuel alcohol from Federal tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7492. By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of the Minnesota State Legislature, urging Congress to adopt a universal service act and conscript capital as well as man power to take profits out of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7493. Also, petition of the conservation commission of the State of Minnesota, urging passage of a bill (H. R. 6914) to authorize cooperation with the several States for the purpose of stimulating the acquisition, development, and proper administration and management of State forests and coordinating Federal and State activities in carrying out a national program of forest-land management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7494. Also, petition of the Tri-State Association of Ice Industries (Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota), urging the continuation of the National Recovery Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7495. Also, petition of the Vestry of the Church of St. John the Evangelist, of St. Paul, Minn., urging amendment to House bill 4120 and Senate bill 1130 so as to provide that the same shall not apply to employees for whom an adequate pension-fund system already exists, providing the benefits of said existing pension system at least equal the benefits contemplated by the proposed bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7496. Also, petition of the City Council of St. Paul, Minn., urging adequate unemployment-insurance legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7497. Also, petition of Russell Gaylord Auxiliary, No. 159, of Minneapolis, Minn., Veterans of Foreign Wars, urging the enactment of House bill 2897; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7498. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Petition memorializing the Congress of the United States to exempt fuel alcohol from Federal tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7499. By Mr. STEFAN: Resolution adopted by the Nebraska House of Represenatives, memorializing the Congress of the United States to exempt fuel alcohol from Federal tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7500. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Townsend Old Age Pension League of Maryland, Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7501. Also, petition of the Joint Action Committee for Genuine Social Insurance, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7502. Also, petition of the Mater Dolorosa Holy Name Society of New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7503. Also, petition of the National Cottonseed Products Association, Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7504. Also, petition of the Nevada Home Labor Association, Reno, Nev.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

7505. Also, petition of the Greene County Chamber of Commerce, Greenville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7506. Also, petition of the John Barry Division, Ancient Order of Hibernians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7507. By Mr. EKWALL: Petition of residents of Portland, Oreg., advocating the enactment of legislation to abolish and prohibit the nefarious discriminatory practice of manufacturers granting special secret rebates and discounts to the so-called "chain stores", mail-order houses, and other syndicates operating in opposition to the independent business interests of the country, regardless of the pretext or subterfuge under which such discounts, rebates, or other special privileges and benefits may be granted; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 1935

(Legislative day of Monday, Apr. 15, 1935)

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, April 24, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2035) to amend an act approved June 25, 1934, authorizing loans from the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, for the construction of certain municipal buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mrs. NORTON, Mr. ELLENBOGEN, and Mr. DIRKSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 254) providing for an investigation by the United States Public Health Service of the plumbing and sanitary systems in Federal Government buildings, 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 following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1209. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to relinquish an easement for a water main at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii; and

S. 1610. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept on behalf of the United States a certain strip of land from the State of South Carolina.

SERVICE IN CELEBRATION OF KING GEORGE'S SILVER JUBILEE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of State, relative to a service to be held at the National Cathedral in Washington, D. C., on the morning of Monday, May 6, in celebration of the Silver Jubilee of King George V of Great Britain, which, with the accompanying copy of letter from His Excellency the Honorable Sir Ronald C. Lindsay, Ambassador of Great Britain, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 23, 1935.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am sending to you herewith copy of a letter which I have received from His Excellency the Ambassador of Great Britain stating that a celebration of the King's Silver Jubilee will be held at the National Cathedral on Monday morning, May 6, at 11 o'clock, and requesting the good offices of the Department of State in notifying different branches of the Government that so far as seats are available American officials will be welcomed. It may be noted in this connection that the tickets are not limited strictly to the officials of the Senate and their wives but may also be used by relatives and friends, generally keeping in mind the number of tickets allotted to the Senate.

If you will be so good as to have Mr. A. F. H. Wiggin, First Secretary of the British Embassy, informed not later than Monday, April 29, as to the total number of seats desired, they will be sent to you for such distribution as you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, April 17, 1935.

The Honorable CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY OF STATE: Bishop Freeman has most generously invited me to use the National Cathedral for a service which we are holding on the morning of Monday, May 6, in celebration of the King's Silver Jubilee—an offer which I have gratefully accepted.

This service, which will start at 11 a. m. and last approximately 35 minutes, will be official only insofar as British subjects are concerned. No formal invitations will be issued. Uniform will be worn by British subjects only.

I need not say, however, that any Americans who might care to come of their own accord privately and unofficially would be very welcome, and that we should feel highly honored by their presence.

I fully appreciate the fact that a large proportion of the official world will in any case be precluded by their duties from attending an informal celebration of this character at such an hour. Perhaps, however, in such cases wives, relatives, or immediate friends, in some instances, might care to come, within the limits of the seating available.

In order to insure that any who do honor our service with their presence should have suitable seating, it has been suggested to me that we should provisionally reserve the first 17 rows of the right side of the main block of seats in the cathedral for their accommodation. As there are 9 seats in each row, this makes a total of 153 seats in all.

The tentative proposal is that these rows of seats might perhaps be placed at the disposal of the Government services quite impersonally in the following order and proportions:

	Rows	*Seats*
Supreme Court	2	18
Cabinet and other leaders of the administration	3	27
Senate	3	27
House of Representatives	3	27
State Department	1	9
War, Navy, and other departments	4	36
Government of the District of Columbia	1	9

It would be of the greatest assistance if your Division of Protocol would be so good as to help us in bringing this suggestion quite unofficially to the attention of these departments.

I would suggest, finally, that to save trouble the tickets required should be sent direct by the Embassy to the various departments concerned for distribution on an intimation from the competent official in each department. Such intimations could be addressed by telephone or otherwise to the first secretary of the Embassy. I should be grateful if they could be received here as soon as may be conveniently possible, at the latest by the end of the month.

Believe me, my dear Secretary of State,
Yours sincerely,

R. C. LINDSAY.

MARCH REPORT OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, submitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities and expenditures of the corporation for March 1935, together with a statement of authorizations made during that month, showing the name, amount, and rate of interest or dividend in each case, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from the Central Council of District Clubs (Federated Civic Clubs of Ramsey County), St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of the so-called "Frazier-Lemke farm mortgage relief bill", which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate petitions of several citizens of the States of North Carolina and North Dakota, praying for the enactment of old-age-pension legislation, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WALSH presented resolutions adopted by the Board of Selectmen of North Andover, the Turn Verein of Lawrence, and the City Councils of Lowell and Revere, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the repeal of the processing tax on cotton manufactures, and the taking of adequate measures for the protection of the textile industry, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented letters in the nature of petitions from Local Union No. 2401, of Charlton City, and Local Union No. 2325, of North Oxford, both of the United Textile Workers of America, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of the so-called "Wagner labor-disputes bill" and the "Black 30-hour work week bill", which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Retail Drug Trade Authority for the Sixth Congressional District of Massachusetts (Beverly, Mass.), favoring the extension of the National Industrial Recovery Act, and the strengthening of the code of fair competition for the retail drug trade, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions adopted by Branch No. 182, of Lowell, and Branch No. 340, of Revere, both of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund, in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2827) to provide for the establishment of unemployment, old-age, and social insurance, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Boston (Mass.) Section of the National Council of Jewish Women, favoring the enactment of economic-security legislation, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a letter in the nature of a memorial from the Marlborough (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, remonstrating against the enactment of sales-tax legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Springfield (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the enactment of the so-called "Wheeler-Rayburn public-utility regulation bill", which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Springfield (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the enactment of the so-called "Wagner labor-disputes bill",

which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a letter in the nature of a memorial from the traffic manager of the American Tissue Mills, of Holyoke, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of pending railroad legislation that would tend to increase freight rates and the cost of commodities, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a letter from the Westfield (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to the bill (S. 1631) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and opposing various changes made therein in the existing law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Washington (D. C.) Federation of Churches, opposing the proposed holding of United States fleet maneuvers in the Pacific Ocean, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a letter in the nature of a memorial from the Fitchburg (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called "Black 30-hour work week bill", which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COPELAND presented resolutions adopted by Aerie No. 941, of Elmira, and Aerie No. 1031, of Mount Vernon, both of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, in the State of New York, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1130 and House bill 4142, providing Federal monetary assistance to the States paying old-age pensions, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Bronx County (N. Y.) Pharmaceutical Association, favoring the extension of the National Industrial Recovery Act, with particular reference to the unfair-trade and loss-limitation provisions of the Retail Drug Code, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of the State of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation threatening to civil liberties, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a telegram from Hon. Louis A. Cuvillier, a member of the New York State Legislature, embodying a concurrent resolution submitted by him in the assembly of that legislature, favoring the prompt enactment of Federal legislation setting up emergency relief boards for home and work relief in every county throughout the Nation, which was ordered to lie on the table.

PREVENTION OF LYNCHING

Mr. WAGNER presented a letter addressed to him by the national secretary of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, enclosing copy of a letter addressed to the President of the United States by the international secretary of that league, which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
Washington, D. C., April 22, 1935.

DEAR SENATOR: We are attaching a letter written to the President on November 15, 1934, by the international secretary of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, who is an American citizen.

We believe that she has raised one of the most important questions in regard to a Federal antilynching bill, which everyone traveling in Europe becomes aware of only too quickly. We ask your serious consideration of this legislation from an international point of view.

Respectfully yours,

DOROTHY DETZER,
National Secretary.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
Geneva, November 15, 1934.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: I am writing you not as an American citizen, which I am, but as the international secretary of this organization represented not only in the United States but in most of the important countries.

It is our principle and belief, on which we consistently act, that all questions of humanity are the concern of men and women everywhere and not only in the country immediately in question.

We, therefore, desire to lay before you our deep concern in the whole matter of lynching, as it occurs sporadically in the United States, and in the specially flagrant case reported recently in Marianna, Fla.

The discredit abroad brought upon the whole country by such occurrences must be, and doubtless is, present to the American mind, even if only very imperfectly realized as to its extent and intensity.

But it is not on this ground that we appeal to you, Mr. President, to use your personal influence to insure that every possible means to put an end to lynching is employed to the utmost. It is not for us to present any idea of our own how this should be done.

We do, however, want to point out that, apart even from the question of human suffering, every example of lawlessness and violence in one country reacts in every other, and intensifies existing tendencies to resort to intolerance, cruelty, and tyranny.

The Nazi justifies his persecution of Jews by reference to the American attitude to Negroes; and the abuses in concentration camps and prisons, which shame mankind, are interrelated with excesses in other countries.

Yours very sincerely,

EMILY G. BALCH,
Honorary International Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. HARRISON, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3896) to provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-service certificates, for controlled expansion of the currency, and to extend the time for filing applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 550) thereon.

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2616) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Y. Underwood, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 551) thereon.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2644) for the relief of the estate of Harry F. Stern, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 552) thereon.

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6323) to provide for the custody of Federal proclamations, orders, regulations, notices, and other documents, and for the prompt and uniform printing and distribution thereof, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Colony of Connecticut, authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 553) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) authorizing the erection of a monument to Grover Cleveland in Washington, D. C., reported it with an amendment.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on the 24th instant that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 93. An act to authorize certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps to administer oaths;

S. 1208. An act authorizing personnel of the naval service to whom a commemorative or special medal has been awarded to wear in lieu thereof a miniature facsimile of such medal and a ribbon symbolic of the award;

S. 1210. An act authorizing certain officials under the Naval Establishment to administer oaths; and

S. 2197. An act to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products in the District of Columbia.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 2676) to require contractors with the Government to pay fair wages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 2677) to purchase and erect in the city of Washington the group of statuary known as the "Indian Buffalo Hunt"; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

A bill (S. 2678) granting a pension to John H. Epperson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McADOO:

A bill (S. 2679) granting a pension to William Henry Kelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A bill (S. 2680) to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for books for the adult blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GIBSON:

A bill (S. 2681) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Champlain at or near West Swanton, Vt., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 2682) for the relief of Chief Carpenter William F. Twitchell, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

A bill (S. 2683) to authorize the selection, construction, installation, and modification of permanent stations and depots for the Army Air Corps, and frontier air-defense bases generally (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY:

A bill (S. 2684) to amend section 4747 of the Revised Statutes to provide for the exemption of certain pensions from taxation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. OVERTON:

A bill (S. 2865) to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Bayou Dupre, La.; and

A bill (S. 2686) to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Grand Bayou Pass, La.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 108) to provide for participation by the United States in the Eighth International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to be held at Brussels, Belgium, in June 1935; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 254) providing for an investigation by the United States Public Health Service of the plumbing and sanitary systems in Federal Government buildings, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance may be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1763) to amend the act entitled "An act to adjust the compensation of certain employees in the Customs Service", approved May 29, 1928, as amended by the act of December 12, 1930, and that it be referred to the Committee on Civil Service. So far as I know there has been no adverse report on the bill.

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

AMENDMENT TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. METCALF submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6732) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 121), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

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

NEW YORK STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I have received with considerable gratification a telegram from the Governor of my State, which I ask may be read at the desk and printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegram will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
United States Senate:

I know you will be deeply interested in learning that I have just signed the unemployment-insurance bill which was passed by the legislature on my recommendation. I am sure you will be happy that our State has once again taken the lead in progressive social legislation. It is my earnest hope that the benefits of unemployment insurance will soon be made available by Congress to the people of the whole Nation.

(Signed) HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

EXCERPTS FROM LECTURE ON THE FORGOTTEN MAN

Mr. TOWNSEND, Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a few excerpts from Prof. William Graham Sumner's celebrated lecture entitled "The Forgotten Man", which was delivered at Yale in 1883.

What he has to say is so very pertinent and so very clear as bearing on our present political and economic conditions that I believe this material should be given widest possible circulation.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Let us put down now the cold, hard fact and look at it just as it is. There is no device whatever to be invented for securing happiness without industry, economy, and virtue. * * *

Now, who is the "forgotten man"? He is the simple, honest laborer, ready to earn his living by productive work. We pass him by because he is independent, self-supporting, and asks no favors. He does not appeal to the emotions or excite the sentiments. He only wants to make a contract and fulfill it, with respect on both sides and favor on neither side. He must get his living out of the capital of the country. The larger the capital is, the better living he can get. Every particle of capital which is wasted on the vicious, the idle, and the shiftless is so much taken from the capital available to reward the independent and productive laborer. * * * In these last years I have read hundreds of articles and heard scores of sermons and speeches which were really glorifications of the good-for-nothing, as if these were the charge of society, recommended by right reason to its care and protection. We are addressed all the time as if those who are respectable were to blame because some are not so. * * * The silly popular notion is that the beggars live at the expense of the rich, but the truth is that those who eat and produce not live at the expense of those who labor and produce. * * *

I want to call to mind the "forgotten man", because, in this case also, if we recall him and go to look for him, we shall find him patiently and perseveringly, manfully and independently struggling against adverse circumstances without complaining or begging. If, then, we are led to heed the groaning and complaining of others and to take measures for helping these others, we shall, before we know it, push down this man who is trying to help himself. * * *

We all seem to be under the delusion that the rich pay the taxes. Taxes are not thrown upon the consumers with any such directness and completeness as is sometimes assumed; but that, in ordinary states of the market, taxes on houses fall, for the most part, on the tenants, and that taxes on commodities fall, for the most part, on the consumers, is beyond question. * * * Who pays for it? Undoubtedly the people who have not been guilty of folly, vice, or recklessness. Out of nothing comes nothing. We cannot collect taxes from people who produce nothing and save nothing. The people who have something to tax must be those who have produced and saved. * * *

By jobbery I mean the constantly apparent effort to win wealth, not by honest and independent production but by some sort of a scheme for extorting other people's product from them. A large part of our legislation consists in making a job for somebody. Public buildings are jobs—not always, but in most cases. The

buildings are not needed at all or are costly far beyond what is useful or even decently luxurious. Internal improvements are jobs. * * * The silver miners, finding that their product is losing value in the market, get the Government to go into the market as a great buyer in the hope of sustaining the price. * * * We are called upon to squander twenty millions on swamps and creeks; from twenty to sixty-six millions on the Mississippi River; one hundred millions in pension—and there is now a demand for another hundred million beyond that. This is the great plan of all living on each other. The pensions in England used to be given to aristocrats who had political power, in order to corrupt them. Here the pensions are given to the great Democratic mass who have the political power, in order to corrupt them. We have 100,000 Federal officeholders, and I do not know how many State and municipal officeholders.

[NOTE.—At the beginning of 1935 the number of regular Federal Government employees was probably more than 1,100,000, while State and local public employees of all sorts were probably in excess of 2,300,000. This makes a total of around 3,500,000 of regular public employees who, with their immediate dependents probably constitute at least ten to twelve million of our population. In addition there were 3,100,000 employed by the Government on "emergency" work of various sorts. This makes a total of around 6,500,000 adults who are now directly on Government pay rolls and who, with their immediate dependents, probably constitute at least 20,000,000 of our population. At the same date there were upward of 3,000,000 more "cases" receiving direct relief from the Government without doing any work. These, with their immediate families, constitute at least 12,000,000 more of our population. Also, most of the farmers in the United States, who, with their families, constitute one-fourth of the population, or upward of 30,000,000, are receiving subsidies or payments from the Government, usually for restricting production. Through these various groups it appears that the Public Treasury is now wholly or in part, and directly or indirectly, taking care of more than 60,000,000 people, or virtually one-half of our entire population.]

Or course, public officers are necessary and it is an economical organization of society to set apart some of its members for civil functions, but if the number of persons drawn from production and supported by the producers while engaged in civil functions is in undue proportion to the total population, there is economic loss. If public offices are treated as spoils or benefices or sinecures, then they are jobs and only constitute part of the pillage. * * *

On every hand you find this jobbery. The Government is to give every man a pension, and every man an office, and every man a tax to raise the price of his product, and to clean out every man's creek for him, and to buy all his unsalable property, and to provide him with plenty of currency to pay his debts, and to educate his children, and to give him the use of a library and a park and a museum and a gallery of pictures. On every side the doors of waste and extravagance stand open; and spend, squander, plunder, and grab are the watchwords. We grumble some about it and talk about the greed of corporations and the power of capital and the wickedness of stock gambling. Yet we elect the legislators who do all this work. Of course, we should never think of blaming ourselves for electing men to represent and govern us, who, if I may use a slang expression, "give us away." What man ever blamed himself for his misfortune? We groan about monopolies and talk about more laws to prevent the wrongs done by chartered corporations. Who made the charters? Our representatives. Who elected such representatives? We did. How can we get bad lawmakers to make a law which shall prevent bad lawmakers from making a bad law? That is, really, what we are trying to do. If we are a free, self-governing people, all our misfortunes come right home to ourselves and we can blame nobody else. * * *

Now comes the question, Who pays for it all? The system of plundering each other soon destroys all that it deals with. It produces nothing. Wealth comes only from production, and all that the wrangling grabbers, loafers, and jobbers get to deal with comes from somebody's toil and sacrifice. Who, then, is he who provides it all? Go and find him and you will have once more before you the forgotten man. You will find him hard at work because he has a great many to support. * * * The forgotten man is delving away in patient industry, supporting his family, paying his taxes, casting his vote, supporting the church and the school, reading his newspaper, and cheering for the politician of his admiration, but he is the only one for whom there is no provision in the great scramble and the big divide.

Such is the forgotten man. He works, he votes, generally he prays; but he always pays—yes; above all, he pays. * * * He is a commonplace man. He gives no trouble. He excites no admiration. He is not in any way a hero (like a popular orator); or a problem (like tramps and outcasts); nor notorious (like criminals); nor an object of sentiment (like the poor and weak); nor a burden (like paupers and loafers); nor an object out of which social capital may be made (like the beneficiaries of church and State charities); nor an object for charitable aid and protection (like animals treated with cruelty); nor one over whom sentimental economists and statesmen can parade their fine sentiments (like inefficient workmen and shiftless artisans). Therefore, he is forgotten. All the burdens fall on him or on her, for it is time to remember that the forgotten man is not seldom a woman. * * *

It is plain enough that the forgotten man and the forgotten woman are the very life and substance of society. They are the ones who ought to be first and always remembered. They are always forgotten by sentimentalists, philanthropists, reformers, enthusiasts, and every description of speculator in sociology, political economy, or political science. * * * If it is desired to bring about social improvements, bring us a scheme for relieving the forgotten man of some of his burdens. He is our productive force which we are wasting. Let us stop wasting his force. Then we shall have a clean and simple gain for the whole society. The forgotten man is weighted down with the cost and burden of the schemes for making everybody happy, with the cost of public beneficence, with the support of all the loafers, with the loss of all the economic quackery, with the cost of all the jobs. Let us remember him a little while. Let us take some of the burdens off him. Let us turn our pity on him instead of on the good for nothing. It will be only justice to him, and society will greatly gain by it. * * * Certainly the philanthropists and sentimentalists have kept our attention for a long time on the nasty, shiftless, criminal, whining, crawling, and good-for-nothing people as if they alone deserved our attention.

The forgotten man is never a pauper. He almost always has a little capital, because it belongs to the character of the man to save something. He never has more than a little. He is, therefore, poor in the popular sense, although in the correct sense he is not so. I have said already that if you learn to look for the forgotten man and to care for him, you will be very skeptical toward all philanthropic and humanitarian schemes. It is clear now that the interest of the forgotten man and the interest of "the poor", "the weak", and the other petted classes are in antagonism. In fact, the warning to you to look for the forgotten man comes the minute that the orator or writer begins to talk about the poor man. That minute the forgotten man is in danger of a new assault, and if you intend to meddle in the matter at all, then is the minute for you to look about for him and to give him your aid. Hence, if you care for the forgotten man, you will be sure to be charged with not caring for the poor. Whatever you do for any of the petted classes wastes capital. If you do anything for the forgotten man, you must secure him his earnings and savings; that is, you legislate for the security of capital and for its free employment; you must oppose paper money, wildcat banking and usury laws, and you must maintain the inviolability of contracts. Hence you must be prepared to be told that you favor the capitalist class, the enemy of the poor man.

What the forgotten man really wants is true liberty. * * * It follows that the forgotten man, who is hard at work at home, has to pay both ways. * * * Now, since we, the people, are the state, whenever there is any work to be done or expense to be paid, and since the petted classes and the criminals and the jobbers cost and do not pay, it is they who are in the position of the child, and it is the forgotten man who is the parent. What the forgotten man needs, therefore, is that we come to a clearer understanding of liberty, and to a more complete realization of it. Every step which we win in liberty will set the forgotten man free from some of his burdens and allow him to use his powers for himself and for the commonwealth.

OPTICAL INSTRUMENTS IN THE WORLD WAR

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by Dr. Arthur Louis Day, Director of the Geophysical Laboratory, Carnegie Institution, before the Society of the Genesee, at Washington, D. C., January 23, 1935, which, I think, will be of general interest.

There being no objection, the address is as follows:

There is always a certain romance about war stories which not only lends to them attractiveness but often insures to them a longer life than is granted to those who shared in the incidents themselves. Stories from the front have dominated our firesides for some 15 years since the close of the Great War and are even more welcome today than at the beginning. Stories from behind the lines, so to speak, are less common and are perhaps somewhat lacking in dramatic quality. Notwithstanding this, the atmosphere was not less tense nor was concerted effort anywhere more vigorously put forth than in the organization far from the front which determined and supplied the needs of our troops. The share in this great organization which fell to the lot of our guest of honor this evening was the manufacture of optical glass and optical instruments of high precision for the control of gunfire. Regarding optical-instrument manufacture, whether for war or other purposes, no word of mine can add anything to the brilliance of the record of the Bausch & Lomb Optical Co. through two long generations.

I suppose there are few in the audience this evening to whom optical glass has significant meaning. For this reason I may perhaps review briefly the counsels and actions of a small group of men gathered in Washington in late March of 1917, after it had become apparent that this country might be drawn into the Great European War. In this group were members of the General Staff of the Army, a few officials of Government bureaus, and a number of scientific men—in all perhaps 20 persons, few of whom had been together before. To these men a very brief and very startling story was told—told in bare fact and in short sentences, with the atmosphere becoming more highly charged with every moment. The civilian members of the group had probably no other background through which to appraise the situation there presented than the stories of the Civil War, where the enemy and his fortifications could be plainly seen and artillery fire was directed pointblank from the gun emplacement at an earthwork in plain view and rarely more than 3,000 yards away. The Great European War,

which had been going on for 3 years, had already developed a wholly different technique. The objectives of heavy gunfire were never in plain view, ranges had increased to 10 or 12 miles, and unless extreme precision could be attained such effort must obviously be wasted.

Thus bluntly were we made to see that unless a number of optical instruments—gun sights, range finders, periscopes, field glasses—and these of the highest precision, could be had quickly, our effort at the front, if we should enter the war, could be of but little help. These instruments were not then available, at least not in quantity, and some of you will doubtless remember the call which was sent out soon after for the loan of all field glasses suitable for officers' use.

Optical instruments meant optical glass, and optical glass is by far the most refined product of the glassmaker's art. How were we to obtain optical glass of suitable quality and quantity for the production of fire-control instruments, and could our officers in the field be furnished with these instruments in time to be of service at the front? Such were the preliminary deliberations of this group.

A canvass was immediately instituted by the Naval Consulting Board, by the General Munitions Board, and by the National Research Council to ascertain the actual situation which then confronted us. The results were ominous; optical glass before this war was not an American product; most of it had been imported from enemy countries, some from our allies. Stocks of this glass in the hands of American instrument makers were practically at zero, because of the fact that during 3 years they had accepted contracts from the Canadian Government and from the British field service and our stock was completely exhausted. It was difficult even to obtain samples of it. And so in April of 1917 when we entered the war there was practically no optical glass available, and without it plainly there could be no fire-control instruments unless our allies could provide them.

Our courage stirred again, however, when two evidences of forethought came to light. As early as 1912 Mr. William Bausch had recognized as a matter of business expediency that an optical industry in the United States could not safely depend for its most indispensable raw material upon foreign sources alone. He had in fact built a small plant and had made some attempts to produce optical glass. Unfortunately the building burned down soon after, with but a small record of accomplishment. In 1914, however, when the European war had precipitated the catastrophe by cutting off the foreign supply almost completely, the plant was rebuilt and further experimentation begun. In this plan experience accumulated under the energetic direction of Mr. William Bausch until by 1917 certain glasses could be dependably made, but the total capacity of the plant, assuming complete success, was no more than 2,000 pounds per month, while the war need which we confronted in that fateful April amounted to 2,000 pounds per day.

Some few others were found who foresaw during the years between 1914 and 1917 insuperable embarrassment to the business of lens making as soon as the existing supply of foreign-made glass should be exhausted. None of their efforts had yet yielded glass of a quality equal to Government standards (except the Bausch & Lomb Co., first named), but there was encouragement in the thought that they were at work.

There was also another difficulty, prosaic perhaps, but insistent. Optical glass must be melted in clay pots which must be reasonably free from iron, for the presence of iron means low transparency, even when present in quantities no greater than a few tenths of 1 percent. Pots of this quality had been made in this country, but always from German clay, and German clay also was no longer available. American clays were abundant but comparatively untried and their properties unknown.

On further limitation and the situation which confronted our military authorities in April of 1917 will be plainly before you. For the optical instruments required by the Government to control its gunfire on the sea and at the front, 9 different varieties of optical glass were necessary, and but 2 of these had ever been successfully made in this country at any time. The seven others remained enshrouded in mystery.

This final limitation brings us face to face with a further difficulty realized by but few people then or now. Optical-glass manufacture is inherently a secret industry, regarding which at the time of the war almost no authentic information had ever been printed. In France it was a Government monopoly, in England practically so. In Germany the industry was virtually concentrated in a single firm whose secrets were its own. Optical-glass formulas were never allowed to become known even within the plant in which it was made. It used to be said in Europe, with some humor but perhaps more of bitter realism, that such formulas were never written down except on the inside of a man's shirt, which was the only thing he never parted with. In the face of this array of discouragements the outlook for a supply of this indispensable part of our war equipment was not bright.

To meet this situation scientists with some knowledge of silicate chemistry (but, of course, no knowledge of optical-glass making) were called upon to help as early as April 12, 1917. Two groups were formed, one from the Carnegie Geophysical Laboratory in Washington, which was to associate itself with the Bausch & Lomb Co. in an effort to extend and perfect its output, another from the Bureau of Standards, which was to operate in part in its own Pittsburgh laboratory (to which the Government contributed $75,000) and in part of the Charleroi plant of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. To each of these groups of collaborators was assigned the task of providing one-half of the requirements of both Army and Navy in the shortest possible time.

This is not the place to record the tears and the blood sweating which were the chief output of the following months, but suffice it to say that the Bausch & Lomb Co., at the end of 4 months, was successfully producing all of the varieties of glass necessary for the Government service, and had multiplied its total output by 4. At the end of the year 1917 this output had increased to 40,000 pounds per month, properly apportioned among the varieties needed.

The Pittsburgh group had not been equally successful and no glass was yet available from that source.

Early in 1918 a reorganization occurred in Washington which brought into existence the War Industries Board and the now famous "dollar-a-year man." This Board was a very strong body and its pressure was immediately felt in this as in most other war industries. One of its early decisions was that the group which had so far succeeded at Rochester should be divided and assigned to two other plants, the Spencer Lens Co. at Buffalo and the Charleroi plant of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. Without entering too intimately upon the details of these additional burdens and experiences, equally harrowing, particularly at the Charleroi plant, which, though very large, was never intended for the precise control necessary in optical-glass manufacture, it may be sufficient to say that eventually these efforts also succeeded; and at the time when our troops in the field were ready for service at the front to take their active share in the crucial fighting of 1918, the optical-glass supply of the United States was substantially equal to the demand for it.

One or two incidents will bring into this picture our distinguished guest of honor this evening. A sudden demand was presented to the War Industries Board to prepare an entirely new glass for an entirely new purpose. Airplane activity had become so far developed and so indispensable that photographic mapping over enemy lines had become a most important responsibility of the Army staff in the field. This meant airplane cameras of wide sweep and extremely high precision—indeed, of a quality considerably beyond anything of the kind which had been attempted before. The necessary optical requirements for such lenses had been figured out, but it was not then known whether any glass could be made to meet these exacting requirements. The time was critical, the pressure high, and the need insistent. This situation was brought to the attention of Mr. Edward Bausch and his group with the simple statement that it must somehow be done. Mr. Bausch asked no questions and considered no details; his reply was simply that if it could be done he would do it. It proved to be the hardest task yet encountered, and it needed all of the inspiration which Mr. Bausch could bring to bear. The glass was a barium glass, thin as water when melted, and totally different in its behavior from any glass hitherto attempted. It soaked into the melting pots like coffee into a lump of sugar and ran out through the sides. In every detail it required totally different treatment from the glasses thus far developed. Nevertheless it was successfully made in 4 weeks' time, and it saw service at the front.

One further incident and I am done. Early in 1918, when it came to be realized by the War Industries Board that up to that time practically all of the glass available to the Government had come from the Bausch & Lomb Co., and the other group set up to produce an equal share had been unsuccessful, the present speaker was sent to Rochester with instructions to wield a battleax if necessary to increase that output to the limit. I entered Mr. Bausch's office that morning with some misgivings. His cooperation up to that time had known no limit, and in point of fact he was fulfilling every requirement which had been laid upon him. My proposal was that he prepare again to double his output and within 30 days. I shall never forget his reaction. He made no direct answer, but took with him a piece of chalk and let me into the glass plant. There he marked out on the floor with his own hand the vacant spaces which could be made to hold additional glass furnaces and gave orders for the immediate construction of those furnaces. No single question was raised. No moment was lost. It was a spirit to overcome all obstacles, and it did just that.

As a conclusion I may add very briefly that the total amount of glass made for the use of the American Army and Navy during the war was about 650,000 pounds, of which about 450,000 pounds were made under the immediate direction of Mr. Edward Bausch and his associates. And this was accomplished in spite of the fact that new sources of supply had to be found for every raw material used in order to insure its purity; new clays must be found and new processes developed for making the pots in which these could be melted; the mysteries of wholly secret processes must be unravelled, and that without any help whatever from our allies, who maintained monopolies of this art, even in spite of undoubted sabotage which occasionally cropped out, notwithstanding all precautions. All this was successfully accomplished under war pressure in time to be of service. It may even be mentioned that small quantities of optical glass were exported from this country to help out before the war was over. It must not be overlooked that Mr. Bausch alone has continued to manufacture optical glass since the war; he has kept alive the experience then gained so that our Army and Navy need never again be caught without "eyes" in its hour of need.

So long as war stories are told and the vital position of key industries for our defense is recognized, this country can never forget Mr. Edward Bausch, of Rochester.

PREVENTION OF LYNCHING

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 24) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws by discouraging, preventing, and punishing the crime of lynching.

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask the Senator from Texas to yield to me in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. 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:

Adams	Connally	Johnson	Pittman
Ashurst	Coolidge	Keyes	Pope
Austin	Copeland	King	Radcliffe
Bachman	Costigan	La Follette	Robinson
Bailey	Couzens	Lewis	Russell
Bankhead	Cutting	Logan	Schall
Barbour	Dickinson	Lonergan	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Dieterich	Long	Sheppard
Bilbo	Donahey	McAdoo	Shipstead
Black	Duffy	McCarran	Smith
Bone	Fletcher	McGill	Steiwer
Borah	Frazier	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Gerry	McNary	Townsend
Bulkley	Gibson	Metcalf	Trammell
Bulow	Glass	Minton	Truman
Burke	Gore	Moore	Vandenberg
Byrd	Guffey	Murphy	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hale	Murray	Wagner
Capper	Harrison	Neely	Walsh
Caraway	Hastings	Norris	Wheeler
Carey	Hatch	O'Mahoney	White
Clark	Hayden	Overton	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is absent because of illness, and that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

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

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield the floor for the purpose of enabling the Senator from New York to explain the bill, the consideration of which has been moved?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is agreeable to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized.

W. M. DUNCAN

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I send to the desk two telegrams and ask that the clerk read them. They are short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

NASHVILLE, TENN., *April 23, 1935.*

Senator K. D. McKELLAR,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Those who know Will Duncan, including myself, deeply resent vicious attack made on him by Senator LONG. A cleaner, more competent, and more honorable man could not be found. It would be hard indeed to find a man more worthy and dependable to occupy the position he now fills. Would appreciate your defending Duncan to the limit if afforded an opportunity.

L. G. DURR.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *April 23, 1935.*

Hon. K. D. McKELLAR,
Washington, D. C.:

Senator LONG's attack today on W. M. Duncan, E. R. A. finance director for Tennessee, does great injustice to a citizen of high standing and efficient, honest public servant. Mr. Duncan is a member of an outstanding accounting firm in Nashville who number among their clients many leading business concerns, and he himself is a man of unquestioned integrity and has the full confidence of this community. Mr. Duncan did not solicit employment with either C. W. A. or E. R. A., but was asked in each instance to serve, his present connection being the direct result of a request from A. Ross Fox, regional field examiner F. E. R. A. Mr. Duncan is secretary of the Tennessee Society of Certified Public Accountants and a member of the American Institute of Accountants.

GEORGE H. ARMISTEAD, Sr.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to say in connection with the two telegrams that it will be recalled that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] brought up the matter concerning Mr. Duncan several days ago by reading a report of a man by the name of Watson. These are voluntary telegrams. I did not know Mr. Duncan at the time the Senator from Louisiana was reading the report. I think I never had met him. At any rate, I did not recall him at the time and so stated. But I do know, very intimately, Mr. L. G. Durr and Mr. George H. Armistead, Sr. There are no two better men in my State or in any other State. Mr. George H. Armistead, Sr., is the editor of the Nashville Banner, one of the strongest newspapers in the State of Tennessee and one of the best-edited papers anywhere. Mr. Durr is one of the finest business men in Nashville and one of the best characters I know. I take pleasure in stating that, in my judgment, any man who meets the approval of these two gentlemen must be all right.

I notice that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is present this morning, and I think that he, as well as myself, will take pleasure in subscribing to the high character of Mr. Duncan and in admitting that a very great injustice was done him.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I inquire if this discussion is going to result in a long debate?

Mr. LONG. I hope not. I hope the Senator will not allow me to be unjustly criticized without giving me an opportunity to reply.

Mr. WAGNER. Very well; I yield.

Mr. LONG. I did not attack Mr. Duncan. I never said a word against Mr. Duncan nor in favor of Mr. Duncan. What happened was that I rose on the floor of the Senate—and I want the Senator from Tennessee to look in the RECORD and see what I said—and read a letter written by the Federal Emergency Relief Regional Division Administrator, in which it was said that this man Duncan was incompetent, unfit, and allied with an unscrupulous political ring in Tennessee. I did that in order that the public might know that the Emergency Relief Administration was not talking about me alone. I do not have anything to do with them one way or the other. Although they still talk about me a little, yet I never have associated with them, will not associate with them, and will not have anything to do with them, topside nor bottom.

I happened accidentally to get hold of a letter written by these people, saying they went down to Tennessee and uncovered a diabolical, dirty political ring there which had a man named Duncan running the E. R. A., with another man by the name of Menzler, whom they alleged to be unscrupulous, inefficient, incompetent, and almost everything else they could think of. I submitted that public document and I defended Mr. Duncan. It will be found in the RECORD that I defended Mr. Duncan and I defended my friend from Tennessee. I defended the political organization of Tennessee, because I am on friendly terms with the politicians down there and want to remain on friendly terms with them.

What I want done now is to have a motion made by my friend from Tennessee—because it will be adopted if he makes it and will be defeated if I make it—to expel from the E. R. A. the man named Watson, who wrote that letter about Mr. Duncan. That is what we ought to do. The man Watson, who unjustly defamed the man Duncan and the politicians in Tennessee, should be put out of the administration, and now is the time to do it. Let us take action

and adopt a motion to keep this good man Duncan from having this kind of aspersions cast on his character from this quarter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a further brief statement?

Mr. WAGNER. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. The trouble about the Senator from Louisiana having defended Mr. Duncan is that he read a report, or an alleged report, which very greatly reflected upon Mr. Duncan and other people of Tennessee. As I said, I did not know Mr. Duncan at the time at all, and I know him now only from what other people have said. I am confident the Senator's statement just made, that Mr. Duncan is a good man and that he was not attacking him, is true to the extent that Mr. Duncan is a good man; but when the Senator from Louisiana read that report it was an attack upon Mr. Duncan. I think the Senator ought not to have read the report reflecting on Mr. Duncan unless he had known something of what was back of it, which he did not.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am trying to show that good men are being unnecessarily mired down by the various bureaucrats issuing such reports. They had one on me. As the Senator from Tennessee knows, it was bound to be unjust because I did not have anything to do with the administration of E. R. A. relief in Louisiana. I just wanted to show that these fellows go around the country and whenever they find a good man, like me or Duncan and others, they attack him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator can protect himself when an unjust charge is made against him, but Mr. Duncan is an employee of the Government in Nashville, who does not have that opportunity on the Senate floor. I desire to say that, in my judgment, that attack, however indirectly made, was wholly unjust and unfair to a good man. I commend these telegrams in his defense.

I think the Senator from Louisiana ought to make an apology to Mr. Duncan.

Mr. LONG. From what I know of these Federal bureaus, any person attacked by their reports is due an apology.

Just a word further, if I may, with the permission of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

Mr. WAGNER. I hope the Senator will not take very long.

Mr. LONG. The trouble with the Senator from Tennessee is that he is defending the very administrators who are attacking the man Duncan. The man Watson is a big high mogul running the E. R. A. relief. He is on record as saying that Duncan is a bad man connected with a worse set of men, and the Senator from Tennessee is offended, but he is not protecting his friend Duncan. He is allowing Watson to remain in office. There ought to be something done with the men who are running the E. R. A. in this manner.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know Mr. Watson. I never heard of him until the Senator read the alleged report made by him. I do not know anything about Mr. Watson and I do not care anything about Mr. Watson. The Senator brought into the discussion two people from Tennessee, and that is a very different proposition, because I shall defend at any time any good man from Tennessee. The letter the Senator read severely criticized Duncan. The other man whom the Senator mentioned, Simpson, is wholly unworthy, and the Senator was undertaking, as I thought, to defend this unworthy man, and I objected to the best of my ability then and I object now.

Mr. Simpson was an emergency relief administrator who was discharged, and I respect and uphold the relief authorities here for having done it. The letter the Senator from Louisiana read praised Simpson. I have nothing to do with Watson. I am not defending him. I believe him to have been wrong in praising Simpson, and even more wrong in criticizing Duncan.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. WAGNER. I decline to yield further at this time. I think I have been rather generous.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator allow me to say about 20 words?

Mr. WAGNER. Very well; 20 words, and no more. I shall count them. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. The letter from a United States Government official to Duncan will be found on page 6133 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I shall join with my friend from Tennessee to see that the man Albert B. Watson, regional field examiner, is dismissed. With the influence which I have with the Roosevelt administration, I am satisfied it can be done. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator where he got that letter? Where did the Senator get this remarkable letter from Watson? Did he get it officially? Does he know it to be a correct report? Does he know that Mr. Watson wrote the letter? Where did the Senator get the letter which he brings in here and uses as a basis for an attack upon citizens of my State?

Mr. WAGNER. Does the Senator from Louisiana decline to answer?

Mr. LONG. Oh, no; I am perfectly willing to answer the Senator.

Mr. WAGNER. How long does the Senator want?

Mr. LONG. Just a moment or two.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I think I shall decline to yield further at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York declines to yield further.

PREVENTION OF LYNCHING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. COSTIGAN that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 24) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws by discouraging, preventing, and punishing the crime of lynching.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate listened to what I regard as not only a very eloquent and brilliant address but a very convincing address by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN]. He has left very little for me to add to the argument in support of the proposed legislation; so I shall content myself with giving, as briefly as possible, my reasons for introducing the measure in cooperation with the Senator from Colorado, and urging as strongly as I can its enactment into law.

Mr. President, the flight of time brings changes in laws, in manners, and in morals; but there is one birthright of Anglo-Saxon law that, dating from Magna Carta, should remain imperishable so long as civilization shall survive. That is the right of every man to a fair trial by his peers in order that he may escape punishment without proof of guilt. The crime of lynching, which punishes without trial and without conviction, is thus the most fundamental of all attacks upon our Government and our ideals of life.

Viewed even in its narrowest aspects, punishment without law means punishment of the innocent. Dr. George Fort Milton, a distinguished southerner and editor of the Chattanooga News, who served as chairman of the Southern Commission for the Study of Lynching, said of the 21 mob killings that occurred during 1930:

> Two of the 1930 mob victims were innocent of crime (they were not even accused), and there is grave doubt of the guilt of 11 others. In 6 of these 11 cases there is considerable doubt as to just what crimes, if any, were committed, and in the other 5 in which there is no question as to the crime committed there is considerable doubt as to whether the mob got the guilty man.

No less distressing than punishment of the innocent is the infliction of punishment out of all proportion to the crime. Of the 28 victims of lynchings during 1933, 15 were charged with only minor offenses. Of the 16 names upon the roll of infamy last year only 10 were even accused, much less proved guilty, of major crimes. Five were tortured for such trivial departures from good taste as writing an insulting note, using opprobrious language, fist fighting, talking disrespectfully, and stealing. To cap the climax, one unfortunate was shot during the sport of a man hunt for another.

I have heard the claim that horrible crimes provoke whole communities to uncontrollable bursts of passion; but this plea can never rectify the severe punishment of the trivial

offender, or the torture of the innocent. Besides, the passion which a civilized code of law recognizes is confined to the individual and is unpremeditated in inception and swift in execution. But the crime of lynching is all too frequently accompanied by planned and prolonged orgies of mob brutality that would have shocked the soldiers of the Inquisition.

We may read the lurid stories of the blood-lusty Roman tyrants without finding anything more horrible than the stories of whip, of lash, and of flaming brand that accompany our modern exhibitions of primitive torture. Even the hardened gladiator in the arena would customarily turn to his emperor for some sign that cruelty should cease; but there is no check when the fury of a maddened mob is unleashed upon its helpless victim.

But it is only when we turn from its individual to its social implications that we grasp the full menace of the crime of lynching. There is no concealing the fact that this practice is directed primarily against the members of a single race, which has suffered 503 of the 554 outrages inflicted since 1918. This discriminatory suspension of civil rights is breeding a terrible resentment among over 12,000,000 people of the United States, who live under and not apart from our Constitution and who have demonstrated their willingness to die heroically in its defense. The shadow of Judge Lynch is obscuring our proudest motto, "Equal justice under law."

I do not desire to harp even upon the effects of this injustice upon a single race. Violating all American principles, the crime of lynching is a defiant assault upon government itself. When the killing of George Armwood took place upon the Eastern Shore of Maryland the Governor and the State troops were helpless before the fury of the mob. The attorney general was threatened with death because he sought to obtain the arrest of the culprits. In another recent case the lynchers burned the courthouse itself. This destruction of a temple of justice was more than a concrete example of contempt for law. It was symbolic of the inconsistency between the concept of law and the practice of lawlessness.

There is no better evidence that lynching is an attack upon law than the claim boldly made by some of its apologists that it is necessary to cure the law's delay. What could be more grimly ironical than this lawless impatience with the slowness of the law? What could refute this contention more completely than the proof that since 1928 over half of the people lynched have been snatched from the custody of peace officers or dragged from the cells of battered jails where they were already in the hands of justice? What evidence is there that those so anxious to hasten the law have been eager to prosecute those who interfere with its processes?

This lawless practice is alarming not only because it oversteps the boundaries of government. It is particularly serious because it corrupts government and inoculates public officials with the virus of the mob. Not long ago a high executive extolled the mass killing of two men and promised executive pardon to anyone convicted of the crime. When representatives of the State condone the subordination of law to lawlessness, then, indeed, the time for remedy is at hand.

Even more significant is the effect upon the atmosphere breathed by the general public. When Claude Neal was tortured to death four to seven thousand people, responding to a 15-hour notice by wire, by radio, and by the press, gathered to watch the sport. Who can measure the lifelong effect of this spectacle upon the little children who were present at the scene, and who shrieked with crazed delight as they plunged their sharpened sticks into the burning flesh?

Events of this nature cannot be localized in their effects. We are living in a trying age. In every nation of the world force is now at war with reason, the reign of despotism is contending with the reign of law, while violence and persuasion are struggling for mastery. In such a period of flux, prejudice and hatred recognize no arbitrary bounds. It is but a short step from summary treatment of those suspected of crime to supression of every shade of economic or political opinion that disagrees with a transitory majority. A fire cannot be localized until it is extinguished.

The plea has been made that lynching can be ended by State action alone; but the plea crumbles under the weight of the facts that it must carry. There have been 5,071 lynchings in the United States since 1882, and 280 since 1922. Since the turn of the century only eight-tenths of 1 percent of these crimes have been followed by prosecutions, and in only 12 instances have convictions resulted.

Thirteen years ago, upon the theory that the States would stamp out the peril in their midst, the Senate refused to pass the Dyer antilynching bill. Since then only six States have passed laws to restrain lynching, and in only one of these States had the problem been a serious one.

Reliance upon local action alone is wrong in principle. How can local action alone prevent lynchings which occur just when sober public sentiment has become engulfed in the passions of the mob and when the agencies of law enforcement are prostrate or unwilling to intervene? One might as well expect an epidemic to cure itself, or by its own good will prevent its ravages from extending to other parts of the community. Federal assistance is imperative if lynching is to be stopped.

The bill which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] and I are sponsoring rests upon the foundation of State responsibility. Far from depriving the States of their obligation and power to preserve order, it gives them added incentives to do their duty. It is supplementary rather than exclusive in character. It provides that any State or local officer whose neglect of duty leads to the killing or injury of a person by a mob shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, or both. Similar penalties are provided for any officer who is derelict in his responsibility to apprehend and prosecute to a conclusion those who participate in these inhuman diversions. In addition, the bill carries the prospect of from 5 to 25 years' imprisonment for any officer who actually conspires with the mob in the pursuit of its illegal ends.

Secondly, the bill provides that those who have participated in a mob for the purpose of inflicting injury or death may be tried in the district courts of the United States. But such transfer from State to Federal forum is permissible only when State prosecuting agencies have failed or neglected to do their duty or when the jurors obtainable for service in the local courts are so strongly opposed to punishment that justice would be denied. Moreover, the Federal courts, when called into action, are to apply the State law. This makes it clear that the Federal Government is to extend its arm only when the State falls down. Every State can retain its autonomy simply by shouldering its responsibilities.

A very important provision of the bill is contained in section 5. This states that the county in which a person is seriously injured or put to death by a mob, by reason of the fact that officers of the State have been negligent in their duty to protect or punish, shall be liable to the injured person or his legal representative for a sum ranging from $2,000 to $10,000. Such a provision is neither novel nor unjust. Eleven States have already passed laws allowing recovery against the city or county in which a lynching occurs, and six of these allow redress in cases of injury as well. Similarly the United States has frequently paid indemnities to other sovereign powers in cases in which aliens have been killed in this country.

The preventive effects of such laws have been well demonstrated. According to an eminent authority, in not even one county which has been subjected to such a fine has a single additional lynching occurred, while the average for the whole State has declined sharply after each penalty. Uniform application of this principle on a Nation-wide scale should serve as a powerful deterrent and an exemplary influence.

The argument has been made that a Federal law would not end lynching. This might be dismissed flippantly by stating that the laws against homicide have not ended murder. But experience tells us that even the threat of a Federal antilynching law has proved effective. Until 1923

lynchings in the United States numbered above 60 every year. In that year, however, following the presentation of the Dyer bill to Congress in 1922, the number fell to 28; and in 1934, when the forerunner of the present bill was before Congress, lynchings practically stopped throughout the United States. But when it became apparent last June that the measure would not pass, a new flood of mob executions began, extending throughout the remainder of the year and chalking up three additional victims since January 1. There could be no better indication of the value of Federal action.

Precedents are at hand. In 1932 we enacted and in 1934 we strengthened the kidnaping law, although the States had been much more successful in preventing and punishing the offense of kidnaping than in dealing with a crime which cuts even more deeply into the roots of our institutions.

There remains only the question of whether this bill embodies a valid exercise of Federal power. The fourteenth amendment to our Constitution provides in section 1 that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws"; and in section 5 that "Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article."

It is true that the fourteenth amendment does not empower the Federal Government to deal with persons in the States who are acting in their individual capacities. It is well settled, however, that the national power may protect the Constitution from violation, not only by States as organic entities or by State laws but also by agents of the State who are derelict in their discretionary or ministerial duties. To hold otherwise would be to deny that, while laws form the framework of government, men are its flesh and blood. Thus, in *Home Telephone & Telegraph Co.* v. *Los Angeles* (227 U. S. 278 (1912)), Mr. Chief Justice White said:

> The provisions of the (fourteenth) amendment as conclusively fixed by previous decisions are generic in their terms, are addressed, of course, to the States, but also to every person, whether natural or judicial, who is the repository of State power.

There is ample precedent for Federal intervention when State officers deny constitutional rights. In *Ex Parte Virginia* (100 U. S. 339 (1879)), the Supreme Court of the United States upheld punishment of a State judge who violated a law forbidding discrimination between white and colored persons in the selection of juries. In *Tarrence* v. *Florida* (188 U. S. 519 (1902)), the background of the recent Scottsboro decision, the Court said that administrative discrimination against Negroes in the selection of jury panels was "as potential in creating a denial of equality of rights as a discrimination made by law." In *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins* (118 U. S. 356 (1885)) the Court struck down the unequal enforcement of a statute that was fair upon its face.

When necessary the intervention of the Federal Government may extend to the intrusion of the Federal courts into the administration of State laws. In *Frank* v. *Mangum* (237 U. S. 309 (1914)) the question was raised whether the highest Federal court could act to set aside a conviction by a State where the outward form of State procedure had been observed while the substance of constitutional rights had been denied. Mr. Justice Holmes made the following classic statement:

> The argument for the appellee in substance is that the trial was in a court of competent jurisdiction, that it retains jurisdiction, although in fact it may be dominated by a mob, and that the ruling of the State court as to the fact of such domination cannot be reviewed. But the argument seems to us inconclusive. Whatever disagreement there may be as to the scope of the phrase "due process of law", there can be no doubt that it embraces the fundamental conception of a fair trial, with opportunity to be heard. Mob law does not become due process of law by securing the assent of a terrorized jury.
>
> We are not speaking of mere disorder, or mere irregularities in procedure, but of a case where the processes of justice are actually subverted. In such a case the Federal court has jurisdiction to issue the writ. The fact that the State court still has its general jurisdiction and is otherwise a competent court does not make it impossible to find that a jury has been subjected to intimidation in a particular case. The loss of jurisdiction is not general but particular, and proceeds from the control of a hostile influence.

Mr. Justice Holmes spoke in dissent, for the majority of the Court disagreed with him upon the facts. The present Chief Justice concurred in the Holmes opinion, and there can be no doubt that the words which I have quoted are an accurate expression of the law. In fact, in *Moore* v. *Dempsey* (261 U. S. 86) the Supreme Court held that a trial for murder in a State court where the jury was under the domination of the mob constituted a denial of due process of law and equal protection of the laws. The Court said:

> If the State, supplying no corrective process, carries into execution a judgment of death or imprisonment based upon a verdict thus produced by mob domination, the State deprives the accused of his life or liberty without due process of law. * * * If the case is that the whole proceeding is a mask, that counsel, jury, and judge were swept to the fatal end by an irresistible wave of public passion, and that the State courts failed to correct the wrong, neither perfection in the machinery for correction nor the possibility that the trial court and counsel saw no other way of avoiding an immediate outbreak of the mob can prevent this Court from securing to the petitioners their constitutional rights.

This case, of course, involved only the right of the Federal courts to set aside a verdict where prejudice against a defendant made the preservation of constitutional safeguards impossible. But the power must also exist in a second class of cases where the Constitution is ignored because of local prejudice in favor of an offender. Since a conviction can occur only by a trial in the court where conviction is rendered, this second class of cases requires the transfer of certain suits to the Federal courts upon proof of necessity. To that end, the present statute is directed.

This bill does not invade State rights. It interferes only with mob rule. Nowhere is the sentiment against lynching stronger, nowhere is the desire for Federal assistance in combatting the scourge within their midst more predominant than in those areas where lynching has reached its peak. Fifty-three million people, without regard to locality or walk of life, have united in pleading for the enactment of this Federal antilynching law. The sentiment for such a law is as wide-spread as the impulse of humanity; it is as deep-rooted as the spirit of Americanism; it is as imperishable as our Bill of Rights.

In the history of this country no campaign for civil justice has been waged in vain, and public opinion in the United States will never be satisfied until "Judge Lynch" is smothered under a heavy blanket of national resentment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on the motion to consider Senate bill 24, introduced by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], I desire to submit some remarks. I accord to the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from New York the highest motives in presenting the bill and asking for its immediate consideration, and, if I may be permitted, I wish to say that I am as much opposed to lynching as is either the Senator from Colorado or the Senator from New York. As a prosecuting officer many years ago it became my official duty to undertake the prosecution of offenders and to see that all parties before the court not only had a fair trial but had the protection of the court until they were legally either adjudicated guilty or were liberated, and I stand now as I stood then. I am opposed to lynching in any form whatever. It is a crime which deserves punishment. Mr. President, lynching is murder, of course. It is murder whether committed by three men or more than three men, and it is likewise murder if committed by one man.

The bill before us, however, raises very serious issues, not issues of sentiment. We readily agree with the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from New York in condemning lawlessness in any form, at any time, by anyone who may participate in the commission of crime. But the bill which these Senators now ask the Senate to take up for consideration constitutes a wholly new departure from all our preconceived conceptions as to the responsibility of the States within their own proper sphere, and of the Federal Government, on the other hand.

This particular bill, Mr. President, in section 1 provides that—

> The phrase "mob or riotous assemblage", when used in this act, shall mean an assemblage composed of three or more persons acting in concert, without authority of law, for the purpose of killing or injuring any person in the custody of any peace officer or suspected of, charged with, or convicted of the commission of any crime.

Mr. President, is it not just as great a violation of the rights of the person involved whether he be murdered by three men or one man? Are not his rights as greatly invaded whether he is assaulted on the highways or in public places by two individuals or whether the injury is suffered at the hands of three individuals? The point I am undertaking to suggest is that if we shall adopt the philosophy and the theory of this bill it will amount eventually to turning over to the Federal Government the prosecution of all crime within the States.

The Senator from New York a moment ago invoked the broad principle that any State which did not, through its officers—not as a State, but through the unauthorized acts of its officers—either by willful act or by neglect, accord to all men the same kind of trial so far as its just results are concerned, ought to come within the sphere of this bill.

What would that involve, Mr. President? In a State court one defendant is tried and acquitted. In another court a defendant is tried and convicted. Would it not in the final analysis involve the question of the Federal Government examining every case which could be tried and determining whether in each particular case the State, through its process of trial, had come to a just or a final conclusion?

Mr. President, this bill is builded on the theory that the fourteenth amendment authorizes its enactment. It will not be contended by these distinguished Senators that there was anything in the Constitution prior to the adoption of the fourteenth amendment which would authorize legislation of this character, but they contend that because the fourteenth amendment was adopted its provisions authorize this proposed legislation.

Let us for the moment advert to the fourteenth amendment and ascertain just what was contemplated by the enactment of that constitutional provision. In order to understand the implication of the fourteenth amendment we must know something of the background and of the purpose actuating those who proposed and secured its adoption. At that time many of the States had laws making distinction between different classes of citizens, and the purpose of the fourteenth amendment was to provide that no State, as a State, should make distinctions between different classes of American citizens.

What does the fourteenth amendment provide? I hope I shall not weary the Senate, but it seems to me that now and then it is a good thing for Senators to go back to the Constitution, read it, meditate upon it, and contemplate the possibilities and the limitations and the restrictions, as well as the power which that great instrument contains. No other time is better than today. In times of crisis and in times of emergency, under the stress often of well-meaning purposes, the greatest strain is put upon the Constitution and governmental processes and today is such a time. There is criticism throughout the land that many of the measures we have adopted are perhaps beyond the constitutional authority. We cannot afford now to inquire into all of those processes——

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURKE in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator think that it is rather invidious to mention the Constitution on the day following the consideration for over a week of the bill which on yesterday was recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry? It seems to me to be rather late in the day for Senators to be bringing up the subject of the Constitution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in this Republic, whatever our errors or our sins of commission or omission may have been in the past, I hope the time will never come when it can truthfully be said that it is too late to hold up the great charter of our Government, the great guaranties of the organic law, here in the Senate at least to admonish its Membership that we are still, in theory at least, bound by its provisions, just as we draw from it whatever authority we assume to exercise in this great Chamber.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just one further remark?

Mr. CONNALLY. I gladly yield.

Mr. CLARK. I agree thoroughly with the last remark of the Senator from Texas, and yet I might have hoped that in the case of the measure which has been under consideration for the last week or 10 days in this body, leading up to the action taken on it yesterday, and in the case of other measures which have been before the Senate during the last 2 years, Members had shown as much assiduity in getting out their manuals and studying the Constitution and recalling the constitutional provisions as is shown whenever a suggestion is made that steps be taken to prevent what, by common consent, is an outrageous perversion of the law.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri discloses to the Senate his great skill as a parliamentarian.

Just as one of the greatest tactical acts a shrewd lawyer can employ in the court room is to divert the attention of the court and jury, so one of the greatest pieces of strategy a parliamentarian can exercise is to divert the Senate from the immediate matter under consideration by holding up some other "horrible example" that has already transpired or is threatened in the future.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield in just a moment.

So today the Senator from Missouri is anxious to retry the question of the Bankhead bill which was before the Senate and which has already been disposed of for the present by being recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I therefore suggest to the Senator, if he is now more concerned with the Bankhead bill than he is with the measure now proposed and pending before the Senate, that he hie himself to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and there debate the constitutional question which he now raises and fertilize the rich fields of the Agricultural Committee with his oratory and his constitutional arguments.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just one further remark?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator from Texas is showing his superlative skill as a parliamentarian and as a dialectician by discussing the constitutionality of this measure, which, after all, is a proposition for the courts to determine, rather than discussing the merits of the proposition.

I have heard a great deal in past discussions on measures similar to the one now pending as to their constitutionality and have heard far-resounding and far-fetched theories of government expounded, but have heard very little about the merits of the proposition. It seems to me that the Senator from Texas is showing his superlative skill as a parliamentarian by discussing a very abstract proposition which, as I say, is, after all, for the courts to determine, rather than the merits of the bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Missouri, by his statements now, increases the high estimate which I placed upon his art and skill a little while ago. A few moments ago the Senator from Missouri was lamenting the fact that in the consideration of the Bankhead bill and other measures Senators had not gone back and consulted and pondered over and deliberated upon the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. CLARK. No, Mr. President, if the Senator will yield; what I was expressing was amazement at the fact that the first time in months we have heard of our old friend, the Constitution, from the Senator from Texas and from other Senators in this body is when an antilynching bill is brought into the Chamber.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, well, the Senator from Missouri in one breath complains that he has not been hearing the Constitution discussed and now he complains that it is being discussed at all. That is the implication from the

Senator's remarks. He asks, "Why have we not before heard of the Constitution?"

Mr. CLARK. Well, why have we not?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am going to tell the Senator. It is because the Senator and others like him have been so concerned with passing measures of a temporary and emergent character that they have probably not been concerned with a discussion of the Constitution. The Senator from Missouri has been lamenting that we have not heard the Constitution discussed, and now, when someone mentions the great charter of our constitutional Government, the Senator from Missouri, who is regretful that discussions of it have not rung through this Chamber for all these months, wants now to shoo it away; he says, "Let us hear no more of this old, outworn document! Why concern ourselves with something that was adopted 150 years ago? Those old fellows, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and George Washington, were very good men in their day and generation, but 150 summers have come and gone, 150 snows have descended upon their tombs and their graves, and why bring up in the Senate of the United States this old document which they formed and fashioned and gave to an infant republic?"

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I will not interrupt the Senator any more.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I will say that I am glad to see my friend the Senator from Texas returning to the consideration of the Constitution. I am certain that the Senator from Texas, when I first knew him many years ago, had as high regard for the Constitution as had anybody else I have ever known, and I am glad to see him coming back to his pristine views; but I submit that it would appear with better grace if the process of return had been a little more gradual than the time between the action on the Bankhead bill yesterday and the Wagner-Costigan bill of today.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator pays me too great a compliment in saying that I have returned. I stand now where I have always stood.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator means on the bill which is under discussion.

Mr. CONNALLY. I stand now where I have always stood on the Constitution, about which we are talking. The Senator from Missouri says that constitutional questions are purely questions for the courts and not for the Senate. Mr. President, if that be the case, why lift our hands when we are sworn in as Senators and assume an obligation that we will defend and protect and uphold the Constitution of the United States?

I regard the Senate of the United States as being as much bound by the Constitution as are the courts bound by it. Is there anywhere a Senator or a citizen, either within these four walls or out yonder in the provinces, as no doubt the Senator from Missouri would regard the States, who either hears my voice now or may, in some unguarded moment, read my remarks in the RECORD——

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Not at this time; I shall yield in a moment—who would say that the President of the United States in passing upon legislation, in exercising the high functions of his great office, should leave all questions as to the constitutionality of measures to the decision of the Supreme Court.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am at a loss to understand why the Senator from Texas should suggest that I regard the States as mere "provinces."

Mr. CONNALLY. I should have said "perhaps."

Mr. CLARK. I did not vote for the Economy Act; I did not vote for the N. R. A.; I did not vote for the A. A. A.; yesterday I was not intending to vote for the Bankhead bill; and I may say further that I do not intend to vote for the amendments to the A. A. A., all of which are measures designed to reduce the States to the status of provinces. The Senator from Texas can make his own explanation, but I do object to his imputing to me any disposition to regard the States as "provinces."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I believe, in view of the Senator's remarks, and the tendency of his mind toward this proposed legislation, and my contention that the proposed legislation does devitalize the courts of the States, that I was warranted in making the reference to the fact that he probably regarded the States as provinces; but I withdraw that remark; I do not want to do any injustice to any Senator, and least of all to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Missouri upon his courage in voting against the various measures to which he has made reference. I am glad of the opportunity of furnishing the occasion for his being able to put into the RECORD these excerpts, which possibly may be of use to him in future political campaigns. If I have served the country and the democracy by contributing to that favorable result, I shall count myself most happy.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for just one further remark, I thank the Senator, while he is putting into the RECORD statements which he thinks may serve him in the future in a political way, for permitting me the opportunity to express a few real heartfelt opinions.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad the Senator today has expressed his "heart-felt opinions." I had hoped that he had always done that here in the Senate, but I am glad to have them expressed today.

Now, Mr. President, returning to the point of my remarks to which I undertook to direct the attention of the Senate a moment ago, and to reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri that the Senate and the House of Representatives should not concern themselves with the constitutionality of measures which come before them and that all constitutional questions should be remitted to the Federal courts and to the Supreme Court, let me say that I do not subscribe to that doctrine. I do not believe the great men who formed the Constitution ever contemplated that the Senate which they were creating and the House of Representatives which they were creating should close their eyes, put shutters on their minds, and ignore absolutely their conception and their construction of the Constitution and the limitations which that great document placed upon the rights of the people, both in order to protect them and to guarantee them against the invasion of those rights by the Federal Government or any of its agencies.

I conceive it to be the duty of every Senator, I conceive it to be the duty of every Member of the House, when any measure comes before him, first to examine at the bar of his own judgment and at the bar of his own conscience whether or not that measure is within the jurisdiction of the Congress under the terms of the Federal Constitution as it has been construed, not alone by the courts but as it has been construed by the Congress itself in years which have passed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield further to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, I enunciated no such doctrine as the Senator from Texas has undertaken to put in my mouth. I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Texas that it is the business of Representatives and Senators, sworn on their oaths, as much as it is the duty of the judges of the Supreme Court and the inferior courts, to consider and examine the constitutionality of proposed laws before voting on them. All I was doing was to express again surprise that it is only when such a measure as this, having to do with a subject such as lynching, is submitted that the Constitution, long in retirement, is trotted out, its front repainted, its joints mended, and put in the forefront of the action.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am pained to hear the remark of the Senator from Missouri that the Constitution has long since been put in retirement. That may be the attitude of the Senator from Missouri, though I hope it is

not. It may be the attitude of some Senators, but I know it is not the attitude of a great many Senators.

This is not the first measure against which I have voted on the ground that we had no power under the Constitution to enact it. The Senator a moment ago adverted to the fact that he voted against the N. R. A.

Mr. CLARK. On that ground.

Mr. CONNALLY. If I may be permitted to class myself with such distinguished company, I, too, voted against the N. R. A., and one of the chief reasons why I voted against the N. R. A. was that I did not believe that under the commerce clause of the Constitution the Federal Government had the power to go into each community and deal with purely intrastate traffic, deal with barber shops, cleaning and dyeing establishments, garages, hotels, and other facilities of that character which are purely local, which do not produce any article of commerce that is shipped from one State to another, but which are purely service organizations and service industries.

So, Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri is entitled to a Distinguished Service Cross for having voted against the N. R. A., I crave that I may at least be awarded a humble little ribbon to mark my comradeship with him in reverencing the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LOGAN. I have tried rather carefully to observe constitutional questions since I have been in the Senate. It appears to me that when a Senator is for a bill he can always find something in the Constitution which will justify its enactment, and therefore he concludes it is constitutional. But if he is against the bill, he can always find something in the Constitution which he believes renders it unconstitutional, and therefore he is against the bill. After all, we generally bring in the Constitution to support us in our opposition to a bill or in our support of a bill. Is not that true as to all the legislation which comes before us?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Kentucky makes a very sweeping charge. I should not go quite so far as does the Senator from Kentucky. He says he has found that in all cases when a Senator is for a bill he finds constitutional warrant for it, and when he is against a bill he likewise finds constitutional warrant for his position.

Mr. CLARK started to leave the Chamber.

Mr. CONNALLY. I regret that the Senator from Missouri sees fit to leave the Chamber just as I am coming to the most interesting part of the discussion.

Mr. CLARK. I thought the Senator had concluded the most interesting part of his remarks.

Mr. CONNALLY. That suggestion does not comport with the very high compliment the Senator paid me earlier. He suggests now that I have already concluded the most interesting part of the discussion; but since my remarks have heretofore been almost wholly devoted to a discussion of the Senator and his opinion, I am not surprised at all that he considers that the most interesting part of my remarks has been concluded.

Mr. CLARK. Naturally I agree to that suggestion. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. I desire to have the RECORD show that while I should greatly deplore the absence of the Senator from Missouri I would not in any wise interfere with his convenience or comfort, and he is at liberty to depart.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to have the RECORD show that the Senator's remarks heretofore have been interesting, but if the Senator thinks he may come to more interesting matter, I desire to remain and hear him.

Mr. CONNALLY. I can relieve the Senator's embarrassment by stating that I expect now to discuss the constitutional questions, in which the Senator has shown so little interest. If I find it necessary or desirable to make any reference to him I shall do so when he shall have returned to the Chamber, in order that he may enjoy that particular portion of my remarks.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator's remarks on the Constitution will naturally be so weighty that I should prefer to read his remarks in the RECORD and have access to the law library when I consider them, rather than to consider them offhand during the debate of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I commend the Senator's desire for access to the law library as often and at as great length as it is possible for him to devote himself to it, because anyone who has shown, as he has by his remarks, a lack of appreciation of even a mention of the Constitution of the United States in this Chamber, certainly ought to consult not only that great document itself but some of its interpretations by the courts.

Mr. President, these remarks are submitted with great affection for the Senator from Missouri, but nevertheless with a feeling of sadness. I remember the Senator from Missouri when he was Parliamentarian in the House of Representatives. I remember then how he venerated and almost adored the Constitution of the United States. That was at a time when he was not dependent upon public favor for tenure of the office which he held. He held office by political appointment. He rendered distinguished service in that position.

No one was more gratified, either in the State of Missouri or beyond the confines of that great Commonwealth, than myself when he was elected to the United States Senate—elected at the end of a heated and interesting campaign, elected after the hurly-burly, the confusion, the tumult of contending factions. I regret, Mr. President, after these things have transpired, to find that one who in his youth was devoted to the Constitution, loved every line of that great old document, consulted it daily as he advised the House of Representatives and the Speaker with reference to rulings upon parliamentary questions, with his very soul saturated and permeated by its throbbing principles, after a few political campaigns sees fit to stand on the floor of the United States Senate and speak of the Constitution as an outworn document, one that should not be consulted by the Senate or the House, but should be relegated alone to the courts and the protection of the Supreme Court of the United States.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall in just a moment. Let me observe that when the Constitution of the United States comes to the point where its only defenders are in the Supreme Court, the Constitution and these institutions of ours will soon crumble and disappear. The Constitution, if it is to survive, ought to have the love and affection of every citizen who is capable of bearing arms, of every man who loves Anglo-Saxon institutions, of everyone who has the courage to stand up against the mob, against the fury and the prejudice and the passion of political campaigns, and to resist every movement engendered by expediency which would seek to weaken or to destroy the strength and the fortitude of its great fabrics.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, of course I thank, from the bottom of my heart, the distinguished Senator from Texas for his very kind personal remarks about myself, which are simply an evidence of the very sincere mutual esteem and even affection which developed between us many years ago, when the Senator from Texas was a Member of the House of Representatives and I was Parliamentarian of that body.

I hope, however, the Senator will not continue to put in my mouth words which I did not use. I do not wish to delay the Senator from Texas from the very weighty discussion of the Constitution, which he has been promising us for some time, but which he has been postponing by this discussion with me. All I have done in the course of this discussion was to express surprise, after listening to the Senator from Texas on the subject of the Bankhead tenant-farmer bill, and the oil bill, and the A. A. A. bill, and several other bills which have been before this body, to see, after long estrangement, my old friend the Senator from Texas and my old friend the Constitution of the United States suddenly appear arm in arm at the suggestion of an anti-lynching bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri provoked such remarks as the Senator from Texas has made; and I hope the Senator from Texas has not been unfair. It is not his purpose to be unfair. The Senator from Missouri listened yesterday for some hours to the discussion by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] of the constitutionality of this measure. He listened, I assume, this morning to something like an hour's discussion of the constitutional and legal aspects of this bill by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. It is a little curious that the Senator from Missouri should sit and listen and deliberate upon the arguments presented by these Senators on the Constitution and on the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, and then, when one for whom he professes such warm esteem and such marvelous affection essays to spend 30 minutes by the clock discussing the Constitution, the decisions of the Supreme Court, and the motion to take up this particular bill, that his soul should be so disturbed that he cannot tolerate the humble and feeble remarks which the Senator from Texas is undertaking to make to the Senate.

I forgive the Senator, though. I know how anxious he is to enact legislation. I realize that he believes in expeditious action on all these measures. I saw him only a few days ago, when the Bankhead bill was before the Senate, stand upon this floor and urge expedition, urge that prompt action be taken, notwithstanding he spent a considerable period of the Senate's time in proposing amendments, in urging motions, and in similar action.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator will be unable to find in the RECORD that I consumed one moment of the Senate's time, that I discussed any amendment, or the bill itself, or made any motion, or spoke in support of any motion, other than on a question of order for about 2 minutes on yesterday afternoon.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did I say the Bankhead bill? I had in mind the Copeland pure-food bill, Mr. President. I beg the Senator's pardon. I had, in my own mind, reference to the Copeland pure-food bill. As I remember now, the Senator from Missouri was concerned with that bill. He was very much against it. He was opposed then to the Federal Government interfering with advertising with regard to pure foods and drugs.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator again is misstating my position, if he will yield to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield. I do not wish to misstate the Senator's position.

Mr. CLARK. I took no such position. I am very much in favor of a pure food and drugs bill. I opposed certain phases of that bill, such as declaring that a crutch or an electrical apparatus for conditioning air in a room was a drug. I opposed such provisions as that after a regulation of the Secretary of Agriculture had been declared invalid by a court, the Secretary of Agriculture should have authority to put the very same measure into effect for 6 months as a temporary regulation. I opposed certain other provisions of the bill; but I have expressed my willingness and desire at all times to be in favor of a proper bill on that subject.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I certainly do not wish to be unfair or even ungenerous to the Senator from Missouri. All I meant to observe was that he was concerned with that bill. He had a right to be. He had a right to oppose it as it was written, and he took up some of the time of the Senate in endeavoring to correct it and criticize it. I commend him for it.

Mr. President, this is the Senate of the United States. This is the place for criticism of legislation. This is the place to discuss legislation. This is the forum ordained by the great Republic under which we live to hammer out and fight out and discuss legislation; and no matter how humble that legislation may be, I, for one, am in favor of its thorough discussion. That is what I am contending for here today.

What I meant to suggest was that the Senator from Missouri, when he was discussing a pure-food bill, was opposed to the Federal Government going in and tinkering with some of the subjects dealt with in that bill. That was a violation of the Constitution. That was a rape of the great organic law; but when it comes to a bill like this, which overthrows the courts of Missouri and of other States in the Union, I am wondering why the Senator from Missouri should be so concerned that a Senator should rise and discuss the Constitution of the United States.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I regret, I may say, to appear in the attitude of assisting in a filibuster on this motion. I regret very much that I made the initial inquiry of the Senator from Texas. So far as I am concerned, I am quite content to let the exchange of compliments and other personalities between the Senator from Texas and myself now pass, if the Senator will proceed to the discussion of the constitutional question which he has been threatening for so long.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be very glad to proceed, and I should have long since proceeded, except for the necessity, in view of the inquiries of the Senator from Missouri, of vindicating the right of every Senator on this floor to discuss the Constitution and the decisions of the courts.

Mr. President, this is the Senate. This is not the same Chamber, but this is the same institution where Clay and Webster and Calhoun and Benton from Missouri itself fought out great constitutional issues and fashioned and shaped the public opinion of the people of the United States in a formative era in American life. Whenever the time comes that the representatives of the people on this floor or on the floor of the House of Representatives are not privileged to discuss at length, if need be, the Constitution of the United States, then indeed will this Republic be in peril.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, is the Senator from Texas talking about the same Constitution that Benton and Webster and Clay and Calhoun discussed?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas does not recognize two Constitutions. He is talking about one. I do not know what the Senator from Virginia adverts to. I am sure the Senator from Virginia is not in the same frame of mind as is the Senator from Missouri, and yet the incident illustrates how valuable it is that we should have in the Senate representatives of every type of thought as to constitutional construction and men with divergent views. The Senator from Virginia is devoted to the Constitution. He tries to cast his votes on the floor of the Senate in accordance with the Constitution; and I am sure he has no objection to the Constitution, as it applies to any pending measure, being discussed on this floor.

Mr. GLASS. Not in the least. I just wanted to know what Constitution the Senator was discussing.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to enlighten the Senator from Virginia. The Constitution which the Senator is discussing is the one found within these leather covers, of which the Senator from Virginia is entitled to one copy; and if he does not already possess it, I shall be very glad to intercede with the Superintendent of Documents to obtain for him a copy of the Constitution.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TRUMAN in the chair). The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. LONG. Ought not these irrelevant matters to be left out of this discussion? Senators will be talking about the Mother Goose Almanac before we get through. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator says "these irrelevant matters." "These" is a very inclusive term. I am wondering if the Senator included what has just transpired. [Laughter.]

The Senator from Texas is not going to discuss the Mother Goose Almanac. He will leave that to the Senator from Louisiana, if he desires, or to other Senators who may be more interested in Mother Goose than in the Constitution

of the United States; and, speaking of Mother Goose, she has been one of the most prolific breeders in all the history of the world.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to discuss the fourteenth amendment, and what I conceive to be the lack of authority in the fourteenth amendment to permit the enactment of the pending bill.

This measure is based upon the theory that the Federal Government will not only hold responsible individuals within the States but it will hold responsible counties, municipalities, and political subdivisions, and will assess damages upon the counties and the subdivisions for the violation by individuals of the terms of this bill.

Mr. President, it will not now be contended that when the Constitution was originally formed it contained provisions authorizing such legislation as that now proposed. But it is said that when the fourteenth amendment was adopted authority was thereby granted for the legislation which is sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

I wish to congratulate these Senators for their courage in offering a measure which, according to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK], will include within the Federal authority labor disputes and riots arising out of labor difficulties.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. In just a moment I shall yield. Recognizing the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] as being one of the foremost representatives of the laboring men of the Union, and recalling that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has toiled incessantly in behalf of the interests of the laboring men of the Union, I realize that it requires a high degree of courage and is an evidence of outstanding statesmanship when the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from New York present a bill to the Senate which would authorize bringing before the bar of Federal courts labor unions, or those who are opposed to labor unions, who may engage in riots or other clashes which may result in bloodshed or serious injury.

I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is certain that the Senator from Texas, who always endeavors to be accurate, has not purposely departed from the RECORD. A careful reading of the RECORD, however, will, I believe, convince him, as it did me, that the Senator from Alabama did not go so far as the Senator from Texas at the moment assumes he went. The Senator from Alabama suggested, after a brief colloquy, which was not concluded, that he thought some plausible excuse would be provided for a pretended drive against members of organized labor. The Senator from New York and I hold the opposite conviction.

I ought, perhaps, to add that in my own State—and I say this in view of the reference made by the able Senator from Texas to some of my experiences—the difficulties encountered by members of organized labor were largely not with Federal courts but with State courts and other State agencies. Nor do I think that experience differs very greatly from the experience of organized labor in other parts of the Union.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I assure the Senator that I do not want to misrepresent him. I heard the colloquy here last evening, and I predicated my statement upon the assumption of the Senator from Alabama. The Senator from Alabama, as is well known, is also a great friend and representative of the interests of laboring man. I do him full justice, I believe, when I class him with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Alabama is anxious that labor unions be not included, and for that reason he pointed out that, under the bill of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Colorado, it would be possible for the Federal Government to take jurisdiction.

Let me suggest this to the Senator from Colorado. He said a moment ago that in the labor disputes in the State of Colorado the troubles the laboring man had experienced had been with the State courts. Of course they have been with the State courts and not with the Federal courts, because under the Constitution and under our present system the State alone has jurisdiction to try those charged with the offenses of riot and assault and murder. But once it is established by such a measure as the one we are discussing that the Federal Government has the right to intervene in any State whenever the State does not accord the same degree of trial and the same kind of trial to every individual, when that precedent is established, Mr. President, is there any reason why it should not extend to the men who belong to labor unions just as it extends to men who do not belong to labor unions?

Mr. President, I am opposed to the whole bill. I am opposed to taking it up. Let me ask the Senator from Colorado a question. If the doctrine is sound that the Federal Government should have jurisdiction to try any three or more men who act together and bring about the injury of an individual, or the death of an individual, then when three or more labor union men are engaged in an unlawful assemblage, or a riot, and do injury to some private individual, or take his life, why should they not be brought before the bar of judgment in a Federal court like every other citizen of this Republic?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. I frequently vote, and always like to vote, in behalf of labor. There is no sanctity about membership in a labor union, however. It does not give any man a higher privilege than is enjoyed by every other citizen of this Republic. If this bill is to apply to ordinary citizens, three in number or more, then why should it not apply to every citizen regardless of whether be belongs to a labor union or belongs to that great mass of our citizenship who, outside of labor unions, toil and produce and consume throughout the Republic?

I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] is present, and, of course, can enlarge upon his suggestion of last evening.

What I originally rose to suggest was that the Senator from Texas had, quite inadvertently, of course, somewhat altered precisely what the Senator from Alabama stated at the time. This is the language of the Senator from Alabama as reported in this morning's RECORD, referring to the measure under consideration:

> It would certainly give to the peace officers a wonderful excuse for stating that they were afraid they would be tried and indicted in a Federal court.

That apparently is not the statement which the Senator from Texas understood the Senator from Alabama to make.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. In just a moment. I shall say to the Senator from Colorado that I did not undertake to reproduce word for word what the Senator from Alabama said, but I thought I would direct the Senator's attention to what the Senator from Alabama said so that he would know I was relying on the issue which the Senator from Alabama had raised. It may be that the Senator from Alabama was incorrect. It may be that I gave too broad an interpretation to his interruption. I certainly had no intention of misleading anyone, because I made specific reference to the fact that the Senator from Alabama had made the suggestion. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I do not know exactly what statement was made today, but the question I asked was based upon my belief that the bill as it is written would give the greatest weapon to the opponents of labor organizations that has ever been extended to them since the beginning of the history of this Government.

I base my statement on this fact: I do not believe there is any lawyer who can read this bill and not be convinced that every time three or more members of a labor organization meet, when they are on a strike, and it can be charged that they have the intention of injuring somebody——

Mr. CONNALLY. Suppose they do injure somebody?

Mr. BLACK. And they also do injure somebody; they can then be tried in a Federal court.

This is the point I have in mind: For years and years and years the labor organizations have been seeking to deprive the Federal courts of that very jurisdiction.

Mr. CONNALLY. By injunction, the Senator means.

Mr. BLACK. Yes. It took many years for the Norris-LaGuardia bill to pass. The only jurisdiction which was had under that law was by contempt proceedings. I wish to state that I think the laboring men of this country have had no better friends in the Senate than the two Senators who offer the pending bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. I said so.

Mr. BLACK. Five minutes before I asked the question yesterday afternoon, was the first time, I should say, that I had read the bill since it came from the committee.

I was familiar with the fact that the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution was offered by those who desired to protect certain persons whom they thought might be injured on account of race. I knew there were very laudable motives behind a great many who supported the fourteenth amendment. Only recently, however, I have had sent to me, as has every other Senator, a little magazine called "the American Review", referring to corporate growth in this Nation; and I found that although the fourteenth amendment was intended to protect members of the colored race, it had served to protect not them, except in a very few instances, but it had served to protect corporate greed and cupidity. It had served, as we all know, to paralyze the arms of the States of the Union in their efforts to protect the people from corporate cupidity.

The figures are given in the magazine to which I referred, and show in the 20-year period from 1890 to 1910 that there were 529 cases involving the fourteenth amendment. I am reading from that magazine:

> Of these, 19 concerned the Negro race. Two hundred and eighty-nine related to corporations.

The remainder related not to corporations but to those who were standing in their place claiming that there was an injury to a property right. So, while it was the intention of many generous-hearted men and women, by the fourteenth amendment, to bring about relief to the Negro race, instead of that it has been utilized for the purpose of injuring the very people it was intended to protect.

I call attention thereto for the reason I am absolutely sure from my study of this bill, and having represented the United Mine Workers and other organizations in my State in strikes and in various controversies they have had, that if this bill should pass in its present form it would give the strongest weapon that was ever placed in the hands of their enemies to strike them to death. That is what I intend to call attention to. I do not know just exactly what the statement was to which I replied yesterday, but I am sure that this bill will accomplish the very purpose I stated if it should be passed in its present form, and I cannot understand how it is that the attorneys of the great organizations of labor have failed to see up to this date exactly what this bill would do to them if it should be passed.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. With full appreciation of the generous words of both the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] I desire to say that the Senator from New York and I do not share the apprehensions expressed. I desire also to thank the Senator from Alabama for making clear this morning, as I think he did not make clear last night, the extent of his concern and the grounds on which he bases that concern.

Without interrupting the Senator from Texas at this moment, and reserving, of course, the right to refer to the subject at a later time, I merely suggest to the two able Senators, whose admirer I am, that if they will join in the preparation of some constructive amendment which they really believe will protect the reasonable and lawful activities of organized labor, and on the adoption of such an amendment will support the pending bill, I shall, of course, be happy to endeavor to cooperate with them.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We are dealing with a very important bill, and we are having a very able discussion of it. I think we should have more Members of the Senate present to hear this able discussion, and 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:

Adams	Connally	Johnson	Pittman
Ashurst	Coolidge	Keyes	Pope
Austin	Copeland	King	Radcliffe
Bachman	Costigan	La Follette	Robinson
Bailey	Couzens	Lewis	Russell
Bankhead	Cutting	Logan	Schall
Barbour	Dickinson	Lonergan	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Dieterich	Long	Sheppard
Bilbo	Donahey	McAdoo	Shipstead
Black	Duffy	McCarran	Smith
Bone	Fletcher	McGill	Steiwer
Borah	Frazier	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Gerry	McNary	Townsend
Bulkley	Gibson	Metcalf	Trammell
Bulow	Glass	Minton	Truman
Burke	Gore	Moore	Vandenberg
Byrd	Guffey	Murphy	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hale	Murray	Wagner
Capper	Harrison	Neely	Walsh
Caraway	Hastings	Norris	Wheeler
Carey	Hatch	O'Mahoney	White
Clark	Hayden	Overton	

Mr. LEWIS. I regret to announce the absence of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] on account of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, when I was last interrupted, I was endeavoring to refer to the fourteenth amendment, and to discuss the pending bill in relation thereto.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] suggests that if the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Texas will draw amendments to the bill, which will make it clear that it does not apply to labor unions, and will thereby promise to support the bill, he will also be glad to exempt labor unions. I fear the Senator from Colorado wholly misunderstood the attitude of the Senator from Texas. If this bill is unconstitutional as to one man, it is unconstitutional as to all men. If it is unconstitutional from the viewpoint of the Senator from Texas as to citizens who are not alined with labor unions, it would be likewise unconstitutional when applied to labor unions. On the other hand, according to the view of the Senator from Texas, if it is not wrong, if it is not criminal for a labor union to kill a man, why should it be unlawful for anybody else to kill a man?

The Senator from Texas takes the view that murder is wrong whether it be committed by John Jones or Bill Smith. Murder is wrong whether committed by a man who belongs to a labor union or by a man who does not belong to a labor union. It is wrong whether committed upon a black man by a white man or upon a white man by a black man.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Senator from Texas, of course, understands that the pending bill does not undertake in any way to interfere with the laws with respect to murder. That was clearly stated last night; and there is no purpose whatever under the measure to deal with anything but the crime of lynching. It is quite unnecessary to incorporate in this measure any provision with respect to murder.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the only difference in that respect between the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Texas is that the Senator from Texas thinks that a murder is a murder, whether committed by one man or by three men. He condemns murder in whatever form it comes; and the Senator from Texas has always abhorred and does now abhor the crime of lynching, just as he abhors all other forms of murder. The Senator from Texas is not simply speaking idle words; he has proven them as a public officer time and time again.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado a question. He states that this bill is intended to deal only with lynching. I should like to ask him to state what is comprehended in the word "lynching"; what is meant by that term?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The purpose of the proposed act is to deal with offenses committed by a mob or unlawful assemblage, as defined in the measure, organized for the purpose of inflicting serious bodily injury or death upon an individual. What I said was that the laws with reference to murder, which inflict severer penalties than those imposed by the pending bill, will be in no sense touched by the proposed legislation.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from Texas?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. GLASS. The Senator from Texas is much better informed in regard to legal matters than am I. I ask him does he know a State in the United States which has not laws against lynching?

Mr. CONNALLY. I know of none, although I have no detailed information as to all.

Mr. GLASS. I know my State has a very severe statute against lynching.

Mr. CONNALLY. And a number of other States have. The Senator from Ohio yesterday called my attention to the fact that the State of Ohio has a strong statute on the subject.

Mr. SMITH. And my State, the State that, I suppose, was the beginning of all this proposed legislation, as it was the first State to secede, not only has a law against lynching but a law which provides for the payment of an indemnity to the family of the person who is lynched.

Mr. GLASS. So does the statute of Virginia provide for such an indemnity, as I recall.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, again referring to the labor angle of this controversy, I wish to submit to the Senator from Colorado a concrete case. In my State a couple of years ago there was a strike of stevedores or longshoremen, or whatever the term is that applies to men who work on the docks. The companies brought in strikebreakers, who were protected by officers, and other men who were on strike organized a group, and there ensued almost a pitched battle, in which one or two men were killed. Under the terms of this bill, with all due deference to the judgment of the Senator from Colorado, it occurs to me that that kind of situation would be covered by the bill. Here was a group of men, more than three; they were organized; they were armed; they went down, and, without knowing which side was to blame, because I do not know, there came about an armed clash; homicide was committed; several men were injured. Why is not that just as much a mob under this bill as any other sort of a mob; and if this bill comprehends other similar acts, why does it not also comprehend that act?

I am not for the measure in any of its provisions, because I wish to leave the exercise of sovereignty with respect to murder and other criminal offenses within the States where they have always resided; but if we are to embrace this doctrine, whether we embrace it now or embrace it at some future time, you are going to set a precedent which will rise up to face you in the years to come, and you will be charged with having set a precedent whereby the Federal Government can go into any State and bring before the bar of justice any private citizen acting in concert with another, in a labor union or out of a labor union, who is charged with any form of violence.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In the case cited by the distinguished Senator from Texas were there subsequent prosecutions for murder?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think so.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Senator's experience is entirely in line with my own. In every industrial dispute of the type mentioned by him with which I am familiar—and we had one years ago in which hundreds of men were indicted, under a dragnet conspiracy charge, for murder in which they did not participate—in every industrial dispute of that character, my experience is that the charge of murder has been filed against the members of organized labor under State laws.

Mr. CONNALLY. To be sure.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Here is a proposed statute which imposes much less serious penalties, and which would naturally not be resorted to under conditions of that sort, because the purpose in an industrial dispute, under the customary facts, would be to promote better industrial conditions and not to injure or kill by lynching, as provided for by the bill under consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator from Colorado a question. If one man is killed by a mob which is composed of labor strikers or sympathizers and another man is killed by another mob which has no relation to labor, why should not the same rule apply to both? Why is it a crime in the one case and not a crime in the other case?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The purpose of the particular measure is, of course, to deal with a community form of lawlessness which everybody in the country, as the Senator well knows, recognizes under the title of "lynching." That type of community offense promoted by certain psychological factors which are familiar to courts, lawyers, and to the general public, is the crime which is to come under the ban of the proposed legislation. Its terms are moderate. There is no reason to resort to it in any case in which murder is duly and appropriately charged.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator from Colorado is correct, though I do not think he is, does he mean to say that wherever the State indicts a mob, or any member of a mob, for murder, then the bill would not apply?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That was not my intended statement. My statement is that if a mob has been organized to lynch a man and a sufficient number of people participate in the offense, as defined in the bill, the bill would apply; but under the ordinary laws with respect to murder, the ordinary processes of the State courts would be utilized and a conviction for a much graver offense in terms of punishment would undoubtedly be sought by the constituted authorities.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the vice in the attitude of the Senator from Colorado, as it is the vice in the attitude of many others who propose departures from our well-known balances between the States and the Federal Government, is that he proposes to give the Federal Government the power to determine when the State has properly punished people, and if the State has properly proceeded then the Federal Government will not intervene. Does not the Senator from Colorado see that the power to decide when and how the State government has performed its function is the power to oust the State completely, because it is a power to decide when the Federal Government shall intervene?

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. LOGAN. I cannot follow the argument of the Senator from Texas. Of course, the State has its laws, and for a violation of those laws the State authorities have absolute power; but if a Federal law which has been or can be enacted would give the Federal Government control, then a violation of the Federal law would be a separate offense. It would be an offense against another jurisdiction. I do not see how the State could be ousted of its jurisdiction at all.

Mr. CONNALLY. I regret that it is impossible for the Senator from Kentucky to follow the Senator from Texas.

Mr. LOGAN. I meant on that point only.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not mean to intimate that the Senator would follow the Senator from Texas on every point. Aside from that, of course, the Senator from Texas recognizes that within its proper sphere the Federal Government may enact any law within its constitutional power, and such a law operates directly on the citizen. It does not operate through the State as a subdivision of the Federal Government. It operates directly on the citizen, and the citizen is amenable to the Federal Government.

The State within its proper sphere may enact a law. It operates, not through the counties but directly upon the citizen himself. He owes two allegiances. There are two responsibilities. For instance, the Federal Government levies income taxes. We do not apportion those taxes to the States, but those taxes operate on every citizen of the Republic, and that obligation is an obligation which he owes to Washington. The State may levy an income tax or other tax, and it operates on the citizen directly in its own way.

When it comes to a criminal law, if the crime is one over which the United States Government has jurisdiction to deal, the citizen is guilty or not guilty, as the facts may indicate. For instance, the Federal Government had a prohibition law and the States had prohibition laws. If a man sold liquor in violation of both laws, he could be punished twice. Why? Because he owed the obligation to the Federal Government to observe its law; and when he violated the Federal law, he was punishable in a Federal court. If by the same act he violated the law of Virginia or the law of Nebraska on the liquor question, he was subject then to punishment in the State courts, and the Federal conviction could not be urged as a bar.

Does the Senator from Kentucky agree with that view?

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, I never heard a clearer statement of the law as it really is than has just been made by the Senator from Texas. There is no ousting of jurisdiction of the State court, as I understood the Senator to say a while ago. It is simply a punishment for violation of a Federal law which belongs to the Federal courts, and a punishment for a violation of a State law which belongs to the State courts. The Senator has very correctly explained it, and I am entirely satisfied on that point.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator very kindly. I think that is the most sweeping approval I have ever had from any of the higher courts. [Laughter.]

The Senator from Kentucky states that murder is now an act against the law of the State. Of course it is. The Senator from Kentucky contends that if the Federal Government has the power, it may also come along and enact a law which makes that same offense punishable again by the Federal Government. Of course, that is true if the Federal Government has the constitutional power. My contention is, and I hope to demonstrate, not by my edict, not by my fiat, but by the solemn pronouncements of the Supreme Court of the United States, that the Federal Government has not now jurisdiction to do that thing, and never had it under the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

To vindicate what the Senator from Texas said a moment ago, if the State indicts and punishes a man for a violation of a State law relating to the crime of murder or personal injury to an individual, he is acquitted or he is convicted, as the case may be.

If the Federal Government can come along after that has transpired and try him again for the same offense, is not that in essence at least an ouster of the jurisdiction of the State? Suppose he is acquitted by the State court. He may then be haled into court and tried for the same crime, for the same murder.

Oh, no; I am in error. That may be done if there are more than three involved. If only one man murders another, the Federal Government, according to the bill now before us, is not concerned with whether the fourteenth amendment has been violated; but if more than three people murder a man, then and then only will the Federal Government seek to vindicate the rights and powers of the citizen under the fourteenth amendment.

Mr. GLASS and Mr. COSTIGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will yield first to the Senator from Virginia, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GLASS. Does not the Constitution of the United States provide that a man shall not be twice placed in jeopardy of his life for the same offense?

Mr. CONNALLY. It does. I shall say to the Senator from Virginia in all fairness, that according to my conception of the Federal Constitution that provision relates only to the power of the Federal Government; in other words, the Federal Government shall not put him in jeopardy twice for the same offense.

I believe the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] will agree with me in that statement. The reason why I say that is that all the limitations in the Constitution of the United States, except where it is plainly evident to the contrary, are limitations on the Federal power and not on the State power, except in those cases where it provides that no State shall do this and no State shall do that. The other limitations on governmental power, generally speaking, are limitations on the Federal power.

Mr. GLASS. Has there ever been any determination of that question in the courts? For instance, if a man should be tried for murder in Texas and acquitted, and an attempt were made to reindict him and try him again, would there not be an appeal to the Supreme Court on that constitutional question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know for the moment of any case exactly like that which the Senator suggests, but I will say that the Federal court might inquire as to whether or not the State had jurisdiction of the offense. If it found that it had jurisdiction, it would not go any further; it would stop right there. I think I am correct in that. I will say to the Senator from Virginia, however, that there are cases defining the scope of the clause as to right of trial by jury, as guaranteed in the Constitution.

Mr. GLASS. Does that mean only trial by jury in the Federal courts?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is guaranteed to the citizen only in the Federal courts. I will ask the Senator from Idaho if that is not true?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. For instance, there are police courts in many States, I understand, that have no juries, and a man cannot obtain a jury trial. That is not held to be a violation of the Federal guaranty of a jury trial. The Federal guaranty of a jury trial means that no citizen of the United States shall be tried by the Federal Government without having the right to a trial by jury. I will say to the Senator from Virginia that I think I am correct in that.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In the course of the very enlightening discussion of the Senator from Texas, will he be good enough at some time to state whether he was opposed to the Lindbergh kidnaping law; and whether, at the time of its enactment, he interposed the objections he is now making with

respect both to its possible application to members of organized labor and its possible invasion of State sovereignty?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas does not remember how he voted on the Lindbergh kidnaping bill; but let us assume he voted for it. I assume he did. That is wholly a different case in this respect: The Lindbergh kidnaping law was applicable only in cases where the criminals transported the kidnaped person across State lines. While I have never agreed to many of the extreme views of those who contend that under the commerce clause of the Constitution the Federal Government can do almost anything it desires, I feel that the Senator from Colorado will recognize the fact that the interstate-kidnaping law was based solely and alone upon the theory, at least, that the Federal Government, under the commerce clause, had the right to enact that legislation.

For instance, it will be remembered that the Mann Act, a criminal act, was upheld upon the same theory, though the courts afterward held that the question of commerce was not necessarily involved in all cases.

Mr. President, I desire now to read the fourteenth amendment. I should like to have the Senator from Colorado hear this:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State—

Listen to this. Upon whom is this injunction laid? Is it laid upon the individual? The injunctions of the fourteenth amendment are laid upon the States. It is a limitation upon the powers of the State government, speaking through its legislature and its governor.

No State shall make—

I shall be glad if the Senator from Colorado will listen to the reading of the fourteenth amendment.

No State shall make or enforce—

What?—

any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State—

Who? Any State—

nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law——

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me conclude this. I was afraid the Senator had not read all of this amendment.

nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

I now yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. COSTIGAN. May I request the able Senator from Texas to read the remarks I made yesterday on this subject, which are contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this morning? In those remarks I undertook to discuss the very question to which he is now directing my attention, and cited decisions of the Supreme Court explaining the significance of the language he has just read.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be glad to read the Senator's speech, although I heard him when he made it; but I shall read it if the Senator desires. I know I shall enjoy it again, and remain as much unconvinced after I shall have read it as I was when I heard it.

Mr. President, my contention is that under the fourteenth amendment no power is conferred to enact this measure. Let us see about it.

All of us are familiar with the history of the fourteenth amendment. It was intended to lay a prohibition on all the States of the Union against passing laws which might discriminate between citizens of the United States. It also provided—it was affirmative in one sense, and negative in the other—that no State should deny the equal protection of the laws.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator may recall the history of the fourteenth amendment, to the effect that at the time the amendment was framed there was an attempt to make the jurisdiction of the National Government apply to individuals.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly. I am coming to that.

Mr. BORAH. But that was rejected, and the amendment was confined entirely to action upon the part of the States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly. I thank the Senator from Idaho. I know the Senator from Idaho is entirely familiar with all the decisions and the history of the fourteenth amendment, and I welcome his contribution to this debate.

In connection with the observation of the Senator from Idaho, I desire to cite some of the transactions at the time of the adoption of the fourteenth amendment.

Thaddeus Stevens, of Pennsylvania, reported the resolution. I am sure no one could be any more zealous on this subject than Thaddeus Stevens, of Pennsylvania. He had a right to entertain his views, just as the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from New York have a right to entertain theirs.

Mr. Stevens, in reporting from the Committee on Reconstruction the first section containing the equal-protection clause, used the language I am about to read; and I invoke it here now, back from the land of shades, to contradict and confute the attitude of the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from New York:

The Constitution limits only the action of Congress—

He is speaking now of the original Constitution, and this is a partial answer to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The Constitution limits only the action of Congress, and is not a limitation on the States. This amendment—

The fourteenth amendment—

supplies that defect and allows Congress to correct—

What?—

the unjust legislation of the States, so far that the law which operates upon one man shall operate equally upon all. Whatever law punishes a white man for a crime shall punish the black man precisely in the same way and to the same degree.

That bears witness to what the Senator from Idaho has said, that the original fourteenth amendment was intended to operate as a limitation upon the acts of the State itself, and not upon individuals. The decisions of the courts following that bear out that statement.

Let me quote James G. Blaine—a man who, as he walked across the stage of public life in America, shed an intellectual luster all about him. What did Mr. Blaine say?

James G. Blaine was a Member of the Congress when the fourteenth amendment was proposed. In his "Twenty Years in Congress" he clearly expresses his view of the purpose and scope of the amendment. These are his words regarding the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments:

Both of those amendments operate as inhibitions upon the power of the State and do not have reference to those irregular acts of the people which find no authorization in the public statutes.

He was thinking of the very things which the Senator from Colorado now says should be prohibited in this bill. Mr. Blaine, who was in the Congress when the amendment was submitted, says that the fourteenth amendment does not confer any power to deal with the irregular acts of individuals which are here sought to be prohibited; that it is purely a limitation upon the power of the States.

Further quoting Mr. Blaine:

The defect in both amendments, insofar as their main object of securing rights to the colored man is involved, lies in the fact that they don't operate directly upon the people.

I should be happy if the Senator from Colorado would listen to James G. Blaine instead of counselors not so wise or so well informed as that great statesman.

The defect in both amendments, insofar as their main object of securing rights to the colored man is involved, lies in the fact that they don't operate directly upon the people, and therefore Congress is not endowed with the pertinent and applicable power to give redress.

James G. Blaine, after he had passed from the stage of public life, while he was writing his Twenty Years in Congress, after the passions and the tumult had passed

away, in setting down for Americans a story of the wonderful period in which he lived, placed there his interpretation of the purpose of and the power of the Government under the fourteenth amendment.

Under that statement of Mr. Blaine, the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from New York can find no authority for this particular legislation.

Mr. President, we are not without the aid of the construction of the courts. The position of myself and some other Senators does not rest only upon the flimsy foundation of our own personal predilections. We have warrant for our attitude in the sanctions of the highest court of this land.

The fourteenth amendment was first exhaustively treated by the Supreme Court in the Slaughter House cases, with which all Senators who have given attention to the law are of course familiar. It will be remembered that in those cases, through a claim based upon the fourteenth amendment, it was sought to overturn an act of the State of Louisiana and administrative acts thereunder seeking to regulate slaughterhouses in and adjacent to the city of New Orleans. It was strongly urged that such acts discriminated against certain citizens theretofore engaged in such business, and therefore were violative of the amendment.

The decision of the Court, one of the really great decisions, in part reads as follows:

> Was it the purpose of the fourteenth amendment by the simple declaration that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States (I will add, "Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law") to transfer the security and protection of all the civil rights which we have mentioned from the States to the Federal Government? And where it is declared that Congress shall have the power to enforce that article, was it intended to bring within the power of Congress the entire domain of civil rights heretofore belonging exclusively to the States?

That is the question the Court propounds to itself. I may remind Senators that if the Congress has power to pass the bill now being considered, relating to some rights of an individual under the fourteenth amendment, then it has the right to go in and to assert the right to see that every citizen, as to all of his rights—property rights, personal rights, and rights of every other kind—shall be brought within at least the supervision of the Federal Government over State control.

I quote further from what the Supreme Court said, and I ask Senators to listen to the language. I said a moment ago that my construction was that if the action contemplated could be taken with regard to personal injury it could be taken with regard to any other civil right which a citizen might possess. The Court said:

> All this and more—

All this and more!

> All this and more must follow if the proposition of the plaintiff be sound.
>
> For not only are these rights subject to the control of Congress whenever in its discretion any of them are supposed to be abridged by State legislation, but that body may also pass laws in advance limiting and restricting the exercise of power by the States in their most ordinary and usual functions, as in its judgment it may think proper on all such subjects, and still further, such construction would constitute this Court a perpetual censor upon all legislation of the States on the civil rights of their own citizens, with authority to nullify such as it did not approve, as consistent with those rights as existed at the time of the adoption of this amendment. The argument, we admit, is not always the most conclusive which is drawn from the consequences urged against the adoption of a particular construction of an instrument. But when, as in the case before us, these consequences are so serious, so far-reaching and pervading, so great a departure from the structure and spirit of our institutions, when the effect is to fetter and degrade—

I hope the Senator from Colorado will note this—

> When the effect is to fetter and degrade the State governments by subjecting them to the control of Congress in the exercise of powers heretofore universally conceded to them of the most ordinary and fundamental character, when in fact it radically changes the whole theory of the relations of the State and Federal Governments to each other and of both these governments to the people, the argument has a force that is irresistible in the absence of language which expresses such a purpose too clearly to admit of doubt.

What else did the Court say with regard to personal rights? I quote:

> It would be the vainest show of learning to prove by citation of authority that up to the adoption of the recent amendments (thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth) no claim was set up that those rights depended on the Federal Government for their existence or protection beyond the very express limitations which the Federal Constitution imposed on the States, such, for instance, as the prohibition against ex post facto laws, bills of attainder, and laws impairing the obligation of contracts. But with the exception of these and a few other restrictions the entire domain of privileges of citizens of the States, as above defined, lay within the constitutional and legislative powers of the State and without that of the Federal Government.

If at the time this decision was rendered the powers lay without the Federal Constitution, when did they come within the Federal Constitution? No amendment, no change, no modification, no alteration of that instrument with regard to these particular matters has ever taken place. The Supreme Court has said that under the fourteenth amendment no such power exists.

Mr. President, the decision from which I have been reading was in the Slaughterhouse cases. Other cases decided, dealing with legislation enacted shortly after the war between the States, were in point. It will be remembered that the Federal Government enacted legislation known as the "civil-rights bill", which sought to guarantee to all citizens of the United States certain rights which the States had to respect. Cases involving that law went to the Supreme Court. The decisions appear in volume 109 of the Supreme Court Reports, at page 3. What did the Court there hold?

It was clearly and convincingly laid down that the prohibitions of the fourteenth amendment were directed at State action and not individual action; that the denial of "equal protection of the laws" meant denial by the State, that abridgment of privileges of citizens must be made by a State and not by its individual citizens before it could be brought within the denunciation of the Constitution.

It was with like clarity pointed out that denial to colored people of accommodations equal to those furnished to whites by railways, theaters, and hotels was not denial thereof by the State but was denial only by individuals.

Mr. President, I quote a portion of the Court's opinion:

> It is State action of a particular character that is prohibited.

State action, not State inaction, not State failure to do something. In other words, the States must affirmatively do something through its regular agencies, through its legislature, or through its Governor, before the inhibition can be invoked.

> It is State action of a particular character that is prohibited. Individual invasion of individual rights is not the subject matter of the amendment. It has a deeper and broader scope. It nullifies and makes void all State legislation and State action of every kind which impairs the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States or which injures them in life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or which denies to any of them the equal protection of the law.

In other words, the State must do some act itself which impinges upon the guaranties before the fourteenth amendment has any application. Again quoting:

> To adopt appropriate legislation for correcting the effects of such prohibited State laws—

The Congress under this decision has only the power to enact such legislation as may nullify or render ineffective State law which violates the guaranty which is secured by the fourteenth amendment.

> To adopt appropriate legislation for correcting the effects of such prohibited State laws and State acts and thus to render them ineffectually null, void, and innocuous. This is the legislative power conferred upon the Congress, and this is the whole of it.

Mr. President, I should like to have that language of the Supreme Court set down in the RECORD, and I should like to have it engraved there, with a border around it, so the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from New York, who is so interested in this legislation that he comes into the Senate

and reads a prepared address and then immediately leaves, should be forced to see it. He will never hear it by listening to the Senator from Texas nor will he read his remarks in the RECORD. I should like to have it emblazoned there so that, in turning the pages of the RECORD, he could not fail to see it. This is what the Supreme Court said:

> To adopt appropriate legislation for correcting the effects of such prohibited State laws and State acts and thus to render them ineffectually null, void, and innocuous. This is the legislative power conferred upon the Congress, and this is the whole of it.

The Supreme Court of the United States says that the only power which Congress possesses under the fourteenth amendment is the power to pass Federal legislation making ineffective, innocuous, and void such acts of the State legislature or of the governor as are in violation of the fourteenth amendment. Mr. President, when that is all the power which is possessed, whence comes this marvelous power to enact the proposed bill? What law of a State is being complained of here? I challenge the Senator from Colorado, I challenge the Senator from New York to go and search the statutes and the constitutions of all the States in the Union and bring back a statute which violates the fourteenth amendment. Of course, not only the courts but the Congress would have the power to make such statute ineffective and void. The Supreme Court says that that is the whole power which the Congress possesses.

I will quote further from the Supreme Court, and I hope some of the Senators who are so deeply concerned with this legislation might listen. The Senator from Colorado has departed.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. 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:

Adams	Connally	Johnson	Pittman
Ashurst	Coolidge	Keyes	Pope
Austin	Copeland	King	Radcliffe
Bachman	Costigan	La Follette	Robinson
Bailey	Couzens	Lewis	Russell
Bankhead	Cutting	Logan	Schall
Barbour	Dickinson	Lonergan	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Dieterich	Long	Sheppard
Bilbo	Donahey	McAdoo	Shipstead
Black	Duffy	McCarran	Smith
Bone	Fletcher	McGill	Steiwer
Borah	Frazier	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Gerry	McNary	Townsend
Bulkley	Gibson	Metcalf	Trammell
Bulow	Glass	Minton	Truman
Burke	Gore	Moore	Vandenberg
Byrd	Guffey	Murphy	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hale	Murray	Wagner
Capper	Harrison	Neely	Walsh
Caraway	Hastings	Norris	Wheeler
Carey	Hatch	O'Mahoney	White
Clark	Hayden	Overton	

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, when interrupted, I was quoting from the decision of the Supreme Court in the civil-rights cases. I shall continue that quotation. This is the language of the Court:

> It is absurd to affirm that because the rights of life, liberty, and property (which includes all civil rights that men have) are by the amendment sought to be protected against invasion on the part of the States without due process of law, Congress may therefore provide due process of law for their vindication in every case.

The Supreme Court says that such a contention is absurd. Quoting again:

> And that because the denial by a State to any persons of equal protection of the laws is prohibited by the amendment, therefore, Congress may establish laws for their equal protection.

The Supreme Court, in the civil-rights cases, held that the guaranty was as against acts by the States and that it was absurd to contend that under that guaranty the Federal Government could take over the jurisdiction of vindicating the rights of the citizen in individual cases.

Quoting again:

> If this legislation is appropriate for enforcing the prohibitions of the amendment, it is difficult to see where it is to stop. Why may not Congress with equal show of authority enact a code of laws for the enforcement and vindication of all rights of life, liberty, and property? If it is supposable that the States may deprive persons of life, liberty, and property without due process of law, and the amendment itself does suppose this, why should not Congress proceed at once to prescribe due process of law for the protection of every one of these fundamental rights in every possible case, as well as to prescribe equal privileges in inns, public conveyances, and theaters?

Mr. President and Senators, the Supreme Court has spoken again in a famous decision with respect to the fourteenth amendment. In *Barbier* v. *Connally* (113 U. S. 27), Mr. Justice Field, in vigorous fashion, announces this doctrine:

> The fourteenth amendment, in declaring that no State "shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws", undoubtedly intended not only that there should be no arbitrary deprivation of life or liberty or arbitrary spoliation of property but that equal protection and security should be given to all under like circumstances in the enjoyment of their personal and civil rights; that all persons should be equally entitled to pursue their happiness and acquire and enjoy property; that they should have like access to the courts of the country for the protection of their persons and property, the prevention and redress of wrongs, and the enforcement of contracts; that no impediment should be interposed to the pursuits of anyone except as applied to the same pursuits by others under like circumstances; that no greater burdens should be laid upon one than are laid upon others in the same calling and conditions; and that in the administration of criminal justice no different or higher punishment should be imposed upon one than such as is prescribed to all for like offenses. But neither the amendment—

It is Justice Field of the Supreme Court speaking—

> But neither the amendment, broad and comprehensive as it is, nor any other amendment, was designed to interfere with the power of the State, sometimes termed its police power, to prescribe regulations to promote the health, peace, morals, education, and good order of the people.

Mr. President, an examination of these epoch-making decisions of the Supreme Court should convince any searcher for the truth that the first section of the fourteenth amendment applies only to State action and is a prohibition on State action alone; that it does not add to the rights of individuals against other individuals. This bill deals with individuals. It seeks to hold responsible private individuals for individual acts, whereas the whole theory and basis of the fourteenth amendment is that it acts upon the States and upon State action; and that it does not authorize the Federal Government to invade the domain of rights for whose protection the citizen must look to the State and to prescribe the character or the degree of protection to be vouchsafed such rights.

These decisions announce the doctrine that, so long as the State does not itself by some State action deny equal protection of the laws, the Federal power cannot be invoked, and, in the event of such denial by a State, only that degree of Federal power sufficient to correct the action of the States in violation of the amendment may be invoked. The only affirmative Federal right created by that part of the fourteenth amendment is the right to be exempt from discriminatory action on the part of the State.

Such is the general scope and purpose of the amendment. But to demonstrate that it affords no basis for the pending measure, it will be proper to address our attention to its various sections, because in its revolutionary provisions it seeks to cover a wide territory.

Mr. President, this bill, in its first section, provides—

> That the phrase "mob or riotous assemblage" * * * shall mean an assemblage composed of three or more persons acting in concert, without authority of law, for the purpose of killing or injuring any person in the custody of any peace officer or suspected of, charged with, or convicted of the commission of any crime.

By what process of reasoning does it become murder because three men kill another and not murder when two men kill another? On what theory is it suggested that the Gov-

ernment should step in and condemn a crime when committed by three men and should refuse to step in when the same crime has been committed by two men?

Mr. President, in order for this bill to be invoked it is provided that the person assaulted or injured, in one case at least, must be in the custody of a peace officer, or he must be suspected of a crime or charged with or convicted of a crime. Is it giving equal protection of the law to the innocent man who is charged with no crime, who has committed no crime, who has not been arrested and charged with a crime to say that if he is assaulted, if he is attacked by a group of three or more and his life is taken or he is injured, the Federal Government will not step in, whereas if he is charged with a crime, if he has been convicted, the Federal Government will step in and bring him under the ægis of its protection? Is it equality of treatment under the Constitution to give a greater degree of protection to one who has violated the laws of his State, who stands charged with a heinous crime, perhaps, and to deny that same degree of protection to the man whose hands are innocent of his neighbor's blood and whose soul is unspotted by the commission of any crime?

The Senator from Colorado and the Senator from New York say it is not their purpose to include within the provisions of the bill a denunciation of a crime if committed in a labor dispute. Let us see what is the situation the Senators have thus presented.

A man working in a factory, or in a shop, or on a railroad, working to gain a livelihood for his family, committing no crime except the crime of working, is assaulted in a labor dispute by a group of more than three men. His life may be taken, or he may suffer bodily injury. Under the terms of the bill the Federal Government would not step into the case. The Senator from Colorado says the Government should not step into the case. The Senator from New York says the Federal Government should not interfere.

However, if those individuals are not engaged in a labor disturbance, if they are acting through malice or passion, if they are acting through the compelling motive of some private grudge, and three or more of them assault or attack another private individual or kill him, then the Federal Government would step in, hail them into court, and try them under the terms of the bill.

Mr. President, the bill does not content itself with making it a crime for individuals who may come within its terms, but it brings within the condemnation of the court the county in which the offense may be committed. It also brings within the compass of the bill's denunciation the county into which those who are guilty may take the victim. Is it fair or is it just to the innocent taxpayers of a county, who may be in nowise guilty of any offense under the bill or under the State law, to have their county penalized by the assessment of fines and of money penalties because certain lawless individuals may take the life of another individual or may inflict bodily injury upon him?

Our theory of government is that the Federal Government is supreme within its own sphere of action and that the State government is supreme within its sphere of action. When did it become constitutional for the Federal Government to drag into a Federal court a subdivision of a sovereign State and lay heavy penalties upon it? If that be constitutional, then we may try a State in a Federal court, because if we can try one subdivision of a State we can try all the subdivisions of the State, and all the parts being equal to the whole, under the theory of the Senators who offer the legislation the Federal court could arraign at the bar a great sovereign Commonwealth and lay upon it penalties and forfeitures because it had not complied with some Federal rule of action.

How would the fathers who wrote the Constitution and those who took part in the early history of the Republic view any such doctrine declared here in the Senate of the United States?

Mr. President, this is a time in which, beyond the borders of the Capitol, we hear many threats against our form of government. We hear those who would change its structure and perhaps destroy it. Others would modify and revise our institutions. Daily and nightly over the radio and in the public forums we hear various groups of doctrinaires who, taking advantage of public dissatisfaction and of unrest among the body of our people, propose their curious nostrums and their new remedies for the ills which they conceive to be besetting us at this time.

I am not surprised to hear those demands beyond the Capitol but, Mr. President, it is alarming when we have other revolutionary doctrines proclaimed here upon the floor of the United States Senate itself. When Senators rise in the Senate and advocate radical departure from the judicial and political policies of the past, it causes me more disturbance than all the wails and outcries by these misguided and misguiding prophets of evil beyond the precincts of the Capitol.

Mr. President, I do not stand on the floor of the Senate or anywhere else to defend lawlessness or lawbreaking. I deplore lynching as much as does the Senator from New York and as much as does the Senator from Colorado. I am opposed to murder in any form, no matter whence it may come.

Yesterday the Senator from Colorado cited the fact that there are 11 States in the Union which have antilynching laws. In that list the name of Colorado does not appear. In that list the name of New York does not appear. There can be no question of the constitutional power of the State of New York to enact an antilynching law. There can be no question of the power of the State of Colorado to enact such a measure. I am wondering why these distinguished Senators, these eminent lawyers, versed in the constitutional law and history of the United States, have not exerted themselves and devoted their efforts and their labors to securing the enactment by the State of Colorado of an antilynching law? Why has the great sovereign State of New York, standing with its shoulders high above the other States in wealth and population, under its acknowledged powers at the present time enacted no antilynching law? Is it any less a crime if the act should be committed in New York than if it should be committed in the State which I, in part, represent? Is there any sanctity which goes with the soil of Colorado which makes an act good in Colorado and a crime in another jurisdiction?

I submit these suggestions only for the benefit of those who, like myself, are against the violation of law everywhere and at all times.

Mr. President, I believe the enactment of this bill by the Federal Congress would not be of benefit in the eradication of the lynching evil. I believe we have been making progress toward the abolition of lynching; indeed, I know we have been making progress in the section from which I come. As the years go by, as a rule, though there may be some exceptions, the number of lynchings is becoming smaller and smaller. Why is that true? It is because the people are becoming educated to abhor lynching. It is because local officers are having a higher sense of their responsibilities, and the people are holding them to a higher degree of accountability for the discharge of the functions of their offices, one of which, of course, is to protect any man in the custody of an officer.

This is a problem which is not going to be corrected by any mere edict which may be issued here in the Congress. We are making rapid and substantial progress in overcoming the evil of lynching.

Mr. President, last year in the 48 States of the Union only 14 persons were lynched. That is 14 more persons than I wish had been lynched. God knows, I abhor lynching. Fourteen persons in 48 States were lynched; and yet the other day at Rockville a train, plunging along in the darkness, struck a bus and wiped out 14 lives at once—14 human lives—as many in that one accident as were lynched in all the 48 States in an entire year.

Mr. President, I believe the Senator from New York and the Senator from Colorado, however noble their purpose, however benevolent their emotions, are misguided in pressing for the adoption by the Federal Government of this revolutionary method of judicial determination over mat-

ters never heretofore within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. Let me point out to them and warn them that the possibilities of this policy are not all comprised within the present bill. We know how, when Congress once embarks upon a new departure or a new policy, it is ever thereafter cited as a precedent for the growing and the spreading and the aggressive advancement of that doctrine. Let me suggest to the Senators that if such a bill shall be enacted by the Congress it will not be long until there will be before the Congress other interests seeking to modify and expand the provisions of this bill. There will be those who will come here and advocate that the Federal Government shall see that in every State of the Union there shall be equal laws with respect to marriage and with respect to divorce, and that under the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, which guarantees equality of treatment of all citizens, the Federal Government shall go into the States and see that those laws are according to the pattern and the standard of the Federal Government.

The Senator from Colorado and the Senator from New York today protest that this bill cannot be turned into an instrument by which labor unions or their members can be brought before the Federal courts. If not under its present terms, there will come a time when there will be those who will urge that in order to oust local prejudices, in order to have an impartial arbiter step into the various States and localities, the Federal Government alone can perform those functions, and that in every labor dispute or labor clash the Federal Government shall take jurisdiction in the Federal courts.

Mr. President, there is equal argument, equal authority of reason, equal warrant of logic for that sort of a course as there is for the course to which the Senator from New York and the Senator from Colorado now invite us.

I wish to say that over the years we have made, and we are continuing to make, rapid and splendid improvement with respect to the question of lynching. Last year there were only 14 cases. The year before there were 20, showing an improvement, of course, during 1934. In 1932 there were only 8 cases in the entire United States. How many gang murders were there? How many men were killed in other violent clashes? Many, many times as many as were killed by lynching.

Mr. President, why should the criminals in Chicago, who lined up some seven or eight other gangsters against a brick wall and shot out their lives, go free of this measure? Why should the Federal Government withhold its punishment from those individuals, and yet in some other similar circumstances, because three men act together, bring them into the Federal courts?

Those of us who come from a certain section of the Republic deserve the sympathy of Senators and Representatives from other sections rather than their attitude of hostility. We come from a territory which has problems that you do not have in the same degree, but which you no doubt will have. We have struggled for years with their burdens and with their baffling aspects, and we are trying to meet our responsibilities as citizens of the Republic and as citizens of our States. We hope the Senate will not take up this measure, because we firmly believe not only that it is beyond the power of the Congress, under the Constitution, but that if it were within the constitutional powers of the Congress it would be an unwise course; that it would bring upon us distresses and evils worse than the evils from which the Senators now seek to flee.

Mr. President, again I desire to leave in this RECORD my utter condemnation of lynching anywhere and everywhere. As a citizen of this Republic, I accord to every other citizen of the Republic the same right which I claim for myself; but I do demand that every other citizen give to the Constitution and to our Government the same measure of allegiance and loyalty that he requires of others. I believe it is a short-sighted policy, under the stimulation of expediency, under the plea of some specious theory of necessity, to ask that we shall so twist and contort our conceptions of constitutional powers as to evade the provisions of the Constitution rather than to assert and uphold them.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from New York did not themselves entertain serious doubts as to the constitutionality of this measure, why did they spend practically all the time of their discussion in seeking to assert and to establish and vindicate the constitutionality of the measure?

I hope we shall not always be afflicted with the spectacle of Senators and Representatives seeking and devising and scheming and plotting how they can draw legislation so as to go around the Constitution, or under the Constitution, or over the Constitution, rather than that we shall have a House and a Senate whose Members consult the Constitution and desire to enact legislation according to its terms and its provisions, observing its limitations as well as its powers.

Mr. President, it is my view that this bill is unconstitutional. It is my view that it involves an unsound, an unwise departure from the historic policies and traditions of this Republic. So believing and holding such views, I earnestly insist that the Senate of the United States should not, at this juncture of public affairs, delay the consideration of other important legislation of an emergent character to take up and discuss the measure which is the subject of the pending motion.

This is not a new problem. We are advancing and coming closer to a solution as each year rolls around. On the other hand, there are awaiting the action of the Senate and of the House many bills of Nation-wide importance, measures which affect not merely 14 individuals in America but 125,000,000 of our fellow citizens. There awaits action on the extension of the N. R. A. There awaits action on the adjusted-service-certificate bill. The Senate will soon be called upon to enact legislation relating to employment insurance and to old-age pensions.

Mr. President, which is of the greater importance—to do something to afford employment insurance for the great army of Americans who are marching the streets with their hands empty of the implements of toil and of trade, who are without the means of livelihood, or to enact foolish and unwise legislation which might possibly affect a dozen persons within the United States? Which is of more importance—to provide pensions for those who are approaching the period of life when they can no longer provide the necessities of life for themselves and their families or to grieve and mourn over legislation of this character, which can affect only the families of those who have already departed?

Mr. President, I appeal to the Senator from New York, I appeal to the Senator from Colorado, not to consume the time of the Senate by pressing upon it this motion to take up the bill of which they are the authors. I appeal to them not to postpone to the great body of American veterans action on legislation in which they are interested. I appeal to the Senator from New York not to postpone the consideration of his own N. R. A. bill by fruitlessly consuming the hours of the Senate in discussing this motion on such legislation. I appeal to these Senators, and to others, not to fritter away the time of Senators who desire to give consideration to these other measures.

Mr. President, if this were a matter which, according to my conception, was within the constitutional warrant under which Congress may act, the situation would be quite a different one, but, frankly, I believe even then such a course as is urged would be filled with folly.

For almost 150 years we have lived under the Constitution of the United States. During that time we have allowed to the States those things which belonged to the States, and to the Federal Government those things which fell within its jurisdiction under the Constitution itself. We have advanced under the great, guiding direction of the Constitution from a people of three or four million to a great nation of 125,000,000. We have progressed from a narrow little strip of colonies along the Atlantic Coast to a great Republic which reaches westward 3,000 miles, to touch the waters of another sea.

Mr. President, we have stretched our borders from the Atlantic seaboard, through the Louisiana Purchase, out to the great territory of the Northwest. Through annexation of

the Republic of Texas, and other acquisitions of territory as a result of the War with Mexico, our domain and empire have reached out to kiss the waters of the Pacific, and have extended along its shores to where they meet the waters of the Columbia.

We have advanced from a poor, humble, and obscure Republic until today we occupy, perhaps, the place of greatest eminence in all the family of the nations which rule this revolving globe of ours.

Have not our people prospered under our system? Have not the institutions of the United States come to be admired, imitated, and, I might say, adored, by the people of every section of the earth who have aspired to self-government and republican institutions?

My plea to Senators today is to leave this old system of ours alone. Let the Federal Government retain jurisdiction over the things which are Federal. Let the States, within their sovereign powers, control the things which belong to the States.

The Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly said that such powers as those sought to be granted under the bill we are discussing fall within the exclusive jurisdiction of State authority. Let us leave them there. Let us leave intact the balance between the Federal and the State authority. Let us teach the citizens of the State that responsibility goes with power and authority, and let us strengthen those ideas of responsibility. Let us give greater fiber and toughness to the campaign of education which has already made such a great advance, and we shall in time, as nearly as any people can meet any question, as nearly as any people can be perfect in any regard, solve most of the evils at which the bill is supposed to be directed.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I am anxious to say a word in behalf of Senate bill 24, the so-called "Costigan-Wagner antilynching bill." I am whole-heartedly in favor of this proposed legislation, for lynching is nothing more than mob murder. It is an anarchistic assault on sovereignty, and represents a temporary overthrow of the State government. President Wilson characterized lynching as vitally affecting the "honor of the Nation and the very character and integrity of our institutions." Under those circumstances, I believe the Federal Government has a right, indeed, a duty, to step in and to assure that the rights guaranteed under the Constitution shall be preserved.

I cannot bring myself to feel any sympathy in this instance for those who rest their opposition to the antilynching bill on the question of State rights, greatly as I believe in the preservation of State rights. I believe that it is demonstrable that those States in which this issue is more frequently raised are the same States which are leaning most heavily on the Federal Government for financial assistance in meeting the ravages of the depression in their cases. It seems to me that if these States are willing that the Federal Government should assume by far the greatest responsibility in taking care of their unfortunate, that they should not be too insistent on denying the constitutional rights of court trial and ordered justice to their own citizens. I have before me a table showing the proportion of Federal aid to a number of these States, many of whose representatives are the most vigorous in opposing the antilynching bill, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

Federal Emergency Relief Administration, obligations incurred for emergency relief[1] from all public funds by State and local relief administrations in 13 Southern States, by sources of funds, January and February 1935

[As reported to the Federal Emergency Relief Administration]

States	Total obligations incurred	From Federal funds		From State funds		From local funds	
		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Alabama:							
January	$1,854,351	$1,769,016	95.4			$85,335	4.6
February	1,716,905	1,576,526	91.8			140,379	8.2
Arkansas:							
January	1,784,394	1,687,092	94.5	$20,197	1.1	77,105	4.4
February	1,820,997	1,755,430	96.4	9,242	.5	56,325	3.1
Florida:							
January	1,637,083	1,637,083	100.0				
February	1,276,795	1,276,795	100.0				
Georgia:							
January	2,428,363	2,343,242	96.5			85,126	3.5
February	2,470,571	2,359,703	95.5			110,865	4.5
Kentucky:							
January	1,824,073	1,437,273	78.8	239,174	13.1	147,629	8.1
February	1,672,212	1,456,853	87.1	2,614	.2	212,745	12.7
Louisiana:							
January	2,371,708	2,328,752	98.2			42,956	1.8
February	2,026,281	1,980,660	97.7			45,621	2.3
Maryland:							
January	1,924,491	1,852,872	96.3	10,893	.6	60,726	3.1
February	1,790,653	1,754,989	98.0	7,884	.4	27,780	1.6
Mississippi:							
January	1,383,017	1,334,658	96.5	24,486	1.8	23,873	1.7
February	1,239,750	1,216,176	98.1	2,623	.2	20,951	1.7
North Carolina:							
January	1,761,484	1,740,293	98.8			21,191	1.2
February	1,437,205	1,431,866	99.6			5,339	.4
South Carolina:							
January	1,353,586	1,323,226	97.8			30,360	2.2
February	1,271,198	1,246,591	98.1			24,607	1.9
Tennessee:							
January	1,618,027	1,553,104	96.0	41,667	2.6	23,256	1.4
February	1,716,909	1,673,016	97.5	41,667	2.4	2,226	.1
Texas:							
January	6,010,544	5,128,979	85.3	881,016	14.7	549	(2)
February	5,978,194	5,293,782	88.6	684,412	11.4		
Virginia:							
January	1,178,262	1,081,514	91.8	1,575	.1	95,173	8.1
February	1,105,191	1,034,999	93.7	279	(2)	69,913	6.3

[1] Includes obligations incurred for relief extended under the general-relief program, under all special programs, for administrations, and for purchases of materials, supplies and equipment, rentals of equipment (such as team and truck line), earnings of nonrelief persons employed, and other expenses incident to the work program.

[2] Less than one-twentieth of 1 percent.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

BEQUEST OF OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I understand that there is on the desk a message from the President of the United States. I ask that it be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGILL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the Library, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Congress is aware that Mr. Justice Holmes bequeathed his residuary estate to the Government of his country. It is the gift of one who in war and in peace devoted his life to its service. Clearly he thereby sought, with a generous emphasis, to mark the full measure of his faith in those principles of freedom and justice which the country was founded to preserve.

I shall, I think, be interpreting aright the feeling of the country and the wishes of the Congress if I suggest that this striking gift be devoted to some purpose worthy of the great man who gave it. Mr. Justice Holmes was fond of saying that we live by symbols. Our fellow citizens of this generation would, I am confident, desire the Congress to translate this gift into a form that may serve as a permanent impulse for the maintenance of the deepest tradition that Mr. Justice Holmes embodied.

That tradition was a faith in the creative possibilities of the law. For him law was an instrument of just relations between man and man. With an insight into its history that no American scholar has surpassed; with a capacity to mold ancient principles to present needs, unique in range and remarkable in prophetic power; with a grasp of its significance as the basis upon which the purposes of men are shaped, Mr. Justice Holmes sought to make the jurisprudence of the United States fulfill the great ends our Nation was established to accomplish. Our generation will not soon forget, as the learned the world over will long remember, his extraordinary achievements as judge, as historian, and as philosopher of the law.

The Congress will, I am sure, agree that it is fitting to utilize this opportunity to remind those who will come after us of our sense of the eminence of Mr. Justice Holmes. In so doing we do not merely commemorate the distinction of an American to whom the whole world has paid tribute. We also mark for posterity our pride in his faith in American democracy, his confidence in the power of our legal institutions to realize, when rightly used, the highest American ideals. Posterity which learns the significance of a life such as that of Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., draws inspiration from its understanding.

I therefore commend to the Congress that the bequest of Mr. Justice Holmes be not covered into the general fund of the Treasury but that it be set aside in a special fund at this time, and at a later date be devoted to purposes which will effectively promote the contributions which law can make to the national welfare. Once it is decided that the Holmes bequest be set apart for special use the precise object may await ample deliberation. A select committee of the Congress, acting in collaboration with a committee of the Supreme Court of the United States, will doubtless evolve the wisest uses to which this noble bequest should be put.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 25, 1935.*

PREVENTION OF LYNCHING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. COSTIGAN to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 24) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws by discouraging, preventing, and punishing the crime of lynching.

Mr. BAILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. TRAMMELL. 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:

Adams	Barbour	Brown	Capper
Ashurst	Barkley	Bulkley	Caraway
Austin	Bilbo	Bulow	Carey
Bachman	Black	Burke	Clark
Bailey	Bone	Byrd	Connally
Bankhead	Borah	Byrnes	Coolidge
Copeland	Harrison	McNary	Schwellenbach
Costigan	Hastings	Metcalf	Sheppard
Couzens	Hatch	Minton	Shipstead
Cutting	Hayden	Moore	Smith
Dickinson	Johnson	Murphy	Steiwer
Dieterich	Keyes	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Donahey	King	Neely	Townsend
Duffy	La Follette	Norris	Trammell
Fletcher	Lewis	O'Mahoney	Truman
Frazier	Logan	Overton	Vandenberg
Gerry	Lonergan	Pittman	Van Nuys
Gibson	Long	Pope	Wagner
Glass	McAdoo	Radcliffe	Walsh
Gore	McCarran	Robinson	Wheeler
Guffey	McGill	Russell	White
Hale	McKellar	Schall	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the pending bill proposes to extend the power of the Federal Government to the supervision of the administration of the criminal laws in the several States. I wish to dwell upon that sentence. It is proposed here, in the Congress of this Republic, so far to depart from all conceptions heretofore entertained concerning the character of the Republic, the limitations upon its powers, and the rights of the States, that we calmly consider a measure the avowed purpose of which, in plain language, is to extend the Federal power to the supervision of the execution or administration of criminal laws in the several States.

It is unnecessary for me to say, Mr. President, that when the Republic was created and the Constitution formed there was not one human being in all the land who dreamed that, in the remotest degree, such a proposal would ever be made in the Congress of the United States.

I say with some pride, but with nothing of invidious spirit, that I have the honor to represent a Commonwealth which was in existence before the Republic of the United States was created. North Carolina was a State before the United States was a political entity.

While the Constitution begins in its preamble, "We, the people of the United States", the character of the Convention and the signatories to the Constitution very clearly leave no doubt of the fact that the Thirteen Original States created this Union. They were creators and they are not creatures. They have their rights duly reserved. Although they have been limited in one way or another from time to time they still consider their rights as sacred, and I myself, as a Senator from the Commonwealth of North Carolina, consider it my highest duty, not only under my oath here, to preserve and maintain the Constitution, but under the obligation of the great trust reposed in me by the people of North Carolina, to see to it that all the rights which remain shall be preserved, so far as I am capable of seeing to it.

I am not going to argue on this occasion the constitutional aspects of this question. I do intend, if this debate shall be prolonged, to make a careful review of the cases, and on a subsequent occasion frankly to discuss the constitutional aspects of the question.

I shall be content to say now that the Constitution is the supreme law of the country and is the law of the Senate. We may change our laws. We may repeal the laws which are and create new laws, but we have no power to change the Constitution. It is the contract between the Union and the States; also the contract between the Union and the people.

Mr. GORE. We can mob the Constitution.

Mr. BAILEY. The junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], my honored friend, who has a long seniority here in many ways, who sees much more deeply than any others of us here—and I thank God for his sight—suggests that we may "mob the Constitution." I hope not, Mr. President. We may assault it, but the Constitution will be here when all those who would "mob" it are dissolved into the dust from which they came, and who by the dissolution dishonor the ordinary earth in which they are buried.

The Constitution is the law of the Senate and the law of the Senators. Thus far and no farther shalt thou go. I have always been deeply impressed with the fact that when one presents himself here with his certificate from his State, the door is still closed upon him and he has no seat, he has

no voice, he has no vote until, with uplifted hand, he has taken oath before the God of the nations that he will protect, maintain, and uphold the Constitution of the United States.

That is the essential, that is the final consummation in the creation of a Senator. Without it he cannot be a Senator. That is written into the bond of the national life, to protect the people in their rights from ignorant men who might get here, from designing men who might usurp power here. That is also to protect the rights of the States of the Union in the powers reserved to those States. That is written and that is recorded also in order to define the limits and to express and determine the powers of the great Central Government which we call the Federal Union. Knowing the power of government, the people limited this one by a solemn covenant between it and themselves.

Mr. President, I read with some care the address on yesterday of one of the coauthors of the proposed legislation, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN]. With all tolerance, and of course with all respect, I cannot conceive how an American citizen could get out of this scene in which we have lived and this history since 1789—how he could have lived in America and believed that the Federal Union could be given power to supervise the administration of criminal law in a sovereign State.

I said I was not going to speak now on the constitutional aspects. I am not going to speak on the proposed legislation from the standpoint of race or section. I come from the South. If I had to be born a million times I should pray that I might be born in the South. I come from a Southern State, with a southern experience. If I had a thousand fates, Mr. President, I should like for each of them to be cast in the State in which I have been cast. I am glad I am a son of a Confederate soldier. I am glad that he and his little family—myself born 8 years after the surrender—lived through the long and trying period that followed. It was bad enough; but there is a heritage in it, an unspeakable heritage. I would not have it otherwise. I would not exchange it.

I am glad that my lot was cast in a land in which I was thrown in contact with those whom we call the "colored people." There are some of them who prefer to be called "Negroes", and I could not quarrel about that. I believe most of them would prefer to be called "colored people." Certainly, as I use the expression, I do not use it with any intention to wound their feelings but only to speak in the terms which have been common between themselves and myself this long time.

I have no prejudices against the colored people. I have nothing but good will for the colored people. I have no other feeling in my heart but a desire to help the colored people. They are human beings, made in the image of God, entitled to human sympathy and to human help.

My State has no prejudices against the colored people. We had a terrible conflict in North Carolina in 1898 in which we undertook to settle a very essential question there, and for a period the races were in a way marshaled one against another. We nominated a great man for Governor on the Democratic ticket, Charles B. Aycock. His monument is here in the rotunda. His monument is on the capitol grounds at Raleigh. When he received his nomination at the hands of his party, I was present. He said:

> Now we are going to have white supremacy in North Carolina. We are going to pass the constitutional amendments. We are going to take charge of this Commonwealth.

Then he lifted his hand to heaven and said:

> God helping us, I swear you all that with regard to the colored people of this Commonwealth we will execute judgment in righteousness!

That is the spirit of North Carolina. We have executed judgment in righteousness. The courts in my State are just to the colored man as they are to the white man. I would not offend my good friends the Senator from New York and the Senator from Colorado, but insofar as a Senator courteously may resent an imputation I resent the imputation on the face of this bill that my State is not capable of executing judgment in righteousness with respect to the humblest, the most miserable representative of either the white or the colored race; and I observe with some pride, but with no disposition to offend or to be unkind, that my State has a law against lynching and against mobs, while the State of New York and the State of Colorado do not have such laws. With all due respect, these Senators might sweep before their own doors before they undertake to bring a Federal mob across the threshold of the courts of justice in the Commonwealth of North Carolina.

Mr. President, this bill is not going to pass. I do not wish to be arrogant about that, or to seem to be arrogant; but it is not going to pass. We will be here all summer; we will fight it out on this line, as General Grant said, if it takes all summer. We are not going to permit the power of the Federal Government to be extended over the administration of the criminal laws in the Commonwealth of North Carolina; and that is no threat. There is a way. We will speak night and day, and if the authors of the bill charge us with responsibility for delaying the consideration of the present program, I will put so much of it upon them as I think I can, but all that I cannot I will take, and I will not flinch about it.

This matter transcends a great many matters that we have considered important. It transcends race, and it transcends section. It strikes directly at the heart of American civilization. It divides, in terms that I could almost welcome, the course which has been more or less of a misty character here of late. We will either preserve the rights of the States, or we will go ahead and extend the Federal power, as has been sought, first by way of stretching the interstate-commerce clause, as Senators will bear witness, by the use of subtle words, by way of "affecting" or "in anywise relating to" interstate commerce, and that sort of thing, until we have a Federal supervision over every civil activity in America, and then complete the transformation not with the camel's nose but with the camel itself—the camel of Federal control over the administration of the criminal laws of the Commonwealths of this country.

Mr. President, that is a battle worth fighting. Without at all seeming to be heroic, that is a battle worth dying in; and, to be perfectly candid, that is a battle worth fighting out if we have to be here until the Congress meets again in January 1936. That is fair notice.

I had a little note down here on my pamphlet by way of memorandum, "The South believes in law." I shall not argue it. I would no more argue that than I would argue my own character. One of the Senators said here just now that he was opposed to mob law. Without reproaching him, if anybody wishes to interpret my attitude here in opposition to this bill as indicating that I am for mob law, he is welcome to do it, but he will not do it in my presence. There are things not to be argued, not to be pleaded. I have no apologies, no defenses, to make. I know where I stand on this matter, and I know my feet are on the solid rock of the character of the American Republic and the character of the Commonwealth of North Carolina.

Again, Mr. President, there is no necessity for this proposed legislation even if it were tolerable. There is no justification for it, and I have the facts here which will show it. I can almost believe the facts would convince my distinguished and honored friend the junior Senator from the State of New York [Mr. WAGNER], who sits beside me. I lay it down as an incontrovertible proposition that there is no justification in the facts for any such law, even conceding it to be constitutional and not abhorrent to our hearts.

Now let me read you the facts.

I have here a statement, not prepared under my authority but under the authority of the Tuskegee Institute of Alabama, the institution made famous by Booker Washington, and now presided over by Dr. Moton. I wrote to him to tell me the truth about all this matter. I did not take the information from what might be called "the white man's side"; I let the institution representing the Negro race in the South give me the facts. Let us see what they are.

This is headed "Lynchings, whites and Negroes, 1882–1934. (Revised report, Jan. 7, 1935.)"

In 1882 there were 64 whites lynched in the United States and 49 Negroes, making a total of 113.

In 1885, 110 whites were lynched and 74 Negroes, making a total of 184.

Mr. GORE. The Senator skipped 1883 and 1884.

Mr. BAILEY. I have a table showing the numbers down to date, and I shall ask to have it printed in the RECORD, but in the interest of time I am just running along to show the general trend.

In 1890, 11 whites were lynched and 85 Negroes, or a total of 96.

There was a great drop for some reason from 170 in 1889 to 96 in 1890.

In 1893, 34 whites were lynched and 117 Negroes, making a total of 151.

In the year prior to that, strange to say, there were 231 lynchings—69 whites and 162 Negroes. The peak figure was in 1892.

Eight years in the other century and 34 in this makes 42 years, and in all those 42 years—and I will ask Senators to watch the figures—the record shows lynchings as follows:

1892	231
1893	151
1894	192
1895	179
1897	158
1902	92
1903	99
1904	83

Let us take the decade of 1920:

1920	60
1921	62
1922	57
1923	33
1924	16
1925	17
1926	30
1927	16
1928	11
1929	10
1930	21
1931	13
1932	8
1934	15

If the American people had made as much progress about everything else as they have made about this, there would be no necessity for any laws about any of the things about which we have been legislating.

Mr. FLETCHER. Do those figures cover the whole country?

Mr. BAILEY. I have been giving the figures as to the whole country.

Remember my point: there is no necessity for legislation in this matter. Where civilization is moving forward as rapidly as is shown, there is every reason to fear that if the American Congress interferes with a progress as beneficent and as constant as that, there will be a back step that will cost us 50 years in progress.

Mr. President, I submit that thought to the Senate. I am arguing now the merits of the question. Why should there be a demand for the Federal Government to put upon us such a law as is proposed—and I shall expound the bill before I get through; it will never be a law—why should the Government put upon us such a bill as this when, beginning with 211 lynchings in 1884, when I was 11 years of age, the number dropped to only 8 in 1931, and to only 15 in 1934? Why should anybody be enacting laws to hasten a progress as fine as that within one lifetime?

Let Senators figure it up themselves. There were 15 lynchings last year, in a population of 126,000,000 people. That is all there were. I say to the Senate that in the same period there have been 15 of every sort of thing in the United States. If we are to enact a Federal law to put an end to a condition under which there were 15 lynchings amongst 126,000,000 people in 1 year, then we will have a lot of Federal laws to enact.

Mr. President, I am not defending lynching. I have not the slightest disposition to defend lynching. My record is well written about that matter; but I am not going to argue it. If anyone wishes to think that I am capable of defending lynching or mob law, I shall not do him the honor even to deny his charge, and I shall not do myself the dishonor to defend against his accusation, but shall take it out in despising him with the contempt which he deserves.

Mr. President, these are the facts. Why enact a Federal law?

I ask that the table from which I have been reading be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

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

Lynchings, whites and Negroes, 1882–1934

[Revised report, Jan. 7, 1935]

Year	Whites	Negroes	Total
1882	64	49	113
1883	77	53	130
1884	160	51	211
1885	110	74	184
1886	64	74	138
1887	50	70	120
1888	68	69	137
1889	76	94	170
1890	11	85	96
1891	72	113	185
1892	69	162	231
1893	34	117	151
1894	58	134	192
1895	66	113	179
1896	45	78	123
1897	35	123	158
1898	19	101	120
1899	21	85	106
1900	9	106	115
1901	25	105	130
1902	7	85	92
1903	15	84	99
1904	7	76	83
1905	5	57	62
1906	3	62	65
1907	2	58	60
1908	8	89	97
1909	13	69	82
1910	9	67	76
1911	7	60	67
1912	2	61	63
1913	1	51	52
1914	3	44	47
1915	18	57	75
1916	5	49	54
1917	3	36	39
1918	4	60	64
1919	6	74	80
1920	7	53	60
1921	4	58	62
1922	6	51	57
1923	4	29	33
1924	0	16	16
1925	0	17	17
1926	7	23	30
1927	0	16	16
1928	1	10	11
1929	3	7	10
1930	1	20	21
1931	1	12	13
1932	2	6	8
1933	4	24	28
1934	0	15	15
Total	1,291	3,352	4,643

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have here also the annual reports of Monroe N. Work, director of the department of records and research, Tuskegee Institute, Ala., as that institution has given the figures to the papers year by year for a long period. This report gives the statement as to lynchings by States.

I will take the year 1920, and give the names of the States in which lynchings occurred, and the number in each State: Alabama, 7; Arkansas, 1; California, 3; Florida, 7; Georgia, 9; Illinois, 1; Kansas, 1; Kentucky, 1; Minnesota, 3; Mississippi, 7; Missouri, 1; North Carolina, 3; Ohio, 1; Oklahoma, 3; South Carolina, 1; Texas, 10; Virginia, 1; West Virginia, 1.

I find, not including those killed in strikes and riots, etc., that there were 57 persons lynched in 1922. * * *

I also find that there were 58 instances in which officers of the law prevented lynchings. Fourteen of these instances were in Northern States and 44 of these instances were in Southern States.

I do not like to have to give statistics about the disposition of the people of the South to support and execute the law, but here are the figures. I said just now I am utterly

impatient of any imputations that because some mob breaks over, as a mob may break over in London, as a mob broke over in Harlem, N. Y., the other day, as a mob may break over in Chicago, as a mob may break over here—that just because some mob breaks over, we are induced to enact a law to give the Federal Government power of execution of the laws, power of supervision of the administration of the laws of a Commonwealth, one of the constituent parts of the Union. I am not less impatient of prejudices against the South on this account.

Here are the figures: 44 instances in which lynchings were prevented by the prompt action of the States in 1922, and those in Southern States.

Let us now move on to the next exhibit, dated December 31, 1924:

I send you the following concerning lynchings for the past year as compiled by Tuskegee Institute in the department of records and research. I find there were 16 persons lynched in 1924.

They get down to 16 in 1924. Remember that is from the high of over 200 of 40 years ago.

This is the smallest number lynched in any year since records of lynchings have been kept, and is 17 less than the number 33 for the year 1923 and 41 less than the number 57 for the year 1922. Nine of the persons lynched were taken from the hands of the law, 6 from jails and 3 from officers of the law.

There were 45 instances in which officers of the law prevented lynchings.

And 37 of them were in Southern States.

In 36 of the cases the prisoners were removed or the guards augmented or other precautions taken. In nine other instances armed force was used to repel the would-be lynchers. In four instances during the year persons charged with being connected with lynching mobs were indicted.

The States in which lynchings occurred and the number in each State are as follows: Florida 5, Georgia 2, Illinois 1, Kentucky 1, Louisiana 1, Mississippi 2, Missouri 1, South Carolina 1, Tennessee 1, and Texas 1.

Because we have one lynching in a State, it is proposed to alter the character of the Republic and place in the hands of the Federal Government the supervision of the administration of the criminal law in a sovereign Commonwealth.

I read from the report for 1926:

According to the records compiled in the department of records and research of the Tuskegee Institute, there were 30 persons lynched. This is 14 more than the number of 16 for 1925. The courts had acquitted one of the victims. Twenty-one of the persons lynched were taken from the hands of the law, 9 from jails and 12 from officers. There were 33 instances in which officers of the law prevented lynchings. Four of these were in Northern States and 29 in Southern States.

All this suspicion is not founded, I think, on prejudice, but founded upon an ignorance for which I blame no man, upon an ignorant belief that the Southern States and the southern counties and the southern courts are not quick to execute the law, that the southern judges are not swift to visit the power of the law to punish upon those whom it tries, that there is a Governor in a Southern State who will not call out every member of the State Guard and every gun to protect the life of the meanest rapist who has assaulted and defiled a pure woman. All of it is without foundation, and I welcome any investigation, and I defy anyone anywhere to look into the records or prove anything to the contrary. Once we hear that anything of that sort is on foot—and we hear quickly—the Governor hesitates not, and the boys with the muskets go.

When they tell me my State is not competent to administer the criminal laws or to maintain order, I do not get angry. I feel too sure of my State. I will say, however, that the United States Government, this Republic, has not any more character or any more capacity for law than the State of North Carolina, or the State of South Carolina, or any other State in the Union that I know anything about. That is not saying that the Republic of the United States does not have character. It has character, and it has power, and it has glory. The only thing which can destroy that character and that glory is legislation such as this, which alters its character, gives it a central power that lays a foundation for a national socialism.

I will go on. This is from Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, from the principal, dated December 31, 1927:

I send you the following concerning lynchings for the past year as compiled by the Tuskegee Institute in the department of records and research. I find there were 16 persons lynched in 1927. This is 14 less than the number, 30, for 1926; 1 less than the number, 17, for 1925.

There were 42 instances in which officers of the law prevented lynchings; 8 of these were in Northern States and 34 in Southern States.

There is no comparison there by way of prejudice against the Northern States. They do not have so many opportunities, I will agree. My point is that the records here show that in 34 instances the lynchings were prevented, and the mobs were held at bay, and their purpose was defeated by the authorities in the Southern States in the year 1927.

In 1928, according to the records compiled in the department of records and research of the Tuskegee Institute, there were 11 persons lynched. They got down to 11. We started with a peak of 231, according to the statistics which I gave just now, and we have got down to 11. We waited till we got to 11 before anyone ever thought of undertaking to pass through the Congress of the United States a law which would extend the powers of the Federal Government to the supervision of the criminal laws and the execution thereof in the Commonwealths of this country.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is quoting from figures which are exactly in accord with figures which were given me. My figures are from as reliable a source as the source from which the Senator received his.

There is no use for us to try to disguise anything. This bill is aimed at the Southern States. Read the letters in the newspapers about our barbarity and our lack of civilization. In spite of the fact that the Southern States, to save their civilization, and out of gratitude to what is known as the National Democratic Party, have supported that party with steadfast loyalty in spite of the remarkable decline in lynchings which the Senator has verified, in spite of the laws enacted in the section at which all this legislation is aimed, here in a so-called "Democratic" administration, we have this kind of aspersions cast upon us.

The point I wish to inquire about is this: In the light of all these facts, available to the Senator from North Carolina, available to me and available to every decent individual, why is such a bill brought here?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from South Carolina, has asked me a question which, of course, I could not answer. I never knew why anyone introduced any bill. That is a problem, of course.

Mr. SMITH. I want to take exception to that statement, because I certainly know why I introduce a bill.

Mr. BAILEY. I never would know why the Senator did it. He may know, but I would never know until he should tell me.

Mr. SMITH. I do not want the Senator to reflect on his own common sense, because the minute he reads a bill, if the man who introduced it had a purpose in mind, the Senator should know why he introduced it. I know why this bill is here and the Senator knows, too. What is the use of beating around about it? [Laughter.]

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, there is a tribunal in which the secrets of all hearts will be revealed. I am willing to defer my judgment as to motives of men until the final judgment.

Mr. SMITH. That may be too late.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; it may be too late, but I fear that an earlier judgment on one of my fellows would be too soon. Judge not, that ye be not judged.

I have read the figures for 1929. In 1930 there were 21 lynchings. There were 40 instances in which officers of the law prevented lynchings, 5 in Northern and Western States,

and 35 in Southern States. Lynching occurred in these States: Alabama, 1; Florida, 1; Georgia, 6; Indiana, 2; Mississippi, 4; North Carolina, 1; Oklahoma, 1; South Caroline, 2; Texas, 3.

In 1931 the number of lynchings was 13. There were 63 instances in which officers of the law prevented lynching. Seven of those were in Northern and Western States, and 56 in Southern States. The States in which lynchings occurred and the number are as follows: Alabama, 1; Florida, 2; Louisiana, 1; Maryland, 1; Mississippi, 3; Missouri, 1; North Dakota, 1; Tennessee, 1; West Virginia, 2.

In 1932 there were only eight lynchings. This was 5 less than the number in 1931, and 13 less than the number in 1930. There were 34 instances in which officers of the law prevented lynchings, 4 in Northern and Western States, and 30 in Southern States. The States in which lynchings occurred and the number in each are as follows: Arkansas, 1; Florida, 1; Kansas, 1; Kentucky, 1; Louisiana, 1; Ohio, 1; Texas, 1; Virginia, 1.

In 1933 the department of records of research of Tuskegee Institute shows 28 persons were lynched. There were 37 instances in which officers of the law prevented lynching, 6 in Northern and Western States and 31 in Southern States. The States in which lynchings occurred and the number in each are as follows: Alabama 3, California 2, Georgia 4, Louisiana 4, Maryland 1, Mississippi 3, Missouri 1, North Carolina 1, South Carolina 4, Tennessee 3, Texas 2.

The latest release is of December 28, 1934. According to the records compiled in the department of records and research of Tuskegee Institute, there were 15 persons lynched in 1934. This is 13 less than the number in 1933, which was 28. There were 51 instances in which officers of the law prevented lynchings, 7 in Northern and Western States and 44 in Southern States. The States in which lynchings occurred and the number in each State were as follows: Alabama 1, Florida 2, Georgia 1, Kentucky 1, Louisiana 2, Mississippi 6, Tennessee 1, Texas 1.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I observe the Senator is reading from figures furnished by the Tuskegee Institute, which said that lynchings had occurred in Georgia in the year 1934. The same statement was made in the report of the committee reporting the bill.

I hold in my hand a copy of the annual report of the Association of Southern Women for the Prevention of Lynching. Under the head of "Georgia" the following statement is made:

> Lynchings: None in 1934.
>
> Tuskegee Institute reports one lynching. The facts are: Curtis James, a Negro, at Darien, McIntosh County, was attacked by 14 men, 12 white, 2 Negroes, all masked. Both James and the gang attacking him were said to be bootleggers of turpentine. James was believed murdered, but no body or evidence of the death was found. Proof of death is required in all cases involving murder, and several weeks before, a Negro reported lynched at Ways Station, Ga., was found, tried, and sentenced to the chain gang.

I merely wish to have the RECORD show that that was evidently a gang killing. Killings of that character may take place in any section. It was not a lynching.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the Senator from Georgia. Of course, there may be errors, but I take it that the statements are practically correct, and that the statistics may be relied upon; but what is their significance? Almost a constant descent in the ratio until, starting at more than 200, we are down to less than 20; and that is 20 in a population of 126,000,000 people, in which the number of grown people must be around seventy to eighty million.

Mr. SMITH. And, Mr. President, the significance is that the larger number of lynchings was with the smaller population. As the population has increased, the number of lynchings has decreased.

Mr. BAILEY. There have been tremendous increases in population, and tremendous decreases in the number of lynchings. If we reduce it to a percentage, as the lynchings reach the vanishing point our friends, who are the proponents of this legislation, propose the bill and insist upon its consideration, knowing full well that it fundamentally alters the policy of the country, and, as I conceive, the character of the Republic.

Now as to the bill: I have read this bill with much interest. I never expected to see its like; but, as I said just now, as a symbol it is not unwelcome. If this is to be the policy of America, the sooner the American people are notified the better. If the extension of Federal power in civil relations, if the stretching of the interstate-commerce clause is to go on until the Federal Government takes charge of every civil activity in the land—if that is to be the national policy, then this bill is the most appropriate symbol and the most signal notice that could be given to the American people of what is ahead of us.

It is time to have a notice, too. Some of us here in the Senate find our voices too feeble to stretch across the continent and our humble words drowned in a universal din of hysteria and confusion and the clear, patient words of national life all obliterated and obscured in the raucous noise that comes from Coughlin over the radio. Perhaps, when we cease to be heard, a bill like this will notify the Nation. If it shall, the reverberations, if I do not miss my calculations, will drown the voice of Coughlin, and then we may thank God for the bill.

I did not mean on this occasion to speak about Coughlin. I left off his title, and I did so deliberately. In his church—and I shall always speak respectfully of all churches—he can be called "Father" or "Reverend Father"; but he cannot be called "Father" or "Reverend Father" in American politics. In his church he may have his priestly robes and his power of absolution, but when he undertakes to promise a harp and a halo to the American people by political action I challenge his priestly power.

There is nothing more sinister in our life right now than that Coughlin from the radio of the Shrine of the Little Flower—the little saint of suffering who interpreted her life by way of identifying herself with the agonies on the cross, who died expressing the prayer that she might return to earth rather than go to heaven and come back, as she said in immortal words, in a shower of roses—from a shrine in her holy name that voice stirs the depths of hate throughout the land of liberty, matches class against class, foments the fires of revolution, to crucify the American people upon his damnable ambition. Coughlin! Not "Father Coughlin."

Mr. President, I have a profound respect for the ministry. My father was a minister. My grandfather was a minister. Of course, I honor the ministry, but they are not just the reasons. I honor the ministry because it is the ministry; but when a minister of the gospel or a minister of a church comes down into the political arena and goes out with his radio incendiarism to stir up the fountains of hate in a distressed land amongst a suffering people, I take it nothing amiss, and I make no apologies, but I will snatch the halo from his brow and throw it into the nearest spittoon, and then throw the spittoon into the gutter.

Now, Mr. President, as for the proposed law, let us read it:

> SEC. 2. If any State or governmental subdivision thereof—

That means any county or township, I take it—

> fails, neglects, or refuses to provide and maintain protection to the life or person of any individual within its jurisdiction against a mob or riotous assemblage, whether by way of preventing or punishing the acts thereof, such State shall by reason of such failure, neglect, or refusal be deemed to have denied to such person due process of law and the equal protection of the laws of the State, and to the end that the protection guaranteed to persons within the jurisdictions of the several States, or to citizens of the United States, by the Constitution of the United States, may be secured, the provisions of this act are enacted.

Now, one moment. Mr. President, this is a legislative interpretation of the Constitution to make the United States the judge of the States and the counties. Who ever heard of that before?

Mr. President, it is suggested that a recess may be in order at this time, and that I may resume tomorrow.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I desire to move an executive session before the Senate takes a recess.

Mr. BAILEY. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBINSON. 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 REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

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

He also, from the same committee, reported adversely the nomination of John R. Hutchison to be postmaster at Santa Maria, Calif., in place of E. T. Ketcham.

Mr. TRAMMELL, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported favorably the nominations of sundry officers in the Navy and the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGILL in the chair). The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

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

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis H. Inge to be United States attorney, southern district of Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank E. Flynn to be United States attorney, district of Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

RECESS

Mr. ROBINSON. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in legislative session, took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 26, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 25 (legislative day of Apr. 15), 1935

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Francis H. Inge to be United States attorney, southern district of Alabama.

Frank E. Flynn to be United States attorney, district of Arizona.

POSTMASTERS

ALASKA

Agnes L. Reinert, Ketchikan.

CALIFORNIA

Gay E. Shamel, Cambria.
Charles D. Printz, Caruthers.
Katherine V. Lera, Millbrae.
Matie L. McCormick, Ojai.
Walter A. Oxford, Orosi.
Alla P. Tidwell, Pine Knot.
Albert G. Stewart, Sanger.

KANSAS

Thomas L. Lozier, Edna.

MINNESOTA

Ingebrigt A. Hanson, Frost.
Carl E. Young, Good Thunder.
Clyde H. Hiatt, Granada.
Oliver A. Matson, Kiester.
Alvin E. Comstock, Lakefield.
Gerald F. Wrucke, Minnesota Lake.
Jessie B. Reynolds, Motley.
Arthur J. Suel, New Prague.
Erna A. Baumhefner, Norwood.
Herman B. Nelson, Sherburn.
Leon L. Bronk, Winona.

OREGON

Elof T. Hedlund, Portland.
George E. Travis, St. Benedict.
George W. T. Doty, West Linn.

VIRGINIA

Thomas E. Chambers, Blackstone.
John W. Rodgers, Hampden Sydney.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 1935

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Everlasting praise be unto Thee, most merciful God. We thank Thee for Thy presence, which inspires happiness, joyfulness, and concord. Thou who art infinite in love and wisdom, let not the star of this day fade until we have raised the level of humanity and the ideal of better living. Give us to understand that the spheres of morality and spirituality are most essential in the economies of society. As the springtime has burst forth on the frozen earth and the beams of its warmth have started to blossom woodland, plain, and valley, so start us with renewed hoping, longing, striving for better things. O let Nature, with its calm and majesty, disturb us with elevated thoughts. Whether the days be blessed or hard with trial, sustain us with fortitude and inner peace. Gird us with the strength of the hills, with the spirit that quiets and with a compelling faith. In the name of our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

"WHY I AM GLAD THAT I AM AN AMERICAN"

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion of Ohio recently offered as a prize a week's trip with all expenses paid to Washington and other points to one boy or girl in the seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades of the public schools of Ohio who wrote the best essay on Why I am glad that I am an American. The winners, 4 boys and 2 girls, are now in the city and possibly in the gallery at this time. They are accompanied by William S. Konold, commander of the American Legion of the Department of Ohio, and W. L. De Weese, State director of child welfare. These essays, in my humble judgment, are worthy of preservation. They are short, not over 500 words each, and will not use any very great amount of space in the RECORD. None of these six outstanding boys and girls are from my own district, I regret to say. I therefore serve no selfish purpose when I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, by printing these six short essays on this timely topic, which I assure the House will be highly appreciated by the American Legion of my State.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may say that no doubt the essays are well worth while.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

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

There was no objection.

The essays are as follows:

WHY I AM GLAD I AM AN AMERICAN

(By John Phillips, grade 7-2-A, Bowling Green Junior High School, Wood County, Ohio)

America! Land of the free, home of the brave! Within your vast boundaries I am privileged to live, and happy to be able to share with my countrymen freedom, independence, and equal rights. Europe may have its luxury, nobility, and antiqueness; Asia may have its riches and royal pomp; but America has something more than either of these nations, for behind that flowing flag of red, white, and blue is the emblem of a promised land, within whose boundaries are found rich, fertile plains, wooded hills, and deep valleys.

America is a land of freedom, self-government, and democracy, with a Government ruled not only by those with wealth and a title their fathers worked hard to earn, but that quality of people who landed first on the rock-bound shores of America, determined and set in their ideas of liberty and justice for all.

I am proud as an American citizen to say that my forefathers have helped America build itself to its present power, a democracy in a republic.

American citizens are privileged to live in a beautiful country, rich in resources, respected, even looked upon in envy at her present commercial power by other foreign powers. Today the dream of our forefathers has come true, inasmuch as America is the leading nation of the world, and the sovereign power does not rest with one type of people alone, but with the masses. We are allowed to vote, hold office, and are protected by our Constitution, which gives us the right to have a voice in the Government, to worship as we see right, to have a trial by jury, and to be equal before the law.

Probably more than any other nation, the American Governmen works for our security. Relief work, pensions, and insurance are but a few of the things that, at the present, keep many people from being jobless and penniless.

I am happy to be an American because America has more fine organizations than any other country in the world. The younger generation cannot help but profit through these organizations, as they grow to become the men and women of tomorrow. The American Legion is an organization of men who fought for our rights, freedom, and liberty in the World War, men who died for what they thought right and kept the United States of America a nation of international prestige. Our fine system of schools gives every child in America a chance to receive a good education. The Red Cross takes care of many people annually in time of disaster. America tolerates all kinds of religion and is noted for her many fine churches. The Scouts of America today are the men and women of tomorrow, and that organization has taken large steps in the upbuilding of America's youth. These are but a few organizations which help to make America a strong, independent nation.

Beautiful America, indeed I am honored to be one of you, my fullest support I pledge to you, and every drop of blood in me will keep that vow, for I am proud of my past, more proud of my future, but proudest that I am a true American.

WHY I AM GLAD THAT I AM AN AMERICAN

(By Junior Wolfe, grade 8-A, Addison School, Masury, Ohio)

I have the pleasure of living in a country of high ideals, governed by liberty-loving citizens. I enjoy an advanced civilization, cultivated and improved by our struggling forefathers.

Under our flag, I choose my church, and when I am of proper age, I will vote as I see fit, and can at all times express my opinion when I believe it helpful. Our laws protect my home, my honor, and my efforts for later preparation for life.

Through our public-school system, I can obtain an education that will prepare me for my livelihood. Through my own ability and effort my training may be continued until it is equal to that of anyone else. Nothing interferes with the choice of my life-work.

If I lived in Russia, I might be thrown into prison for criticizing the Government. In America the Government might consider my criticism.

In Germany, I would be compelled to take part in military training, preparing for future war. In the United States my associates do not favor the hardships and sufferings of war.

If I lived in India, I might be considered in the lower class, and I would have to do odd things in the presence of the higher class. In America, people are all considered the same.

In China I might be crowded into a small dirty hut or a houseboat. The United States furnishes plenty of room, and in crowded cities there are healthful conditions.

In some parts of the old world there are very few free schools. The United States has a public-school system along with the private schools and tutors. In our system I have learned to protect property, to respect my elders, to be courteous to everyone, and to respect law and order.

Our country is located in a favorable climate, not only for healthful conditions for the homes of persons, but for the growth of the different varieties of fruits and other products. In the Southern States raw materials are raised because the climate is suitable for their growth, and sent North for manufacturing, thus giving growth to transportation.

We have a variety of raw materials; some that are mined are iron ore and petroleum, some that are grown are cotton and wool. There is a plentiful supply of building materials, such as lumber and stone.

With all of these conveniences I see no reason why anyone should be dissatisfied to live in the United States. But I readily understand why anyone is glad that he is an American.

WHY I AM GLAD I AM AN AMERICAN

(By Jane Dressel, ninth grade, Belpre High School, Washington County)

First of all, I am glad to be a part of such a great country as America, the home of the spirit of hope, liberty, and justice, and of the great ideals which made America the hope of the world.

America does not consist of groups. She lives up to the quotation "All men are created equal." All the people are considered equal because we do not have class distinction. America is called "the melting pot of nations", because different nationalities are allowed to enter, and a mixture of races and talents produces the best and most attractive people and eventually American citizens. The American people have a voice in the Government. They are allowed to vote for the man they think is best. The women of America have more rights and are allowed to vote also. They hold Government offices and are able to make their living easier and better by having the same advantages as men. The American citizens have more freedom in religion. They have the right to join and take part in the church they choose.

America has a higher standard of living for the common wage earners such as we are. We have the labor-saving devices in our homes, and the things that make homes attractive and pleasant places in which to live. Our food and clothing are more practical and healthful than in other places. The automobile has ceased to be a luxury in the United States while in Europe only the wealthier classes have them.

The schools of America are considered to be among the first in the world. The grammar and high schools combined provide enough education for one to secure a position after graduation. The fee to enter college is very moderate, suited to the financial standing of the individual who wishes to attend and procure a higher education. America has good medical, law, and agricultural colleges also.

I am very proud of the beauties of America. Her natural resources are considered to be among the greatest in the world. The national parks, Niagara Falls, Grand Canyon, and mountains, plains, deserts are some of the glorious scenery which one sees while going through America. The beautiful cities and towns are clean, healthful, and prosperous.

The welfare and health of the people are looked after well. America's hospitals and doctors are among the best. The most scientific equipment is procured. The different homes for the deaf and dumb, insane, orphans, and old people are made pleasant places in which to live under such conditions.

In closing, I am glad I am an American because of the freedom and educational advantages which help me to become an honest and helpful American citizen.

O beautiful for heroes proved
  In liberating strife,
Who more than self their country loved,
  And mercy more than life.

America, America
  May God thy gold refine.
Till all success be nobleness
  And every gain divine.

WHY I AM GLAD TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By Carlton Ott, grade 10, St. Paul's High School, Huron, Ohio)

There are many reasons why I am glad I am an American. First of all, America is a superior nation. She has fought many hardships from the earliest time of her history. Her first great test of strength was the Revolutionary War. With poor forces she defeated the English. Then, too, her hardships were great because of the savage Indians. She has never lost a war. Now she is the leading country of the world.

America has a good, strong Government. She does not have a ruler elected for life as many countries have, but one who is elected for 4 years by the people. The citizens who are 21 years of age or older have the right to elect, either directly or indirectly, all Government officials. The President does not have all the power. His proposals must be passed by Congress before they become laws.

We Americans ought to be glad we have religious freedom and freedom of speech and of the press. Look at Mexico where Catholics are being persecuted. Jews do not have their just rights in Germany. Isn't it much better to live in America where all men are equal, than in many other countries where certain classes of people are persecuted? Many countries have all the people's mail and newspapers censored. We do not have anything of the kind.

America has many beautiful parks and rivers, such as the great Niagara Falls, Potomac River, Yosemite and Yellowstone National Parks, and the Grand Canyon. She has very many large and beautiful cities such as Washington, D. C., New York, and Chicago. She has many beautiful libraries and museums where many thousands of American people go daily for the purpose of spending their leisure time. She has industries of all kinds.

We Americans have many places of recreation. Our national game is baseball. Every large city has a stadium or some large park in which to play baseball, football, and many other games.

America has produced many great men who were world famous. Among them were Washington, Jefferson, Monroe, Lincoln, Longfellow, Theodore Roosevelt, and many others. Another famous man who loved America dearly was Nathan Hale. When about to be killed as a spy, he said, "I regret that I have only one life to lose for my country." I am glad to live in a country with such great leaders.

America is the home of inventors. Thomas Edison invented the electric light; Bell, the telephone; Ford, the automobile; McCormick, the reaper; Whitney, the cotton gin; and Howe, the sewing machine. These are just a few of the American inventors.

America has an excellent system of schools. Every child has an opportunity to receive a high-school education. In many countries, children receive very little education. The American people have a good chance to become highly cultured. America has many colleges and universities in order to give her people further education.

Methods of travel are easy. Almost every family owns an automobile. People go from one large city to another in a few hours. Roads are paved. America has many hospitals and asylums for the sick. Cities are kept clean.

I am very glad to live in America, the country with large cities and good seaports, navigable rivers, large forests, good farming land, and most of all, a good Government. Why shouldn't I be glad to live in a country with many advantages which many other countries have not?

WHY I'M GLAD I'M AN AMERICAN

(By Ruth Newell, junior class, grade 11, 114 Woodland Avenue, Columbiana, Ohio)

I'm glad I'm one of the youth of America marching under the Stars and Stripes; one of the children under dear old Uncle Sam's protection.

Who would hesitate to wish to be an American with all the numerous advantages before him? Individuality is probably the greatest opportunity which the American boy and girl can claim as their heritage. Our ancestors proved their love of liberty at the outcome of the American Revolution. By putting their very heart and soul into the enterprise they succeeded in their purpose. When our forefathers drew up the Constitution they assured freedom of speech, press, and religion to every American.

How does this assurance of liberty affect me? I may profit by freedom of speech by hearing all sides of questions on the radio and at lectures. I can further my education by reading books, magazines, and newspapers, thus profiting by other persons' ideas. I have this advantage by the freedom of press. Choice of religion is a privilege allowed to every single person. If some boy or girl desires to pursue any line of special work he is not hindered in any manner unless by certain circumstances in his own private life. A boy interested in aeronautics may study the subject and advance just as readily as he wishes, and is not held back by governmental interference. Neither is a girl hindered in her desire, for progression in any special work. America is a land of individualism. This opportunity for individuality has given us many personages of whom we are justly proud; in the field of education Dr. Charles Clist; in electrical research, Thomas A. Edison; in the rubber industry, Harvey Firestone; in mechanical research, Henry Ford; in the administration of justice, Judge Florence Allen; and in the field of philanthropy, Jane Addams. The achievements of these great men and women prove to every boy and girl that they have an opportunity to perform some worthwhile work for the betterment of mankind.

American parents do not rule their children's ideas, ambitions, and thoughts, but leave them a reasonable range of freedom. This single reason would give me good ground for proclaiming my partiality for America.

Public education is probably the greatest cultural advantage in being an American. By having a public system of schools the mass of the people have a chance to learn while in most lands only a selected few have the opportunity. The first phase of American education is the public school. This assures everyone knowledge of the fundamentals of education. College is then the next opportunity offered if you are ambitious enough to make use of it. The person who does not wish to obtain a position in the professional lines has the chance of business learning in public schools and then commercial or business colleges follow. For the boy or girl who wishes to take up some practical trade, provisions are made in manual-training departments or domestic-science halls in the public schools and then apprenticed to a factory or some other institute. For less fortunate individuals night schools, emergency schools, and junior radio colleges have been provided.

I think the American people as a whole are a better looking race and have a more pleasing personality than any other country. The mass of the people are better clothed and have a higher standard of living. During the colonial period of American development all the races of Europe mingled together. This melting pot of the races instituted a better looking and singular race, the Americans.

Where can one find a country so vast, so picturesque, so scenic, so historical, and so altogether grand as the United States of America? I am proud to be a citizen of a land of so great a population and size. Because of this large amount of territory, America is not so crowded as European and Asiatic countries, and better living conditions are evident. Too, poorly lighted and ventilated tenement districts are being razed and better homes provided because of plenty of space. Our health is thus protected and sanitary living conditions ensue. As a result poverty is not so eminent. In a country of ample room a trend of progression is prevalent.

Then, too, we live in a country of many beauty spots—mountains, forests, caves, waterfalls, plains, canyons, and most every type of scenic beauty a boy or girl could wish for. A land of beautiful background is an incentive for its people to live beautiful lives.

In a country of such varied climate and wide range of background many types of sports are enjoyed. The American boy and girl have their duties, but they also have their time for play and leisure.

Comparing our lives with the lives of our foreign brothers and sisters, I would not choose to be other than an American. If I were an Italian or German child at a very early age, I would be training for war and pressed with government problems. In Russia I would be deprived of religion, sanitary living conditions, and adequate education. Every time I would cheer for dear old Uncle Sam and salute the Stars and Stripes.

WHY I AM GLAD I AM AN AMERICAN

(By James F. Pflum, grade 12, St. Rose School, Allen County, Ohio)

Glad that I am an American? Of course I am! When I realize what our forefathers went through to establish this country, when I think of the opportunities this country offers, of the resources contained here, of the educational advantages held out, of the climatic and scenic beauty of our land, when I consider that we are the most democratic, self-ruling people in the world, how can I be anything but glad?

The United States, unlike most countries, is not the home of a certain race of people who live together merely because they are members of the same race. It was founded by people from various lands, all in search of the same ideal—self government and freedom. Love of liberty united them all in one close brotherhood. From this brotherhood descended the present American people.

The Government of these people is left almost entirely to the people themselves. Our whole political creed is briefly summed up in the Declaration of Independence: "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

America heads the list in offering equal educational advantages to all its citizens. A systemized plan of free public schools and laws enforcing compulsory education have gone far in bringing the intelligence of the average American above that of his foreign neighbors. America is the land of opportunity, and the advancement of a man or woman along any line depends entirely upon the individual. He is not restricted by any class system. In America there is only one class—Americans!

Discoveries and inventions of Americans have done much to promote the wealth and comfort of the American people at home and their prestige abroad. The glare of millions of lights in our business districts, the unceasing ring of the telephone, the farm machines that so lighten the work of our tillers of the soil. The modern household timesavers are all products of American endeavor and bring to the mind a galaxy of famous names—Whitney, Fulton, Cooper, Edison, Bell, Morse, Field, McCormick, etc.

Not only have the intellectual and material well-being of our citizens been the deep concern of the builders of our Nation, but the spiritual was also safeguarded in the positive pronouncement contained in the first amendment to our Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This beacon light of freedom of conscience flashed its consoling message to the persecuted of every nation. Across the mighty waters came the oppressed of all peoples to establish their home on this solid rock of religious freedom.

Our country possesses not only a wealth of resources, but also an abundance of scenic attractions. Why travel abroad when within our own borders we can find the lonely sands of the Sahara, the rush and bustle of Piccadilly Square, the snow-capped peaks and quiet valleys of the Alps, the heat of the tropics, and the cool woodlands of the Black Forest.

America has a heart. Few countries care for the orphan, for the aged and infirm as she does. Our National, State, and municipal health departments, as well as the plan of supervised recreation for children, aid in developing a nation of strong and healthy citizens.

America stands for peace, for good feeling among the peoples of the earth, yet our record in war is second to none. Recently, when the nations of the earth became involved in a world war, we beheld the flower of American manhood, khaki-clad, spring into action and follow Old Glory across the seas. The rows of crosses in Flanders fields bear silent testimony of America's share in the struggle "to make the world safe for democracy."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 58]

Allen	Doutrich	Kopplemann	Sandlin
Andresen	Driver	Kvale	Schaefer
Bankhead	Duncan	Lamneck	Schneider
Berlin	Eaton	Larrabee	Schuetz
Brennan	Englebright	Lemke	Seger
Brooks	Fernandez	Lewis, Md.	Shannon
Burdick	Ford, Miss.	Lucas	Short
Cannon, Wis.	Frey	McGehee	Sisson
Cartwright	Fulmer	McGroarty	Snyder
Cavicchia	Gambrill	McLean	Somers, N. Y.
Celler	Gasque	McReynolds	Stack
Chapman	Gassaway	Maas	Sweeney
Clark, Idaho	Gifford	Marcantonio	Taber
Clark, N. C.	Gillette	Meeks	Thomas
Connery	Gingery	Murdock	Tinkham
Cooper, Ohio	Goldsborough	Nelson	Underwood
Crawford	Hancock, N. C.	O'Malley	Vinson, Ky.
Culkin	Higgins, Conn.	O'Neal	Wigglesworth
Daly	Hollister	Palmisano	Williams
Dear	Hope	Parsons	Wilson, Pa.
Dempsey	Houston	Peyser	Withrow
DeRouen	Igoe	Ransley	Wolcott
Dies	Jenkins, Ohio	Rayburn	Woodruff
Dingell	Kennedy, Md.	Rogers, N. H.	
Disney	Kennedy, N. Y.	Sabath	
Dondero	Kleberg	Sanders, La.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty-one Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ADDRESS AT LAYING OF CORNERSTONE OF POST OFFICE, EFFINGHAM, ILL.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address of J. Austin Latimer, special assistant to the Postmaster General, at the cornerstone laying of the new post office at Effingham, Ill., on April 15, 1935.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of J. Austin Latimer, special assistant to the Postmaster General of the United States, at the cornerstone laying of the new post office at Effingham, Ill., April 15, 1935:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very happy that this, my first visit to Effingham and Effingham County, and that section of Illinois known as "the Hub", is under such pleasing conditions, and my only regret is that the pressure of official duties made it impossible for your good friend and mine, Congressman ARNOLD, to be here at the cornerstone-laying of this building for which he has labored so many years. Here in his home section, in the very place where he attended Austin College many years ago, may I be permitted to say that, in my opinion, there is no more useful man in Congress than your able Representative. As Chairman of the Post Office Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. ARNOLD has rendered outstanding service to the country and has demonstrated himself to be a real and able friend of the Postal Service. Just as I was leaving Washington he called me over the telephone to ask that I express his deep regret at not being able to be present at these exercises and extend his greetings to his Effingham friends.

It is also a real pleasure to know personally your two splendid Members of the upper House, Senators LEWIS and DIETRICH.

It is most inspiring to come into this mighty empire of Illinois, with its length of nearly 400 miles and its population of over 7,000,000 people. Your State leads in so many things, I will not attempt to enumerate them, but to me outstanding are your institutions of learning and your liberal support of your schools, colleges, and universities. Illinois has abundant natural resources, both in her soils and beneath the surface, and ranks as one of the leading States in minerals and manufactures, but it is in the field of agriculture and in the value of her farming lands that she is supreme. Many years ago the famous French explorer, Father Marquette, wrote of the potential wealth of Illinois' rich soils and beautiful rivers: "We have seen nothing like this river for the fertility of the land, its prairies, woods, and wild cattle."

It is a particular added pleasure to have been selected by the Postmaster General to represent him at these exercises and he has requested me to convey his personal greetings and regret that he himself could not be present. In this he is joined by the other officials of the Post Office Department, and I particularly want to bring to you greetings from a splendid son of Illinois who is one of my best friends in the Postal Service—Chief Inspector K. P. Aldrich, a native of this section of your State.

This is an important day in Effingham, for no institution serves the public more generally than the post office, and the dedication of a new post-office building is always an occasion for rejoicing. This is particularly true in this instance because of the attractive appearance and splendid facilities of your new building, which, with the site, represents an investment of $800,000. As you know, the Treasury Department awarded the contract for the construction of the building to A. C. Atherton, of Evanston, Ill., on October 5, 1934.

I am happy to participate in these exercises along with your excellent postmaster, Mr. Grover C. Norris, and your well-known mayor, Hon. Harry J. Rickelman, and to appear on the platform with several of your former postmasters, who have done their part in making possible this handsome building.

Our records in Washington show that a post office was established here in 1855 with John Haney as your first postmaster, followed by George H. Scoles, December 12, 1855; Jacob Bishop, November 21, 1856; Andrew J. Gilbert, January 12, 1858; I. M. Mett, April 1, 1859; John J. Funkhouser, May 11, 1859; Robert E. Moore, January 30, 1860; Lucius M. Rose, March 20, 1861; David B. Alexander, April 12, 1862; Henry G. Habing, April 7, 1865; David B. Alexander, January 11, 1866; William S. Coleman, June 5, 1866; Lewis W. Smith, March 30, 1869; William McPherson, March 1, 1873; John F. Barlow, March 22, 1875; William C. Wright, October 5, 1877; Samuel N. Scott, December 15, 1881; Charles H. Kelly, January 13, 1886; John H. I. Lacy, January 9, 1890; William M. Stewart, February 16, 1894; Richard F. Lawson, February 7, 1898; William Austin, February 13, 1907; David L. Wright, October 22, 1913; William W. Austin, May 8, 1922; Grover C. Norris (acting), October 21, 1933; Grover C. Norris, March 7, 1934.

The Postal Service is one of our oldest public institutions, dating back to earliest colonial days, and in the 300 years of its existence it has been one of the most important influences in the development and progress of the country. As Postmaster General Randall so well expressed it in his Annual Report of 1866—

"This service, under the liberal patronage of the Government, has done more to aid in developing the resources of the country than anything else except the cultivation of the soil. It has done more to aid in enlightening and Christianizing the people than anything else except the spelling book and Bible. The post office and mail route travel with civilization and mark its progress as distinctly as the schoolhouse and meeting house."

Today it is the habit to take an efficient mail service for granted, even 24-hour mail service between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, yet we all realize that should the Postal Service cease to function for a single hour, the business of the entire country would be brought to a sudden standstill with disastrous results to every citizen of the country, so indispensable is the Postal Service to our commerce and our business and social life.

Let us consider for a moment the tremendous progress made in the handling of the United States mail within the past hundred years. In 1835 rates were about as in Benjamin Franklin's time, and not until the year the post office was established here in Effingham was prepayment of postage made compulsory and registry service established. One hundred years ago envelops were unknown and postage stamps were not authorized until 1847. The traveling railway post office was inaugurated in 1840; money-order service was established in 1864, particularly to accommodate Civil War soldiers. Free delivery of mail in cities began in 1863 but the rural free-delivery service is not yet 40 years old.

On the third of this month was observed the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the picturesque Pony Express between St. Joseph, Mo., and San Francisco, which visioned the carriage of the mail to the Pacific coast in the then incredibly short time of 10 days, whereas today a letter dispatched from Washington at 4:25 one afternoon will reach Los Angeles at 8:10 the next morning.

Some idea of the magnitude of your Postal Service may be gained from the following statistics:

With approximately 230,000 employees, more than one-third of all the civilian employees of the Government, the Post Office Department is the largest of the Government departments and the only one that is represented in every city and town and village in the country. At the present time there are 45,921 post offices in the United States, of which 1,526 are in the State of Illinois. Thirty-five thousand, three hundred and thirty rural routes are giving service to nearly 7,000,000 families; 743 full postal cars and 3,496 apartment mail cars are utilized in the Railway Mail Service. During the fiscal year ended last June 30, it is estimated the United States Postal Service handled 1,022,675,975 pounds of second-class matter; issued 198,656,378 money orders and handled postal savings deposits aggregating approximately one and one-fourth billion dollars. The receipts from postage paid on mail during that period amounted to $519,249,989—an average of $4.05 per capita.

Now, just a word in regard to the statistics of the dead-letter office. Because of carelessness on the part of the senders who gave incorrect or inadequate addresses or failed to put a return address on the envelop, or because of failure on the part of the addressees to notify their postman or post office of their new address when moving, over 10,000,000 letters with over $69,000 enclosed had to be sent to the dead-letter office during the fiscal year 1934—an increase of 7¼ percent over the previous year. Through its experienced and expert staff the Department succeeded in returning to the senders 2,664,789 of these letters and the greater part of the enclosed money, but the Department would appreciate the cooperation of all its patrons to make sure (first) that all letters are addressed carefully, with the return address of the sender shown on the envelop, and (second) that the change-of-address cards furnished by the post office and postman be filled out when patrons change their address.

There is much more than I could say about the interesting department of the Government with which I am connected, but

I want to close by making a brief reference to that which is very close to us all—the continued recovery of our country. I know that I am speaking to men and women who are first, and above all, Americans with an intense love for their country, and those fundamental institutions upon which this great Republic has been built. I feel likewise that in common with the rank and file of the citizenship of this Nation you are stanchly behind President Roosevelt in everything that he is doing in this recovery program.

These are stirring days in which we live. It does not require the seventh son of a seventh son to prophesy that the whole future of our country depends upon the successful accomplishment of the great national objectives toward which the administration is striving. We are going through one of the critical periods of American history, one of those periods which, occurring in almost every generation, have seen what Abraham Lincoln in his Gettysburg address called "a new birth of freedom."

I call upon you to enlist whole-heartedly and without reservation under the banner of Franklin D. Roosevelt who has already attained a great place in American history and who will rank as one of our greatest Presidents. He has given us confidence and courage to clear away stout-heartedly the mistakes and wrongs of the past and to erect a new system of exact and equal justice for all. He has never faltered and with cheerful heart he still leads us on—the "bravest of the brave." With united support he will continue to lead us from one victory to another until we reach the great objective—a happy and prosperous country.

It's no time for a quitter now, as Grantland Rice so well expressed it in verse:

"Of all the days that ever were,
Since Moses framed the ancient code,
Or vanished years that knew the stir
Of Caesar's legions down the road—
Take all the aeons that have flown,
From drudge-pit to the laureled brow,
Above all ages time has known,
There's no place for the quitter now.

"Start back to where the caveman ruled
The first grey dawn of rugged life,
Where each raw clan in turn was schooled
To stand against an endless strife,
Through reigns of terror and of gore
Through shattered faith and broken vow
Far less than time has known before,
There's no place for the quitter now.

"The world has known its share of pain,
Its share of vandals and of Huns,
The world for ages now has lain
Beneath the echo of the guns,
But since within the world's dim dawn
Our fathers leaped from bough to bough
Though all the terror fate has drawn,
There's less room for the quitter now."

ADDRESS BEFORE THE SHRINE CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. HAROLD KNUTSON, on April 24 before the Shrine Club of Philadelphia.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] before the Shrine Club of Philadelphia, Pa., April 24, 1935:

There is a singular propriety in discussing tendencies of our governmental policies and in taking stock of our liberties in this city of Philadelphia. The sacred places of the Nation are widely distributed. The shrines at which the patriotic American worships mark the way-stations of the Nation's glory. Massachusetts has her Bunker Hill and Fanueil Hall, while Virginia her Mount Vernon and her Yorktown. Monuments reared here and there preserve the high notes in the epic story of the making of America.

But here in Philadelphia is the cradle of American liberty. It was in Independence Hall that the Declaration of Independence—the world's great charter of human rights—was penned and adopted. It was from a Philadelphia belfry that a full-toned bell rang forth the joyful message that a new nation had been born, dedicated to the lofty concept that all men are created equal. It was in this city that the Nation's leaders, assembled under the chairmanship of George Washington, consummated the work of the American Revolution and gave us our fundamental law.

These are but suggestions of the historic traditions that cluster about Philadelphia. Within the scope of its influence are other sacred spots where splendid devotion and unselfish sacrifice have given them a lasting significance. In the immediate neighborhood is Valley Forge, where Washington and his band of patriots suffered to establish the Union of States. A little farther off, but within the confines of Pennsylvania is the field of Gettysburg, where men gave their lives that this Union should be preserved.

It was upon that field that Lincoln, with the eloquence of a prophet of old, pledged the faith of the past and future—"That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

In the light of this magnificent confession of American purpose in the contemplation of this sacred pledge, it behooves us to look about and note whether we are keeping the faith.

Under what its sponsors are pleased to call the new deal, dangerous practices already have been indulged in, and even more dangerous tendencies are in evidence. In a combination of fascism, marxism, communism, and conservatism, the new deal has harried our people and ravished our Constitution so the founding fathers, who labored in this city over a hundred years ago to perfect it, would scarcely recognize their handiwork. Almost unlimited authority has been given the Executive. Bureaus clothed with arbitrary power to regulate the lives of our people have sprung up and continue to sprout and flourish like the bay tree; Government agents are spread over the country like a plague of locusts; the regulations of bureaus have been given the imperial sanction of law, while in the name of recovery innumerable and vexatious barricades have been thrown across the pathway of prosperity.

Congress has been gradually divesting itself of its constitutional powers, until in the last outstanding example it placed in the hands of the Executive the stupendous sum of nearly $5,000,000,000 with authority to spend it as he sees fit.

In doing this Congress has delegated its authority not only to spend money but has also resigned from its province of establishing policies for the Executive to carry out. Call it what you will, but the granting of such far-reaching authority marks the close of constitutional government at least for the present, and a return of representative government will be brought about only with the gravest difficulty.

Always in history, when nations abandoned the beaten road of experience, others were prone to follow. The chaos resulting from the World War has caused a variety of dictatorships to spring up. It had seemed that America, firmly grounded in representative republican government, would remain steadfast to the old ideals. The past 2 years, however, have witnessed a furious effort not to maintain our cherished ideals of government but to afflict us with a swarm of experiments spawned by a visionary and unpractical "brain trust", and turned loose with reckless disregard of consequences. In place of carefully worked out plans designed to meet the emergency, each day now sees a new scheme and the query of the average newspaper reader as he looks at his morning journal is not "what is new" but "what's next." Laws, schemes, plans, and regulations have come so fast and in such number that even the closest students of current events are unable to summarize them or to give an intelligent explanation of what it is all about.

In the face of these frantic and fantastic experiments, prosperity has not returned, unemployment continues, and direct relief is now to be followed by a wholesale attempt by the Government to supply the jobs which private industry is no longer able to furnish.

An outstanding example of the effort to revive prosperity by means more likely to retard it is the program of reciprocal-trade agreements which the administration is working out. The effect of these agreements will be to throw the American market open more and more to foreign inroads and to place the American laborer in competition with the poorly paid workmen of Europe and of the Orient.

The law permitting reciprocal-trade agreements to be negotiated by the President, without the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, was enacted less than a year ago, and since its enactment we have negotiated trade agreements with Cuba, Belgium, Brazil, and Haiti. Trade agreements with other countries are now in process of negotiation.

We have heard many reasons advanced for the depression and not a few suggestions for its cure. One of the most ingenious remedies to come to my attention was the suggestion of Secretary Wallace that we could only end the depression by restoring the purchasing power of foreign countries and that such purchasing power could only be restored by turning the American market over to those countries.

Ever since the enactment of the Hawley-Smoot tariff law back in July 1930, and for a considerable period prior thereto, a vicious and misleading campaign was carried on in Congress and through the press against the measure. It has been denounced as a thing of evil, without any redeeming qualities, and we were repeatedly assured during the campaigns of 1932 and 1934, by the party now in power, that one of the first things they would do upon securing control of the Government would be to repeal the present Republican tariff law in its entirety.

The Democrats secured control of the House 4 years ago, since which time they have had an overwhelming majority in that body. In fact, the majorities in both the House and Senate are the greatest ever enjoyed by any political party in all the history of the Republic, and yet not a single move has been made to repeal the present Republican Hawley-Smoot tariff law.

The courageous thing, of course, would be to repeal it, but to do so would mean political suicide because it would result in the absolute destruction of American industry and agriculture through the loss of the American market, which is the best and only cash market in the world today.

Pennsylvania is one of the greatest States in the Union, and no State has contributed more toward the upbuilding of the Republic that we all love and revere. At one time you were the greatest oil-producing State in the Union. You have the largest deposits of anthracite coal and vast bodies of bituminous coal. Your steel industry is the greatest in the world and you are vitally interested in the manufacture of textiles, machinery, glass, and cement. I dare say that there is not a State in the Union whose welfare is more dependent upon the great American market than is Pennsylvania, and I hope that what I may have to say to you today will be of special interest because of that fact. Not only are you a great mining and manufacturing commonwealth, but as an agricultural State you rank well up to the top and I believe that Lancaster County is rated the richest agricultural county in the Union.

In the consideration of the subject assigned to me for today, it may be well to ponder over the fact that on the basis of value, 67 percent of all the items imported into this country under the present tariff law come in free of duty, while but 33 percent are dutiable. Neither should we, in its consideration, overlook the fact that when we devalued the dollar it had the effect of reducing tariff rates by 41 percent. As a result we are today the lowest tariff country in the world, with the possible exception of England, so it must be readily appreciated that there is no justification or necessity for a lowering of tariff rates at this time either through reciprocal-trade agreements or by act of Congress.

We are told that the shrinkage in our foreign trade is due to our past policy of protection. Figures compiled by the Department of Commerce show that with the exception of Japan every great exporting country in the world has suffered the same shrinkage, so we may safely brush aside the statement that our decline in foreign trade is due to reprisals. Rather is it due to the world-wide depression from which every country has suffered in proportion to the expansion made by such country under the stimulus of the World War.

George N. Peek, head of the International Credit Bank, is authority for the statement that our foreign commerce during the past 20 years has amounted to approximately $40,000,000,000 and from that trade we have sustained a net loss of $2,000,000,000. In normal times we consume approximately 94 percent of our total production—industrial and agricultural—with the exception of cotton, and why we should make so much fuss over our 6-percent foreign market, more especially when official figures show that we have sustained a net loss of 5 percent from that trade during the past 20 years, is beyond my comprehension.

We can only do business with foreign countries by extending credit or buying from such countries. The contention of the pro-reciprocal adherents that we must buy as much as we sell, and vice versa, is not borne out by official figures of our foreign trade. For instance, we sell twice as much to the Netherlands as we buy, whereas we buy three times as much from Brazil as we sell her, and our imports from Colombia are 600 percent greater than our exports to that country.

So many lose sight of the fact that foreign commerce is based upon two premises: Price and necessity. We buy four times as much from Brazil as she buys from us because our principal purchase consists of coffee. We buy Brazilian coffee because we like its quality and the price is attractive. The same holds true with Colombian coffee.

Nations do not go out and buy from each other because of friendship. They buy in the world market, and price and quality are the determining factors, regardless of national likes or dislikes. Our principal exports at the present time consist of automobiles and accessories, machinery and cotton. Our automobile and machinery manufacturers can meet the competition of the world because they employ mass production. The quality of the American product is so far superior to that of our foreign competitors that we are able constantly to extend our trade along those lines. Then, too, the American manufacturers of automobiles and machinery are able to meet the highly competitive prices of the world market.

Foreign commerce continually shifts. For instance, world exports in 1929 totaled $32,709,000,000, of which the United States exported $5,241,000,000, or 16 percent. In 1934 world exports had shrunk to $11,186,000,000, and our exports had fallen to $2,133,000,000 which was 19 percent of the whole. So far as our share of the export world trade is concerned, we were more favorably situated in 1934, when we had 19 percent of the world commerce as against 16 percent in 1929.

On August 24, last, we signed the Cuban trade agreement, and it went into effect 10 days later. We were told of the wonders that agreement would perform for us. Let us see what happened. In the 6-month periods prior to and following the signing of the Cuban agreement our exports to that country increased from $22,800,000 to $27,203,000, an increase of $4,300,000, but our imports from Cuba for the same comparative period increased $16,347,000. In other words, Cuba has gained 400 percent more from the agreement than we have, so far as net results are concerned, as we had to increase our purchases from her by $16,000,000 in order to secure an additional Cuban trade of $4,000,000. Do you call that good business?

Furthermore, we increased Cuba's sugar quota to this country by 300,000 tons and reduced the production of American cane and beet sugar by the same amount. Sugar is one agricultural commodity of which we have never produced a surplus. In fact, we have always been big importers of sugar and yet we agreed in that treaty to further restrict our home production. A half a ton of sugar to the acre means that 600,000 acres of land must be taken out of sugar production in this country, as a result of that agreement, and put into some other crops and it's certain to be crops of which we already have surpluses. Is that good business?

A short time ago a friend of mine sent me a clipping from the Boston Marine Guide, giving the invoices of shipments received in that port over a 3-day period. In looking it over I was amazed to find that one shipment consisted of 96,000 tons of anthracite coal from Russia. Another shipment consisted of 2,000 tons of rye. Another shipment consisted of 4,000 tons of corn, and yet another shipment consisted of 32,000 tons of print paper. I have with me today, for your inspection if you desire, lists of manifests taken from the New York Journal of Commerce, between April 13 and April 17, and it is simply appalling to note the commodities that are being shipped into this country, which we are able to produce at home and should produce at home.

In one breath we talk about ending the depression and putting the idle back to work, then turn around and enter into a trade agreement with Belgium that will probably put every cement factory in the State of Pennsylvania out of business and it will also close your plate-glass factories.

How many Pennsylvania miners could be put back to work if we stopped importing anthracite coal from Russia and Great Britain? I dare say thousands. Up in our section of the country, we have large areas of timber adapted to the manufacture of print paper. Much of this timber is in small holdings, but today it is of little or no value because the American market is being supplied with print paper from Canada, Scandinavia, the Baltic countries, and Russia. There are manganese deposits in something like 35 States of the Union, and some of them have been highly developed, but nearly all are now closed down because we are buying our manganese from Russia and Brazil. In the Brazilian treaty we reduced the duty on manganese from 1 cent to one-half cent a pound and the unfortunate part of it is that under a recent proclamation of the President every other country in the world will get the same benefits as are given to the country with which we have negotiated a specific treaty, although they give us no equivalent concession in return.

When Secretary of Agriculture Wallace was before the Ways and Means Committee, in which I have the honor to hold membership, he gave it as his opinion that any American industry or activity that cannot stand on its own bottom and meet foreign competition should go into something else.

If the coal producers of Pennsylvania cannot meet the competition of forced labor in Russia, would Mr. Wallace close down the coal mines in this State? If the steel manufacturers of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Minnesota cannot meet the competition from England, Belgium, Germany, and France, would he have us close down our steel mills and throw hundreds of thousands of working men out on the streets? Because the rye growers of Minnesota and North and South Dakota cannot possibly meet the competition of European rye, should they be compelled to stop growing rye and forced into something else? Because the American match manufacturers cannot meet the competition of Japanese and Russian producers, should the 40 or 50 match factories in this country be obliged to close down and throw their workers out of employment?

You have doubtless read in the press within the past few weeks numerous items telling of the enormous increases in imports of Japanese textiles, toys, and matches. The importations in textiles for the first 3 months of this year greatly exceeded the total imports of textiles from Japan for the entire year of 1934. In Japan the whole family works except those who are too old or too young. Their factories operate 72 hours per week, and the wage scale is from 20 cents to 50 cents a day. Every Japanese working man's home is a sweatshop where the children toil all day and far into the night making toys and other little knick-knacks to be sold in America. Because our textile and match manufacturers and our toymakers cannot compete with Japan, Secretary Wallace would have them go into some other activity.

We would like to know what activity can absorb all those who would be thrown out of employment under the operation of his philosophy of economics.

With one hand we reach out for an illusive foreign commerce, which represents a net loss of 5 percent, and with the other hand we continually pile burden upon burden on American industry, which makes it more and more difficult to hold that market. The N. R. A. has increased production costs in this country by at least 25 percent. Agriculture has been handicapped through the operation of the A. A. A. and the crop-reduction program. The processing tax on cotton has just about destroyed our foreign market for cotton. Only on Friday of last week the House passed the so-called "social-security bill", which would place multiple taxes on pay rolls, all of which must be charged to the finished product. How, in the name of common sense, can we place tax upon tax on industry and yet expect to go out and capture the markets of the world? The idea is too fantastic to merit serious discussion.

I have made long a study of the tariff question and am 100 percent sold upon the proposition that we should pay more attention to the preservation of the home market and less to the foreign market. I am one of those old-fashioned Americans who believe that our first duty is to our own people and that we should employ every legitimate means at our command to see that the American market is maintained for the American producer and wage earner. If we will apply ourselves to the problem of adjusting domestic production, not only on the farm but in factories and shop, and then give all activities that degree of protection which they need to their well-being, it would go far toward solving the present depression and the unemployment problem.

I cannot, and I will not, subscribe to the new deal's proposal to adopt the policy of the survival of the fittest to all industry throughout the world, which means that the small, struggling American industry, whether agricultural or otherwise, will have to give way to foreign producers who, by the advantage of low cost of production, can prove themselves more efficient. In determining efficiency in production, we should take into consideration wages paid, hours of labor, living conditions, and the general well-being of the toilers in the various countries. I would not say that the Japanese matchmaker is more efficient than the American matchmaker merely because he can lay his product down in our market for 40 cents a gross less than the American can produce it for. I would not say that the peon of Argentina is more efficient than the American farmer because he can produce meats, grains, and dairy products for half what it costs our farmers to produce similar products. I would not say that the Russian anthracite miner is more efficient than the Pennsylvania miner because he can ship his coal over here and undersell us.

Oh, I realize that there are probably those among us today who will say that I am too much of a nationalist, and that the time has come to obliterate national boundaries and reach out the hand of fellowship to the other nations of the world. I am willing to go as far as any reasonable individual in promoting good will among the nations of the earth, but I am not willing to go to the extremity of sacrificing the American fireside to do so. I hold that our first duty is to our own people, and while I am intensely sympathetic to the hungry and down-trodden of other lands, I cannot but feel that my first duty is to the hungry and unemployed of my own country.

I feel that if we would remove the uncertainty that now hangs over American industry and agriculture by assuring them of reasonable freedom from needless governmental interference, we could end this depression in 6 months. All we need to do is to tell the country that the dollar will be stabilized—I care not at what price—that no further burdensome restrictions or taxes will be invoked; that a sincere attempt will be made to balance the Budget, and that all needless expenditures will be cut out.

If this administration would but open the door of opportunity, that opening upon which 125,000,000 Americans have fixed their anxious and hopeful gaze, we would enter into one of the most remarkable eras of prosperity that we have ever enjoyed. The stage is all set for us to go. Homes need painting and repairing; farms need new buildings, machinery, and fencing; people need clothing. There are millions of Americans who need a considerable amount of dental work done and operations performed. None of you can recall a time when merchants' stocks were as low as they are now. My friends, we are not going to end the depression through an orgy of spending. We cannot spend ourselves into prosperity.

Since the time of Hoover and Mellon we have increased the national debt from sixteen billions to thirty-two billions, and the end is not yet. If this spending spree continues, it can only mean one of two things: We will have to turn our entire income over to the Government in the form of taxes, or we will have to resort to inflation, and that is one of the things that is retarding and preventing recovery. No one knows from one day to the next what lies ahead of us, and those who have the money and who should be out in front working for the country's recovery are held back through fear and uncertainty.

Let us remove that fear and the gloomy clouds that have hung over the land like a pall for the past 5 years will roll away and the sun of prosperity will shine again.

THE COURT OF FINAL RESORT

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein a poem by Horace C. Carlisle, now an employee of the United States Government.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle, now an employee of the United States Government:

THE COURT OF FINAL RESORT

For three score and ten hopeful, historical years
  The Supreme Court of Law in the United States
Sat and served in the room which the Senate reveres
  As the forum in which it once held its debates;
But this Court, in which justice alone is the guide,
  Whose integrity stands—indestructive as stone—
Thru its uncharted sessions, henceforth will reside,
  More befittingly housed, in a place of its own.

On a sacred, suggestive, select plot of ground—
  Where historic old houses of fame used to stand,
'Mongst the buildings of national note that surround
  The American Capitol—pride of the land—
The Supreme Court, in grandeur, unmarred by a flaw,
  Glorified by a beauty, uniquely its own,
Has decreed equal Justice, vouchsafed under law,
  And has carved it, high over the entrance, in stone.

In accord with the architect's purposeful plan,
  Steel supports, designed not to be broken nor bent,
Hidden tactfully there from the vision of man,
  Rest upon a foundation—of tested cement—
Where they, riveted firmly together, supply
  To the structure the strength, like Gibraltar, to stand,
Tho the clouds of distraction spread over the sky,
  And the storms of destruction sweep over the land.

While the inner walls, hiding this network of steel
  With superior marble—as lasting as time—
From the far sunny Southland—distinctly reveal
  A significant charm, that suggests the sublime,
The superb outer walls of this building, supreme—
  From Vermont's marble quarries of crystaline white—
Lend a new inspiration to statesmanship's dream
  For the strict preservation of justice and right.

In this Temple of Justice, thru time's great beyond,
  As the centuries measure the lessening years,
May the great Court, that solemnly sits here, respond
  To wealth's eloquent pleas and to poverty's tears
With impartial exactness, unbiassed, unswayed,
  That the verdicts it renders may meet the commands
Of the Great Jurist's judgments, that must be obeyed
  Long as Justice the Guardian of Liberty stands.

May American justice attend all the pleas
  And judicial opinions set forth by this court.
There can come no appeal from the binding decrees
  Of the Nation's supreme Court of Final Resort.
And this temple, supreme in its purpose and plan,
  Great memorial marvel, exhumed from the sod,
Is a symbol, sublime, of man's duty to man—
  And an emblem, divine, of man's duty to God.

—HORACE C. CARLISLE.

MARK TWAIN

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROMJUE] before the Missouri Society at Washington, D. C., on April 17.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROMJUE] before the Missouri Society, at Washington, D. C., on April 17:

There are still perhaps some few people who do not fully comprehend Mark Twain and his accomplishments. A distinguished writer once traveling in the country of the pyramids was accompanied by a local and native guide. The visitor was making some comment about Innocents Abroad and Mark Twain in general. The guide suddenly stopped and looked inquiringly at the traveler and asked him this question: "How many sheep has Mark Twain?" The guide perhaps had about as good an understanding of Mark Twain as some of his critics, who, perhaps on account of jealousy or lack of comprehension, at times sought to label him as a mere buffoon.

During Mark Twain's earlier writing experience on one occasion he addressed a letter to his brother Orion, and in it he stated: "When I get married I am going to quit writing to please everybody and I am only going to write to please myself." He probably thought at the time he made this statement that by the time he got married he would have a sufficient competency to take care of himself and wife and could do as he pleased. One wonders whether he may not have overlooked the fact, however, that when a man is once married he can no longer always do as he pleases.

Some of Mark Twain's critics annoyed him quite a bit by trying to constantly make it appear he was only a humorist. On one occasion, being somewhat irritated by this criticism, Mark Twain said: "It is the will of God that we must have critics, and missionaries, and Congressmen, and humorists, and we must bear the burden." If I may be permitted to comment on this, I will say that there are far too many critics and not too many missionaries, probably just enough Congressmen, and too few humorists. A humorist is largely born such—not made; Congressmen are created by their constituents; a real honest-to-goodness missionary bears the stamp and approval of the great Master over all; while critics are quite self and freely made, no particular qualification or standard is required; they are so easy to make, as they are, to a large extent, their own creation.

In the early hour of an early spring morning some years ago I had the pleasure and opportunity of traveling by bus from Columbia, Mo., to Kansas City, Mo. The highway, for many miles, led along not far from the Missouri River. A wealth of frost was still abundant on the grass, trees, and the fences along the way. I sat for many miles looking out the bus window, observing herd after herd of beautiful, well-kept and, for the most part, well-fed cattle. I knew I was traveling over our country's richest soil. I was comparing the different herds, one with the other, and study-

ing the methods and manner employed by the stockmen along the way in caring for these beautiful herds. I must have seen that morning, although I did not keep accurate account, in the neighborhood of 50 herds of cattle. The truth is my attention was almost entirely directed to viewing and observing these cattle. Across the aisle from me in the bus sat the wife of Judge James B. Gantt, who was one of Missouri's most distinguished jurists, and who for years occupied, in an eminent way, a position on the supreme court bench of our State. She was looking out the opposite window. Presently I noticed that with her hand half uplifted she was occasionally dropping her finger a bit, as if counting. Presently I inquired of her if she had seen the many beautiful herds of cattle along the way, and she replied that she had not. I said, "Have you failed to see many of these cattle along the way?" She replied, "I have not seen a single cow brute this morning—not a single one have I seen." I said, "I think I must have seen somewhere between 40 and 50 herds of as nice-looking cattle as are to be found anywhere." She said, "I have been counting bird nests along the way. Do you know I have seen 52 bird nests, and I have kept account of them." "Oh, look!" she said, "there are two more." "Have you been noticing them?" she inquired of me, to which I replied, "I have not seen a single bird nest—not one." I said, "You have been observing bird nests, while I have been looking at cattle; neither of us has been seeing that which the other observed." And so I said to Mrs. Gantt, "I have learned a lesson; perhaps in life we often see that for which we are looking, and so, too, we may fail to see that for which we do not look."

While we come to consider the life, the character, and the work of the distinguished Mark Twain perhaps the same situation may exist.

Samuel L. Clemens was born just 100 years ago the 30th of this coming November at Florida, Mo., in a log cabin, it is said. His life and his work have been looked upon, perhaps, in the same manner and for the same reasons by his friends and his critics as were the cattle and the bird nests observed by Mrs. Gantt and myself. Some have said that Mark Twain arose out of discouraging frontier conditions where there were few books and where no adequate standard of living had been developed. As a matter of fact, however, it is doubtful whether, anywhere in America, there could have been found in the forties and fifties of the last century a small section of country more favorable for his start in life than northeast Missouri. At the time of Mark Twain's birth the place of his birth was said to be about 40 miles south of what was considered the official frontier line of the United States and about 200 miles east of the official western frontier line of our country, which, of course, classed that territory as pioneer environment.

As evidence of the fact that it was a splendid section of our country in which to be born and reared and to receive youthful impressions and influences may be further verified by the fact that within a few miles of his birthplace was also the birthplace of Admiral Coontz, of the American Navy, who died some few weeks ago during this year, leaving a long and distinguished career; also in this same section of northeast Missouri there was born Admiral Willard of our Navy, who died just within the past few days after a long and distinguished service to our country; also it so happened, in this same northeast section of Missouri not far from the birthplace of Mark Twain, was the birthplace and the early home of General Pershing, the head of our Army during the World War, and who has at all times given examples of heroic and valuable service to our country; also in northeast Missouri, not far from the birthplace of the men just enumerated, is the birthplace of General Crowder, who was head of the Draft Board during the World War; also in northeast Missouri, near the scenes of the birthplaces of these distinguished men enumerated, was also the birthplace of Lieutenant Wiley, of our Navy, and only a few miles distant from the birthplace of Mark Twain was almost the lifelong home and residence of Speaker Champ Clark, where he, as a young lawyer, set forth, and where he enjoyed a long and distinguished career for public service and where he lies buried with honor and glory today.

It is not my purpose here to take up and discuss the various excellent and splendid works which Mark Twain contributed to the world. Literary critics and readers may differ as to the value, influence, and worth of the different books and works of which he was the author; some saw points of merit in all his works and some, as they believed, perhaps, may not have been so willing to praise as highly as others.

Mark Twain was not only a writer and author of great distinction—he was a philosopher as well as humorist, with scarcely any competition.

I remember on one occasion, at a time when I was a young law student in the Missouri University, I had the honor, pleasure, and privilege of seeing, meeting, and hearing Mark Twain. The university auditorium was crowded to its greatest capacity and almost immediately after he commenced talking to the student body the entire audience was in a convulsion of merriment and laughter, myself along with all the rest. Being a young law student and realizing it was a bit of wisdom for a lawyer at least to be able to read and understand people and to know whereby and wherewith people, and particularly juries, might be led from joy to sorrow, from one mood to another, and from gloominess to merriment, I rested my own attention for a time and struggled in an effort to give deep study to the power that was being manifested by the distinguished author. I had no more become settled down in this determination, studying him and his tactics mechanically, until I again found myself in the midst of the current of joy and merriment rushing along into the great sea of delight that he was carrying his entire audience to. Again I gripped myself, as I believed, planting my feet along the banks of the stream of mirth, and again I commenced or tried to commence my analysis of his power and influence in the sphere in which he was operating.

No more did I do than get myself fixed for further study and analysis than again I was drawn into the delight and merriment along with all the rest, but after all there was real sense and sound philosophy and real helpfulness from all his discourse and while we must admit that environment and training, opportunity and experience go far in determining the heights to which mankind may scale we must not forget that deep down in the soul of man there is something—call it heredity or what not, that has a tremendous influence in determining what man really is and also in determining what he may be and become.

Mark Twain, in his early youth, was a resident and maintained his home for years at Hannibal, Mo. Practically all of his boyhood and young manhood days were spent in and around Hannibal and up and down the Mississippi River. Points of interest about the city and the old homestead still are marked and kept in a fitting way in his honor. On Cardiff Hill a light is constantly burning throughout this year. The button having been touched by President Roosevelt sending the current of electricity forward, and the same will continue to illuminate Cardiff Hill throughout this year in honor of the one hundredth anniversary of the distinguished author, philosopher, and humorist's birth and achievement.

Mark Twain died at Redding, Conn., at his then residence, Stormfield, April 21, 1910, and burial took place at Elmira, N. Y.

Innocents Abroad, Life on the Mississippi, the Gilded Age, the Connecticut Yankee, Huckleberry Finn, Tom Sawyer, Pudd'nhead Wilson, Roughing It, the Prince and the Pauper, and many other of his works have erected an imperishable monument to his memory that will continue to be of imperishable value. While he was for many years a distinguished citizen of Hannibal, Mo., he became at last, long before the completion of his good works, a distinguished citizen of the world.

H. R. 6234

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein copy of a letter written to my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. ROGERS] by a former Member of Congress, W. W. Hastings.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written to my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. ROGERS] by a former Member of Congress, Hon. W. W. Hastings:

TAHLEQUAH, OKLA., *April 8, 1935.*

Hon. WILL ROGERS,
Chairman House Committee on Indian Affairs,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of April 4 enclosing me a copy of H. R. 6234, "To promote the general welfare of Indians of the State of Oklahoma and for other purposes" and a subsequent letter requesting me to give you my reaction on this proposed legislation.

I have given this bill most careful study. It contains many similar provisions to those carried in the Wheeler-Howard bill, which was under consideration during the Seventy-third Congress and from which Oklahoma was excluded. I heartily favor increased and adequate appropriations for Indian education, health work, relief among destitute Indians, including the purchase of land for the use of indigent and homeless Indians.

The bill which you enclose me, from sections 1 to 4, inclusive, restates existing law and renews century-old promises to the Indians, and section 18 reenacts the authority heretofore granted to make appropriations for the benefit of Indians which have been carried in the Interior Department bill for a number of years. There is no new grant of authority to make appropriations for Indians in this section. It is a restatement of existing law.

Unfortunately the press reports contain only a general outline of the bill and do not take it up and analyze it section by section. Reports of those who have thus far appeared before the committee discuss the principles of the bill and do not indicate that they are familiar with the details.

In the hope of being of some assistance, I want to invite the attention of Members of Congress to certain constructive criticisms of the various sections of the bill.

Section 5 defines the term "Indian of the first degree" as a person having one-half or more Indian blood, and the term "Indian of the second degree" as a person having less than one-half Indian blood. This latter definition includes Indians of less than one-half degree Indian blood to those enrolled as of one two hundred and fifty-sixth quantum of Indian blood.

Section 2 contains the following paragraph:

"(b) All lands, property, and funds of the Indians of the second degree, as herein defined, are to be by the Secretary of the Interior relieved of all restrictions as rapidly as the best interest of the Indians and the public will permit and justify."

Section 7 contains two provisos:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, with or without application from the Indian owner of

any such restricted lands, funds, or other property of less than one-half Indian blood, remove the restrictions from all or any part of the lands, funds, or other property belonging to such Indian."

And the second proviso is as follows:

"That before removing the restrictions from any land belonging to any Indian of less than one-half Indian blood", notice is provided to be given.

Section 9, in part, provides:

"That the trust or otherwise restricted property, of whatever kind or nature, belonging to any Indian of the State of Oklahoma of less than one-half Indian blood", which indicates a reimposition of restrictions on Indians of less than one-half Indian blood.

The press does not report any explanation for this definition of an "Indian of the second degree" or any reason why the above provisions quoted from sections 2, 7, and 9 are embodied in the bill if it is not intended to reimpose, by implication, restrictions on all Oklahoma Indians of less than one-half degree Indian blood. If it is not for this purpose, why insert this definition and the language quoted from the above sections?

The restrictions were removed from the lands and funds of all Indians of less than one-half Indian blood who are members of the Five Civilized Tribes by the act of May 27, 1908. The provisions hereinabove quoted in fact seem to indicate a reimposition of restrictions on Indians of less than one-half Indian blood. If this is not the intention, why the language quoted from the above sections?

Members of the Five Civilized Tribes of less than one-half Indian blood have been free from the supervisions of the Indian Bureau for almost 28 years. All of these Indians are citizens of the United States and have exercised the rights of citizenship and voted at all elections since statehood. Many of them have held important positions of trust, and I feel sure that public sentiment would oppose the reimpositions of restrictions on lands and funds of Indians of less than one-half degree Indian blood. If these provisions are not intended to apply to members of the Five Civilized Tribes, the exception should be made clear and not left in doubt.

Section 6, among other things, provides:

"Securities belonging to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma shall, while held by the Secretary of the Interior, be free from any and all taxes."

Your attention is invited to the act of May 10, 1928, which exempted agricultural land, not to exceed 160 acres, from taxation, but specifically provided that all minerals and moneys received from oil and gas should be subject to taxation—State and Federal—the same as any other citizen of the State. The theory of this provision of May 10, 1928, was to protect the poorer Indian from confiscation of his land through taxation. I think no one will attempt to justify exemption from taxation of wealthy Indians who receive large incomes from minerals and oil and gas.

Section 9 confers exclusive jurisdiction upon the Secretary of the Interior: "(1) To continue administration of Indian estates; (2) to determine the heirs of such decedents; (3) the approval or disapproval of wills by such decedents; (4) the partition of lands, funds, or other restricted property among the heirs of such decedents; and (5) the settlement of any claims against restricted estates of such decedents." The decision of the Secretary of the Interior which, of course, means acting through a law clerk in the Bureau of Indian Affairs "shall be final and conclusive."

The last proviso of section 8 is as follows:

"That hereafter no guardian shall be appointed by the courts of the State of Oklahoma for any person of one-half or more Indian blood except on petition approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

This section, in effect, would take away all jurisdiction from the county and district courts of the State of Oklahoma in matters affecting Indians of one-half or more Indian blood. It means that all of the authority shall be exercised by a law clerk upon ex parte affidavits 1,500 miles away from Oklahoma. I cannot favor the determination of these matters upon ex parte affidavits and by a law clerk in no wise responsible to the people of the State of Oklahoma. It means interminable delays, irritation, and unsatisfactory administration.

Surely no Member of the Oklahoma delegation familiar with the Indian question would favor this section. I see no objection to giving notice to probate attorneys or some other Indian representative when any action is to be taken in any court in the State of Oklahoma, so that representatives of the Indian Service may appear as a matter of right and represent and protect the Indian, including the right of appeal, but I do most vigorously protest against the enactment of this section, or any part of it, that would confer exclusive jurisdiction upon the Secretary of the Interior who acts through a law clerk in the Indian Bureau.

This is not intended as a criticism of the present personnel of the Indian Bureau, many of whom have been there for years and rendered splendid service, but it is against long-distance government, and, regardless of the personnel of the Indian Bureau, the principle is as objectionable now as it was when it inspired our Revolutionary ancestors to risk everything to fight for local self-government.

It must be remembered that many Indian families have heirs some of whom are more than one-half Indian blood and some have less. As to the partition of lands, this provision would in effect destroy the value of interest in lands if there is not provided a way through the courts to determine the interest and provide a method for the sale of it. Section 8 would confer exclusive jurisdiction upon the Secretary of the Interior.

Section 8 of the act of January 27, 1933, makes it the duty of the probate attorneys appointed under the act of May 27, 1908, to appear and represent any restricted member of the Five Civilized Tribes before the county courts of any county in the State of Oklahoma or before any appellate court thereof and any matter in which said restricted Indians have an interest and they have the right of appeal.

Section 3 of the act of April 12, 1926, provides for a transfer of any suit from a State court to a Federal court where a restricted member of the Five Civilized Tribes is a party upon filing a motion to that effect.

Since the enactment of the act of April 12, 1926, and the act of January 27, 1933, there has been no criticism against protecting the rights of a restricted Indian either in the State or Federal courts of the State of Oklahoma.

Section 8 of the pending bill strikes at the very heart of the sovereignty of the State.

Section 9 provides:

"Wherever any question arises as to the quantum of Indian blood of any Indian subject to the provisions of this act, for the purpose of determining jurisdiction over the estate of such Indian, or otherwise, the Secretary of the Interior shall determine said quantum of Indian blood and his determination thereof shall be final and conclusive."

Under existing law the rolls are made conclusive evidence of quantum of Indian blood. This provision would repeal existing law and confer that jurisdiction upon the Secretary of the Interior. If a case were up for trial in the State or Federal court and the question of the quantum of Indian blood were to arise the case would have to be suspended until that question were determined by a law clerk 1,500 miles away. At present the rolls are conclusive and there is no uncertainty about it. This provision may be construed to permit the Indian Bureau to go beyond the rolls. This question should not be reopened.

The last half of section 10 provides for the collection from Indian owners a sum not exceeding one-fourth of 1 percent on the corpus of their accumulated funds amounting to $2,000, and the sums collected are to be placed in a fund for the relief of indigent Indians.

I strongly challenge this section. I favor a more liberal policy for the Indian Service in permitting Indians to voluntarily contribute to the support of needy friends and relatives. This they would liberally do if permitted. However, I do not favor using the taxing powers of the Government to tax one group for the benefit of another. You may tax all by general law, but I hesitate to agree that you can by law tax one class for the benefit of another.

With reference to the general authority to buy land for the benefit of homeless Indians, I favor the principle. However, I do not favor the purchase of large areas of submarginal land upon which the Indians cannot be taught to make a living. The land should be bought in the name of the United States for the benefit and use of the Indians and contracts made with respective Indians for the use of small tracts subject to rules and regulations of the Secretary of the Interior. If productive lands are not purchased, the purchase of submarginal lands and the improvement of them will be expensive and in the end prove a failure. If small productive tracts of approximately 20 acres to a family were bought and the Indian encouraged and taught to assist in improving the same under the supervision of more farm agents provided for the Indian Service, it would prove more successful and less expensive. The Indians could be located in the same area where they would be accessible to Government representatives without necessarily purchasing all contiguous tracts, much of which is nonproductive.

If all of the land within certain areas is purchased, much of the worthless land will be bought at exorbitant prices. This money should be saved for the homeless and indigent Indians for whom it is intended.

Remember, it costs as much to build a house, fence, and improve unproductive submarginal lands as it does productive land. Submarginal means, of course, lands which are under average production. Let's be frank about it. These are lands upon which no person, Indian or white, can make a living. Why purchase this character of land for Indians? It is bound in the end to prove a failure. An Indian gave a practical definition of submarginal land by calling it "starve to death" land. If the Indians of the Nation are induced to go upon nonproductive lands upon which it cannot be hoped that they can make a living, there is a moral obligation upon this Government to continue to maintain them through appropriations from the Federal Government.

The Congress should be made to understand that all of the lands of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, as well as the lands belonging to the Indians of smaller tribes, have all been allotted. Checkerboarded all through the Indian area, lands are owned and held by unrestricted Indians and by white people of no Indian blood. One cannot buy large areas of contiguous land without purchasing a very large part of nonproductive land. Up and down the streams and in the valleys in the same neighborhood small tracts of land could be purchased available for Indian use.

Two areas have been tentatively selected and options are being taken for the purchase of the lands included within them in northeastern Oklahoma. I have general information with reference to both and do not hesitate to say that, in my judgment, it would be a mistake to spend money from the Public Treasury in the purchase or improvement of either of them.

It should be brought to the attention of Congress that all of the Indians of Oklahoma are citizens of the United States and that all exercise the right of citizenship. They vote and hold office just as other citizens of the State. Many of them have been elected

to the county and district benches. While the people of this State favor the protection of the Indian from being despoiled of his land or other property through their being represented by probate attorneys and United States district attorneys, they cannot favor taking away the jurisdiction of the courts, as is provided in section 8, and conferring this exclusive jurisdiction upon the Secretary of the Interior acting through a law clerk upon ex parte affidavits 1,500 miles away.

Let me repeat again, in order to make my position clear, that I favor adequate appropriations for Indians for education, health work, relief, for the purchase of productive lands for homeless and indigent Indians, and to employ additional farm agents to be located in their midst to assist them and show them how to plant, cultivate, market, and conserve their farm products.

Sincerely yours,

W. W. HASTINGS.

FREE SPEECH

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a speech that I was to give over radio station WHN in New York City on Friday, April 19, 1935, at 6:15 p. m., but which was not delivered because the officials of the station notified me an hour beforehand that owing to the fact that a copy of my remarks had only been received 2 hours in advance that I would not be permitted to speak.

In my opinion this was just a flimsy, fictitious excuse and a brazen interference with free speech by WHN on political issues. It is a form of censorship that is repugnant to free American citizens, particularly when there are hundreds of paid publicity agents at Washington doing nothing but getting out news and propaganda in defense of the new deal day and night over the radio and in the press. There is no regulation by the Federal Communications Commission that requires a copy of a radio speech to be delivered in advance.

I have spoken many times over different radio stations and have never been censored in any way before. The attitude of WHN, a comparatively small station, which had invited me to speak is a typical example of the state of terror that exists in some of the smaller stations that they might not have their license renewed.

I have too much respect for the membership of the Federal Communications Commission to conceive for one moment that partisanship would or could be carried to that extent. The action of WHN was probably inspired by fear of the bureaucracy and regimentation in Washington, but even the "new dealers" do not dare to interfere with freedom of speech and if they ever atempt it, it will be a political boomerang and a blunder of the worst kind.

Naturally, the Republicans would take up the challenge without delay or evasion in behalf of freedom of speech and our free institutions.

In am inserting herewith a copy of a telegram sent by me in reply to one from the American Civil Liberties Union, offering their cooperation to fight against suppression of free speech:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 22, 1935.*

ROGER N. BALDWIN,
Director American Civil Liberties Union,
100 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.:

Replying to your telegram, am in favor of the fullest freedom of speech and of the press for all American citizens regardless of race, colors, creed, or party affiliations, except to the extent of urging the overthrow of our republican form of government by force and violence, which is guaranteed to each State by the Federal Constitution. I do not favor granting freedom of speech to aliens in order to spread class hatred, promote strikes, riots, sabotage, and industrial unrest, and to undermine and tear down our free institutions. I favor deporting such aliens and giving their jobs to loyal American citizens who have faith in our institutions and American system. Will be glad to cooperate with you for the fullest and freest discussion of political and economic problems; clear stations for legal responsibility except for libel, slander, and sedition; require public records of reasons for refusing or censoring political economic talks; and to set up a commission to investigate radio control. The attempt of the Federal Government to censor, control, or interfere with the rights of American citizens to expose the tragic failure of the new-deal experiments is a menace to our free institutions and popular government. It must be fought without compromise or the American people will be deprived of free speech and of their rights and liberties and find themselves no longer sovereign and free citizens but pawns to a bureaucratic, autocratic, dictatorial Government at Washington without their consent or approval.

HAMILTON FISH, Jr.

THE CANCELED OR UNDELIVERED SPEECH

THE PROPOSED VICIOUS REAPPORTIONMENT IN NEW YORK STATE AND THE NEW DEAL

I desire to take this opportunity to pay my respects to Governor Lehman, whom hitherto I have always held in the highest regard as above petty, despicable, and blind partisanship. Of all the contemptible and ruthless political acts ever attempted out of brazen partisanship the attempt to gerrymander the up-State congressional districts, obviously to throw two sitting Republican Members together in one district, regardless of geography or in the interest of the people or counties involved, is the grossest, rawest, and cheapest political kind of trickery. It makes no difference whether James Aloysius Farley, with political venom in his heart for having his repeated blunders exposed by Republican Members of the Congress, such as the air mail fiasco and gifts of imperforated stamps to members of the Cabinet, his own family, and to the President, or whether it is the President's autocratic and high-handed way of answering the Republican critics who, such as SNELL, DAN REED, CROWTHER, TABER, CULKIN, and WADSWORTH, have ridiculed and exposed the tragic failure and breakdown of the new-deal experiments. Nevertheless, Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, as sponsor of the congressional reapportionment up-State, must bear the responsibility.

Tammany Hall, in its balmiest and most political corrupt days, would never have dared to sponsor such an abomination of desolation. What a travesty for a supposedly high-minded and politically honest Governor, who received hundreds of thousands of Republican votes, to blight his own record as Governor and his standing as a liberal to sponsor, at the crack of Jim Farley's patronage whip or the revengeful and dictatorial urging of the autocrat in the White House, a dishonest, dishonorable, and monstrous redistricting of up-State congressional districts.

Let Governor Lehman call an extra session of the legislature and try by whip and spur to lash recalcitrant and disgusted Democrats into line. But let the people know all the facts and the extent of the bitter, bigoted partisan spirit that animates the sponsors of the bill and the motives behind it. As for me, it makes no difference what district I am in because I have always been able to fight my own battles and carry the issues to the people.

If Governor Lehman goes on the radio and appeals for a fair congressional reapportionment bill, no one will object—but if he tries to jam through the present rotten measure conceived in political hatred and revenge he will go out of office as the weakest, pettiest, and most bigoted partisan ever to sit in the Governor's chair. The congressional reapportionment bill stinks and shines and shines and stinks like a dead mackerel in the moonlight.

Let the Governor beware of his false friends and permitting them to drag him down into the political quagmire and to involve his name and reputation in a putrid mess and into a political scandal that even Tammany disdains and which like Banquos ghost will not down but will plague Governor Lehman and his reputation for fair and honest dealing for years to come.

The time has come to tell the truth and to let the people back home, in spite of the honeyed words and sugar-coated fireside talks of the President, know that the new-deal measures, particularly the N. R. A. and A. A. A. are collapsing of their own weight and are being denounced even by Democrats as the greatest economic failures and monstrosities in the history of our country.

The Republicans would have no right to criticize the new-deal measures if they had succeeded in relieving unemployment and putting American men and women back to work, even at the cost of $15,000,000,000. The tragedy of the situation is that there are a million and a half more unemployed, according to the American Federation of Labor, than there was a year ago.

The Republican Party has been shadowboxing long enough and pulling its punches beyond the necessities of the occasion. There is only one person responsible for the break-down and failure of the new-deal policies which are retarding recovery and prolonging the depression, and that is Franklin D. Roosevelt, who was the author of all those unsound experiments, including the N. R. A. and A. A. A. that are leading the country on to the rocks of bankruptcy, chaos, and disorder. No matter what party American citizens may have belonged to in the past, the time has come for all those who believe in our industrial system, based on private initiative and reasonable profit, in sound money, in a balanced Budget, and against Government ownership, destructive taxation, continued borrowing, and unlimited deficits and in intolerable and crushing bureaucracy at Washington, to join forces to throw out the "new dealers."

All the new-deal measures have clashed with common sense, the experience of the past, and the Constitution of the United States. The blatant General Johnson declared the N. R. A. a holy and sacred institution above reproach, but today, even Democrats join in the swelling chorus repudiating it as a failure that should be wiped out or drastically modified. There was once a time when any critic of the N. R. A. was either a traitor or a partisan bigot. The President's message on the utility holding companies was an amazing example of the extent that the administration has become a propaganda machine. No American, according to the President, has the right to even petition Congress to modify legislation with-

out committing an unethical and unloyal act. Have the liberties of the American people burned so low that they have no rights or voice left to petition their elected representatives in Congress?

The President speaks of a more abundant life for the American people—a very beautiful phrase for fireside talks. But how can it be developed by a program of scarcity and reduction of crops and birth control of pigs and an increase in the cost of living? When the American people wake up and see that the President's program is destroying wealth and impoverishing the people, political sentiment will change over night. There has been a tremendous swing in public sentiment away from the new deal in the last 3 months, but that is only the beginning of an avalanche that, once the facts are known of the utter collapse and breakdown of the new deal, will sweep everything and everyone responsible for the socialistic experiments and the destruction of business confidence into political oblivion. The people have been mesmerized and hypnotized owing to the consistent and studied attempts to mislead and befog the real issues. Let us tear the veil off and unmask the true situation.

I indict the new-deal administration on its record for the past year as the greatest failure in American history. I charge President Roosevelt with having destroyed business confidence, squandered American resources, and with the impairment of the national credit. I accuse him of having imposed unsound, unworkable, and socialistic measures upon the Nation that have increased the cost of living, impoverished American people, lost the world market for our cotton and wheat surplus crops, and increased unemployment. I condemn him for demanding control of the purse strings from Congress, turning the Constitution into a scrap of paper and changing our representative form of government without the consent of the governed, into an autocratic and dictatorial form of government. I denounce his administration as having no economic policy except to pile debt upon debt by borrowing billions upon billions without any thought of balancing the Budget or the inevitable day of reckoning and collapse of credit and the bankruptcy of the Government. I hold President Roosevelt responsible for appointing numerous radicals, Socialists and Communists to important positions in the Government's service, who have done more to cause labor unrest, unprecedented strikes, and to promote more class hatred in 2 years than all other administrations since the birth of the Republic.

CLAIMANTS WHO SUFFERED LOSS FROM FIRES SET BY GOVERNMENT-OPERATED RAILROADS IN MINNESOTA IN 1918

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I addressed the House of Representatives in connection with the bill H. R. 3362, for the relief of people who lost their property as a result of fires set by Government-operated railroads. When I talked to my colleagues at that time, I pointed out that this bill has the endorsement of President Roosevelt and submitted evidence to sustain that position. Those most familiar with the facts, will know that the Government made cheap, unfair, and coercive settlements with the fire claimants.

One of the leading newspapers in the Northwest is the St. Paul Pioneer Press, published at St. Paul, Minn. This newspaper has a reputation for accuracy and for careful investigation of facts before they adopt an editorial policy. The St. Paul Pioneer Press did investigate relative to the policy of the Government in connection with the fires of October 1918.

The St. Paul Pioneer Press in commenting on the settlements which had recently been completed by the Director General of the Railroads, used this language in an editorial under date of Thursday, August 29, 1929:

VICTIMS OF THE LAW

Financial need forced a majority of the Minnesota forest-fire sufferers of 1918 to make settlements of their claims against the United States Government on a basis of from 30 to 50 percent. They could not await unwinding of red tape before receiving full amount of damages due.

The Government admitted responsibility for the fires, which were started by sparks from locomotives while the railroads were under Federal control. The full amount of the loss likewise was conceded. But, taking advantage of dire extremity of the sufferers, the Railroad Administration sought to adjust the claims on a partial-payment basis.

Having accepted these settlements, victims of the fire have no further redress in courts of law. Their only recourse is to Congress, where they may present a claim of moral responsibility for the remaining amount due them. Acting on that procedure, 8,000 of the sufferers have organized themselves into an association which will ask that a Federal appropriation of $18,000,000 be made to pay them in full.

The public has no desire to see their Government act like an ambulance-chasing claim adjuster, taking advantage of the law's delays to secure unfair settlements on its victims. Instead of being payments the amounts first granted should have been advances to tide the impoverished farmers over their crisis until a final adjustment could be made. Every good citizen will agree, if he knows the facts, that Congress should hearken to the plea of the Minnesota Forest Fire Reimbursement Association.

This editorial will be found on page 281 of the hearings in the House committee conducted the week of March 26, 1930, on a measure then pending for the relief of the fire claimants.

I am sure that my colleagues will agree with me that settlements made under conditions outlined in this editorial, were not settlements at all, but only partial payments on account.

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. AYERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss briefly the bill H. R. 6995, introduced by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH], to restore the Spanish-American War veteran to his previous status, and I think it is only proper and appropriate that this discussion should be had on this, the thirty-seventh anniversary, of our entering into war with the Kingdom of Spain.

Americans are not a military people; we have never maintained a noticeable standing army; we have never fought for an increase in territory; we have never fought because our commercial spirit had been outraged; we fought only because it was necessary to maintain and establish our independence; and thereafter we fought to uphold and maintain our manhood and standing among the family of nations; to protect and preserve our rights on land and seas; to outlaw tyranny in this hemisphere, and in all instances we have fought for honor and humanity.

We are and always have been mindful of the horrors of war. Our forefathers realized that when they crossed swords with King George, but they were not afraid in their battle for the right, neither were they afraid in 1812 when they battled Great Britain for the freedom of the seas. They were not afraid in 1845 when they went to the rescue of the liberty-loving Texans. War was indeed a horror in '61, when brother was pitted against brother. But it did not frighten either those who wore the "blue" nor those who wore the "gray", for they each believed that their position was for right and for freedom. On each side it was a demonstration of the high character and determination of the men who make up this Nation. When the insults of Spain to this country came along in '98 it was both those who wore the "blue" and those who wore the "gray" that quickly put an end to Spain's tyrannical rule in the Western Hemisphere and maintained the honor of this Republic.

On January 25, 1898, a United States warship, the *Maine*, on a peaceful mission, arrived at the harbor of Habana. Its coming had been cabled ahead and it was met and piloted to its anchoring place by a regular Spanish Government pilot. While lying there on this peaceful mission, on February 15, it was destroyed by a mine lying directly under it. With its destruction 266 loyal Americans, without the slightest warning, went to a watery grave.

The fact that Spain for some time had been cruelly slaughtering and starving to death our next-door neighbors, prompted a large percentage of our people to the belief that we should free Cuba from Spanish rule; however, neither the President nor the Congress believed that we should interfere. But when the *Maine* and 266 Americans were sent to the bottom of Habana Harbor by what was determined to be a submarine mine, over which the ship had been anchored by a Spanish officer in a supposed spirit of friendship, and when Spain, on only a superficial examination, had declared that this was an accident due to an internal explosion, practically the whole of America revolted against Spain and demanded its withdrawal from Cuba.

President McKinley, showing great forbearance, suggested an armistice of the warring countries to allow negotiations

for peace through the friendly offices of the United States, with full assurance that the United States did not wish to acquire Cuba. This suggestion was refused. After that, nothing short of Cuban independence would satisfy the American people. Neither the President nor the Congress could have withstood this sentiment. The last vestige of Spanish power in the western world must now be ended.

On April 20 Congress passed a joint resolution asking for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba and that Spain withdraw from the island. When this was transmitted to the Spanish Minister here in Washington, he asked for his passports, and withdrew. This action was brought to the attention of the Congress on April 25—37 years ago today—by message from President McKinley, which was read at this hour of that day. Later in the afternoon a bill passed both Houses without a dissenting vote, declaring that war existed between the United States and the Kingdom of Spain.

Volunteers were called, and overenlistments occurred in every State. Untrained, they were taken to the swamps and jungles of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippine Islands. They had none of the privileges made possible by modern medical science as were afforded in the World War. The casualty list from fever and disease was far greater than in any other of our wars.

WOUNDS OF THE STATES HEALED

In the War between the States, Joseph Wheeler, of Georgia, had been a gallant cavalry officer in the Confederate Army, where he had won the title of "Fighting Joe." Although past 62 years of age, he was one of the first to answer the call. The President, who had been his adversary in the Civil War, at once commissioned him a major general, and he was the first man under fire in Cuba, for he was at the head of his command at the opening of hostilities. General Wheeler was in actual command of the land forces in Cuba. He was accused of assuming that command, but nevertheless he had it and his generalship is an everlasting tribute to his Americanism and his ability. It was under him that Colonel Roosevelt and his Rough Riders served. And it was under him that Colonel Wood fought. General Wheeler's wise executive foresight, displayed in the many battles at and around Santiago, San Juan, and San Juan Hill, was responsible for our victories by the land forces on the island. With him, in addition to the Roosevelt Rough Riders, were other cavalry, infantry, and artillery, made up of sons of men who had fought beside him in the Confederate Army, and of sons of men who had been with Grant and McClellan and Sherman in the Union Army.

Fighting under General Wheeler, and one of the first of those to make the supreme sacrifice, was Sgt. Hamilton Fish, of New York, first cousin of our distinguished colleague from the Empire State, and grandson of Hamilton Fish, Secretary of State under President Grant. This war immediately demonstrated that all sores between the States had healed and that we had a united front to preserve our integrity and to maintain our honor against all enemies, and that we were one America, inseparable. [Applause.]

While the Spaniards were being taken care of at Cuba, Admiral Dewey with the Pacific squadron was taking care of them on the other side of the world. The War with Spain really ended within 4 months, resulting in Cuban independence and leaving us with a rebellious foster child in the far-off Pacific; indeed, the hostile attitude of the Filipinos necessitated keeping our troops in the islands at war strength for some 18 months.

The Spanish-American War developed a Dewey, a Schley, a Sampson, a Hobson, a Wood, a Roosevelt, a Funston, and one of the most loyal and patriotic volunteer armies ever organized. On the other side, the horrors of that war are the worst we have ever encountered.

ENLISTED WITHOUT ANY IDEA OF REWARD

The average Spanish-American War veteran is now past 61 years of age. Thirty-five years ago he enlisted out of sheer patriotism and devotion to country and without any hope of reward other than the feeling that he had done his duty as a citizen. When the war was over and the Philippine Insurrection was settled, these voluntary soldiers left the malaria and typhoid swamps of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and of the Philippines with germ-ridden and diseased bodies; yet little did they think of ever desiring or of ever needing a Government pension. Their pride and their hope was that they had preserved the integrity of their country and that they had freed a down-trodden people, and now they hastened to get back to their loved ones and to the land of health and happiness. A large percentage of them started home from a malaria, from a chronic-dysentery, or from a typhoid bed. Not until the aftermath of those terrible diseases had made serious inroads on their physical ability would they ask or seek relief from their Government.

After some 22 years, an appreciative Government put them on the pension list; and now it is not fair to say that their pensions should be reduced or that they should furnish any additional evidence to maintain them. Their present condition, when considered with the very nature of the service they performed, is presumptive evidence that the Congress was right when it gave them the pensions, and all subsequent Congresses should maintain the action of that Congress.

HORRIBLE HEALTH CONDITIONS

Eighteen months in the Philippine Islands in those days and under the conditions that existed in the islands at that time would permanently disable any white man. "Malaria", "chronic dysentery", "typhoid", "camps in stagnant swamps", "leprosy", "lack of medical and hospital facilities", "all-around insanitary conditions", "Alger's embalmed beef" were all common words and phrases connected with our Army in the War with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection.

THE SMITH BILL TO RESTORE BENEFITS

Mr. Speaker, the veterans of the Army of '98—the 100-percent Volunteer Army—should be placed on the same basis as the veterans of the War between the States, and their widows and dependents should be treated likewise. [Applause.] To the end that we will do that, we should at this session and without hesitation pass H. R. 6995, a bill introduced by Congressman SMITH of Washington, repealing the Economy Act insofar as it pertains to the veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Boxer Rebellion, and the Philippine Insurrection and their widows and orphans.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I wonder if the gentleman has had opportunity to examine the bills introduced on behalf of the Spanish War men. I have introduced a bill to place the Spanish-American War veterans on the same basis as the Civil War men, and that is what should be done.

Mr. AYERS. That is exactly what I am arguing we should do.

Mr. LUNDEEN. And I think the gentleman is making an excellent argument.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYERS. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the magnificent and eloquent tribute he has paid the Spanish-American War veteran. I think these veterans have been shamelessly treated under the so-called "Economy Act", and I would like to know just what the status of the bill (H. R. 6995) is at this time.

Mr. AYERS. It is in committee. It has not been reported.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. What is being done toward having it reported by the committee?

Mr. AYERS. I do not know what the action of the committee is to be. I sincerely hope it shall be favorable and that the bill may get to the floor of the House at an early date.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I would like to join in a petition to have the committee discharged from the consideration of the bill and have the measure brought up on the floor here. For this Congress to adjourn without correcting the injustice that has been inflicted on these worthy veterans, most of whom are now far past the age when they can earn a livelihood, would be an act of the grossest neglect and ingratitude. If we continue to ignore those who have made sacrifices for the flag as these Spanish War veterans did in '98, while expending millions, yea, billions, for every imaginable vagary, it will be poor encouragement for men to rally to their country's colors in the future.

Mr. AYERS. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his contribution.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for one observation, it seems to me there should be an amendment put in the bill when it is considered by the committee, not to reduce any pension that they are now receiving.

Mr. AYERS. The purpose of the bill is to restore them to their status before the enactment of the economy bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But some of them are getting more now, under a peculiar ruling, than they would get under such a bill, and there ought to be an amendment in the bill so as not to reduce any pensions.

Mr. AYERS. I agree with the gentleman from Kentucky and thank him for the suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of economy our Government reduced the benefits of these men and their dependents, and now in the name of recovery, which is on everyone's tongue, let us fully restore these just, equitable, and well-earned benefits. [Applause.]

To these veterans, alive as well as those dead, this Government is indebted, and for those alive and for the widows and orphans of those dead, I urge this body to pass the Smith bill.

We are always quick to recognize our direct obligations to the dead and we are prompt in expounding their virtues. We are also liberal in floral tributes to them. That is all just and right, for it should be so. But I am one who also believes in flowers for the living. [Applause.] Now, my fellow Members of the House, from your demonstration of approval of that remark, I call upon you to pass this bill and give to these living veterans a flower worth while. Indeed, a flower to the living is worth scores of bouquets to the dead. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. HOEPPEL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOEPPEL. Mr. Speaker and Members, 37 years ago today the Congress of the United States formally declared war on the Kingdom of Spain, stipulating in the bill which was passed that—

> War existed since the 21st day of April, A. D. 1898, including said day, between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain.

I rise this afternoon to pay tribute to the approximately 6,000 men and women who lost their lives in the Spanish-American War, and the approximately 200,000 participants who have died since that period; also to express my high regard for our Spanish-American War veterans who are yet alive.

It is quite proper also that, on this day, we rise in reverent memory to the principal characters in that conflict—President McKinley, Colonel Roosevelt, Gen. Joe Wheeler, General Merritt, Admirals Dewey, Sampson, Schley, Bob Evans, and others who contributed so unselfishly to bring success to American arms.

Approximately 450,000 officers and men were enlisted and served between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, on which latter date the Philippine Insurrection was finally terminated. Never before in our history had a war of such proportions been fought in which every individual involved was a volunteer. "Remember the Maine" was the slogan which impelled thousands of American youths to volunteer for service.

This Congress includes a number of individuals who served in the War with Spain and it also includes numbers of others who volunteered for service but who were not accepted.

War, at its best, is what Sherman termed it. In the brief time allotted to me, however, I wish to call attention to some of the benefits which came to our Nation as a result of our participation in the Spanish-American War.

LAST VESTIGE OF SECTIONALISM EFFACED

No one can deny that the mingling of the volunteers of the North with the volunteers of the South in the Spanish-American War contributed in no small measure to the complete effacement of sectional feeling in the United States. It is my belief that I voice the opinion of the Northern volunteers when I state that as a result of their commingling with our patriots of the South and with the southern citizenry, a more complete understanding developed between the North and the South and I believe the wounds of the Civil War may be said to have been effectually healed from that period.

I myself was quartered with the First Texas Volunteer Regiment for a time and the higher regard which I have for the Texas delegation in the Congress, especially my good friends, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. PATMAN, JOE EAGLE, and others, may be said to have its roots in the friendship and understanding which I absorbed in my first association with the men of the South in 1898.

Outstanding as a testimonial to the principles of the American people, we, as a Nation, can point with pride to the fact that although we were victorious in this conflict, we did not annex the territory of the vanquished but instead, we paid the Kingdom of Spain quite liberally and satisfactorily for the territory we acquired as a result of the war.

The United States also established a new principle among nations in that liberty was accorded the Cuban people and self-government was established in Puerto Rico and in the Philippines as soon as conditions warranted. Ours was not an act of imperialism but an act of liberalism to an alien people. This principle stands today in glaring contrast to the attitude of other governments toward their various dependencies or colonies.

Going a step further under the present Democratic administration, through the repeal of the Platt amendment, full liberty of action is now enjoyed by the Cuban Government while, at this time, machinery is in process of development whereby complete independence may be extended to the Philippine Islands.

Commercial and other advantages accruing to the United States as a result of the Spanish-American War have been estimated at more than $8,000,000,000. Outstanding and worth more than actual dollars and cents, however, are the prestige and esteem of the civilized world which we enjoyed as a result of the admirable conduct of our Army and Navy on land and sea. The exploits of American troops in China, in joint action with the allied forces in the relief of Peking, gave evidence to the world that the American soldiers were excelled by none, not even by the highly trained troops of Europe. A hitherto little-appreciated Nation, the United States emerged from the Spanish-American War as a world power.

Notwithstanding the national advantages which have resulted from the sacrifices of our Spanish-American War veterans, they have been virtually the "forgotten veterans" of our wars. Ill-prepared, our troops fought at Santiago with obsolete equipment. Not only were they handicapped by a lack of arms and munitions, but our medical facilities appeared to have been developed very little since the days of the Civil War. Disease took more men than bullets, not only in Santiago but later on in the Philippines as well.

VETERANS OF CUBAN ARMY AT MONTAUK POINT

I submit for the inspection of the Members photostatic copies of pages of the New York World, published in Sep-

tember 1898, depicting conditions at Montauk Point, where the returning Cuban Army was quartered and showing the havoc which improper food, improper sanitation, and inadequate medical care wrought among our veterans, already enervated as a result of their tropical service. As this article shows, by actual photographs and sketches, many of the veterans from Santiago were reduced to mere shadows of their former selves; one veteran lost 70 pounds in weight in the time between his departure at Tampa and his arrival at Long Island City from Cuba in August 1898. Many returned only to die and as I myself was at Montauk Point, quartered with the Army which came from Cuba, I witnessed the astoundingly large number of daily burials of our men.

Wherever possible the convalescent sick were invalided home and left to shift for themselves. Eventually they were discharged and took up the battle of life as best they could with their physical handicaps.

Similar conditions applied in the Philippines, and those on the west coast who observed the returning Army from the Philippines, will confirm my statement, that the men were virtually walking skeletons. These men also were invalided home and discharged shortly thereafter. Notwithstanding their impaired health, they endeavored to carry on and, thanks to their resolute spirits, many of them regained their health temporarily. Practically every man who contracted malaria, typhoid, dysentery, and other diseases in Cuba and the Philippines has, in a sense, however, borne these disabilities throughout life. An examination of the unusually high mortality rate among Spanish-American War veterans today evidences the fact that their lives have been shortened as a result of the physical impairments suffered during their active service days.

Every World War veteran today owes, indirectly, a debt to the Spanish War veterans. Had it not been for the lessons absorbed by our medical department during the Spanish-American War and Philippine Insurrection, there is no doubt that the mortality rate during the World War from disease and other causes would have been much higher. In a sense, the price in sacrifice, suffering, and permanent physical impairment which the Spanish-American War veteran paid, and continues to pay, protected the World War veteran from a similar experience.

As a veteran of the World War myself, I know something of the sacrifices and splendid service of our veterans of that conflict, and I recognize that they are fully entitled to the benefits which have been granted to them by a grateful Government. I mention this as I do not wish my remarks to be construed as in any wise disparaging to them or as bringing into question their right to the benefits granted them.

THE SPANISH VETERAN—THE "FORGOTTEN VETERAN"

I would emphasize the fact, however, that our Nation is also debtor to the Spanish-American War veteran, and that he too is entitled to sympathetic consideration at the hands of a grateful Government, a fact which seems to have been too much overlooked in the past. The Spanish War veteran, when discharged from the service, was sent home to rehabilitate himself with the help of his family and friends. There were no hospitalization laws at that time. He received no pension nor compensation until 22 years after the war, except in some instances an insignificant general-service pension of $6 to $17 per month. He did not receive a cash bonus of $60 on discharge; neither did he receive an adjusted-service certificate.

He did not have the advantages of Government insurance at a low premium rate. There was not a Red Cross, Y. M. C. A., or Salvation Army lassie—God bless them—at every camp and station to cater to his needs. While he was fighting and advancing the interest of our Nation abroad, his family received no dependency allowance. He received insignificant rations, of which embalmed beef was a basic portion. In addition, the medical staff of the Army was poorly equipped in respect to preventive medicine and more modern sanitation facilities, so that the veteran was the more or less helpless victim of the epidemics which ravaged the camps.

Notwithstanding the various handicaps which the Spanish veteran suffered, he was not a quitter. He volunteered to fight with no thought of personal gain, and his objective was to bring liberty to an oppressed people and honor and prestige to his country. Approximately 15,000 volunteers of State regiments who were in the Philippines at the end of the Spanish-American War revolunteered to serve, because of the outbreak of the insurrection, until replacements could be sent from the United States to relieve them. Notwithstanding that their enlistments had expired, they remained in the Philippines to suppress the insurrection and to make more secure the victory which Dewey brought to American arms in the capture of Manila.

In spite of this mark of special heroism and superpatriotism on the part of the State volunteers, our Nation has failed thus far to meet its just obligation in paying to these men the cost of their transportation from the Philippines to San Francisco or the point of their enlistment. As true Americans, none of them would lay down their arms and permit the insurrectos to drive the remaining forces of Regulars to the ships at anchor in the bay. They held Manila and pushed back the insurrectos with great loss of life to themselves and those who survived the hazardous campaign in the tropical swamp areas suffered, in many instances, permanent physical impairment.

I reiterate that the Spanish-American War veteran was a fighting man. He participated in what was in all probability the last war of its kind we shall ever experience—that is, one of a semiguerrilla or open combat nature, in which the stamina of the individual is the determinative influence. He was not motivated by the hope of obtaining credit for himself, he thought only of advancing the best interest of our Nation.

For this reason he is justified, in my opinion, in feeling a deep sense of resentment at the attitude of our Government, as evidenced in the Economy Act, by which to maintain the credit of the United States, the well-deserved pensions—pitifully insignificant—paid to the Spanish War veterans were either abolished or drastically reduced. It should be borne in mind, in this connection, that there were very meager, if any, medical records kept during the Spanish-American War; and even such records as were kept of Volunteers and Regulars in the Philippines were mostly destroyed by termites; therefore, the requirement in the Economy Act, 35 years after the termination of the war, that service connection for disabilities be established in order to show title to pension was, in effect, a practical denial of pension benefits to the majority of our Spanish War veterans. Such a requirement is unreasonable and absurd, in view of the circumstances referred to, and for that reason, if for no other, the Spanish War veterans should be restored to their former pension benefits or their present disabilities recognized as service connected.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that the compensation and pension which our Spanish War veterans are now receiving are totally insufficient?

Mr. HOEPPEL. Their pension is not only insufficient now, but it has always been insufficient in consideration of the services which they rendered and the assets which they brought to our Nation through their sacrifice and suffering in the Tropics. The pensions granted to their widows and dependents are similarly inadequate and it is a travesty on justice that those who contributed so much to our national welfare should be so shabbily treated.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is it not also true that there are thousands and thousands of disabled Spanish War veterans taken off the rolls by the Economy Act, who are still off the rolls and on the relief rolls?

Mr. HOEPPEL. Every word the gentleman says is true and that, indeed, is one of the most pathetic features of the Economy Act, a measure which was enacted to maintain

the credit of the United States. I am confident that no Member of this Congress, recognizing the sacrifice of the Spanish War veterans, would permit the maintenance of the credit of the United States to stand in the way of giving to them a fair and just pension.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 minute more.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. There is a bill now pending (H. R. 6995) to remedy this situation, is there not?

Mr. HOEPPEL. That is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the present status of that bill? I was in hopes that it had been reported.

Mr. HOEPPEL. Answering my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, the bill to which he refers has not yet been accorded a hearing in committee. Because of the standing and ability of the gentleman from Texas and the sincere and honest attitude he has taken in the interest of all our veterans, I hope he will urge the chairman of the committee to grant us an early hearing on this measure. I recall with deepest gratitude the wonderful support which the gentleman from Texas gave to Mr. PATMAN, in the passage of the bonus bill in the last Congress, and again in this session, for which the World War veterans are deeply indebted to him. I am confident that he will assist us with the Spanish-American-veteran pension bill with the same degree of enthusiasm.

Mr. BLANTON. That bill is before which Pension Committee?

Mr. HOEPPEL. The Pension Committee to which are assigned all pension bills, except those pertaining to the Civil War. As a Member of the House, in daily association with you, I feel sure that the Membership is well disposed toward all veterans, and especially the Spanish War veterans. Therefore, I am confident that if we could bring H. R. 6995 to the floor for consideration, it would be passed by a huge majority.

I have discussed the veteran question with the President on several occasions and have repeatedly expressed myself as opposed to the veteran provisions of the Economy Act, which, in my opinion, are flagrantly unjust. In a recent conference with him I emphasized the imperative necessity of enacting a law providing a uniform scale of pensions in order to handle this question justly and fairly with respect to all our veterans and their dependents. If we cannot enact such legislation in this session, however (and due to the burden of pending emergency legislation, the prospects are not encouraging), the least we can do is to correct the glaring injustice suffered by our Spanish-American War veterans and their dependents under the provisions of the Economy Act, by the enactment of H. R. 6995 to restore to them their former pension benefits. [Applause.]

MAKE SCIENCE THE PEOPLE'S SERVANT

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HILDEBRANDT. Mr. Speaker, no feature in the administration bill to expand the Tennessee Valley experiment appeals to me more strongly than the section authorizing the purchase of municipal power plants where a referendum vote shows the people to be favorable to the idea.

The project itself is one that captures the imagination while commending itself to the practical good sense of all who feel that public utilities should be blessings for the whole people instead of tools by which a favored few can extract vast profits from the remainder of the population. But the project itself is of minor consequence compared with the encouraging possibility of publicly owned power plants throughout the country if the pending measure becomes a law. Its enactment will mean far more than the development of Tennessee Valley hydroelectric power. Such a law may constitute the first important step toward ownership by the people of one, at least, of the natural resources that should never have belonged to private interests at any time. While it would be only a short step, when we consider the necessity of transfer of public utilities generally from the hands of corporation magnates, nevertheless, it would be of tremendous significance in the economic and political history of the Nation. Not only would it lift many burdens from the backs of the common people, but it would constitute an important precedent for continuing along the enlightened and progressive path of public ownership. It is not surprising that every profiteering interest in America is fighting this bill, tooth and nail, hoping either to defeat it or to completely emasculate it in case it is passed.

I have urged the development of hydroelectric power from the Missouri River and pointed out the immense advantages that would accrue to the people of my State, South Dakota, as well as to residents of other States. The same principle is applicable everywhere, although naturally I have stressed such development in my own section. I am more familiar with conditions there and I feel a special responsibility there, although I certainly hope for the maximum of hydroelectric development the country over—development that means comforts and conveniences for the whole people at actual cost plus a moderate overhead, instead of development that will result in more profits for the Power Trust and its subsidiaries.

No nation has more marvelous machinery, more remarkable inventions, more scientific genius, than ours. Why, then, are not our people free from the curse of poverty, unemployment, economic uncertainty, and the fear of destitution?

In an article in the Literary Digest by Prof. Henry Flury, an able Washington biologist and author, headed, "Is This an Age of Science?" the professor remarks:

> Many of us who handle scientific ideas as a means of earning our daily bread are wondering whether this really is an age of science. The race between catastrophe and education (science) may be more nearly true than many of us realize and we must shake ourselves out of the smug complacency that this is an age of science. Rather it is an age of button pushers.

The trouble, it seems to me, is not in the button pushing itself but in the fact that the button pushing is now so regulated as to benefit none but a small minority. This has been shown by Professor Flury as well as by many other modern economists such as Stuart Chase and Scott Nearing, who have urged, not the abolition of the machine, but the use of the machine for the entire citizenry instead of as a means of profit making for a tiny percentage of the Nation. The fault is not in the machines; it is in the denial of their facilities to the general public except through payment of tribute to owners who acquired them, not by superior industry and thrift but by legalized robbery under the prevailing profit system.

What an uproar would result if I were to recommend private ownership of roads. How objectionable we find the few remaining toll bridges that are privately owned. How absurd you would consider it if I were to propose private ownership of rivers, harbors, docks, fire departments, parks, playgrounds, and schools. Yet is there any more reason—in fact, is there not much less reason—why trusts and industrial barons should be the proprietors of the mines from which comes our fuel, the plants from which we get our electricity and gas, the railroad systems on which we travel and ship goods, and the factories that produce our clothes and manufactured food? Are these things not even more essential than the others? To put them in the hands of the people, operating through the people's Government, would not be confiscation, but restitution.

Harry F. Ward, professor of Christian ethics in Union Theological Seminary, in his able brochure, The Profit Motive, has well said:

> The type of thinking and activity that has produced the smooth-running dynamo cannot long endure the sloppy disorganization of business for profit which cannot get fuel to a powerhouse without waste of coal below and human life above the ground, which cannot distribute its benefits without increasing inequality, dis-

content, and conflict. Science is compelled by its own nature to seek an economic order in which the production and distribution of goods are intelligently adapted to approved needs and not left at the mercy of blindly conflicting impulses.

JAMES A. MOFFETT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], a Representative at large from the State of Ohio, made a few scattering remarks in reference to the Federal Housing Administrator, James A. Moffett. Mr. Moffett has written a letter to Mr. YOUNG and has sent me a copy of that letter. I spoke to Mr. YOUNG this morning, told him I was going to ask unanimous consent to place Mr. Moffett's letter in the RECORD so that both sides of the story might be recorded. He said he did not object to my putting the letter in the RECORD.

Mr. YOUNG. If the gentleman will yield, I have no objection, but I am going to follow that request by asking unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of my answer to that letter of Mr. Moffett.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this point to insert the letter of Mr. Moffett written to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

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

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

APRIL 24, 1935.

Hon. STEPHEN M. YOUNG,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. YOUNG: A statement made on the floor of the House, attributed to you, to the effect that I have been here less than 2 weeks in the last 2 months, have been in Palm Beach, and now am planning a trip to the Orient, inferring that I have not attended to public business, is misleading and incorrect, and, I think, in fairness to me you should be acquainted with the true facts.

I went to Palm Beach to attend my son's wedding and to take a vacation to which I was strictly entitled. I have been constantly on the job night and day since I came here last July. When absent from Washington, except for the trip to Palm Beach, it has been strictly on Government business.

Under the rules of Government I believe I am entitled to a vacation, the same as anybody else.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) JAMES A. MOFFETT,
Federal Housing Administrator.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein my answer to the letter of Administrator James A. Moffett at this point in the RECORD.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, simply to ask a question, will the gentleman's letter in any way involve or reflect upon my good friend the Deputy Administrator, Mr. J. Howard Audrey, of New York?

Mr. YOUNG. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Texas, I want to state I consider that James A. Moffett, as Administrator of Federal Housing, has been an abject failure.

Mr. BLANTON. But I am not asking about Administrator Moffett. I am asking the gentleman if his letter will in any way involve or reflect upon the Deputy Administrator, Hon. J. Howard Audrey, of New York, who is a capable, efficient official and a splendid gentleman, he being one of my classmates when we were in the University of Texas together.

Mr. YOUNG. No; my letter does not refer to him.

The following is the letter referred to:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 25, 1935.

Hon. JAMES A. MOFFETT,
Administrator Federal Housing Administration,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MOFFETT: The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24 containing the speech I made on the floor of the House yesterday is being mailed you under separate cover.

The statements made by me are neither misleading nor incorrect.

In event the correctness of these statements is challenged, I intend to make use of my file on the Housing Administration, the contents of which have been collected and compiled by me since last December. I then propose to obtain half an hour or more and make a complete statement setting forth the results of my investigation and research in regard to your administration of the Federal Housing Administration.

It is my well-considered opinion that your resignation should be accepted and that you should be given a permanent vacation, instead of a leave of absence for the purpose of making a trip to the Orient, and that a new Federal Housing Administrator should be appointed forthwith.

Yours very truly,

STEPHEN M. YOUNG,
Congressman at Large, Ohio.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7672) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the Naval Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MCCORMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, before I commence my observations in reference to this appropriation bill I desire, first, to ascertain from the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARY] if it is his intention that this day shall be consumed in general debate and defer the reading of the bill until tomorrow?

Mr. CARY. It is. We have 4 hours and 23 minutes of general debate remaining, which will take the entire day.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And there will be no effort made on the part of the committee to read the bill for amendment today?

Mr. CARY. No, sir.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Then, Mr. Chairman, at this point I shall not discuss any of the various provisions of the bill, but under the 5-minute rule I shall have certain amendments which I shall offer for the consideration of the Committee.

In framing the Constitution of these United States our forefathers were farsighted in making it the duty of Congress to provide and maintain an Army and Navy and it is our solemn duty to provide adequately for our national defense.

The fundamental naval policy of our country, which has been affirmed for many years, is "to maintain the Navy in sufficient strength to support the national policies and commerce and to guard the continental and overseas possessions of the United States."

For Congress to fulfill its duty to provide for national defense commensurate with the needs of a nation such as ours, with its standing as a world power, and to permit the full realization of our fundamental naval policy, adequate funds must be provided not only to maintain the ships and personnel we now have but, in addition, for new ships and additional personnel to man them. The fact remains, however, that we have never had such a Navy, and unless Congress makes the necessary provisions we never will.

The naval appropriation bill now before this branch of Congress for consideration is a step in the right direction in adequately providing for the needs of our first line of defense—the Navy. The members of the subcommittee for naval appropriations of the Appropriations Committee deserve the highest commendation and are to be congratulated for their action in reporting to this House a naval appropriation bill providing for sufficient funds to adequately provide for the Navy for the coming fiscal year.

While this bill provides for the largest peace-time appropriation for the Navy, no American need fear that the United States will ever become militaristic. Since the Washington Conference and until the present administration the Navy

has been woefully neglected. Only during one administration has there been any authorization for new construction and that was for cruisers and one aircraft carrier. It is now necessary for this and succeeding administrations to do in a shorter period of time what others have neglected to do. It is the voice of the people that will ever rule this country of ours, and it is the voice of the people that will determine the strength of our Army and Navy. I am confident this determination will be for adequate national defense. For this Government to maintain a navy which is not strong enough to win in battle is the worst form of extravagance. It lulls the people into a false sense of security and may have the most disastrous consequences.

The United States believes whole-heartedly in limitation of armaments, and we have contributed very greatly to the consummation of that ideal. At the end of the World War the United States was about to become the dominant naval power of the world. When the Washington Conference assembled in the fall of 1921 we possessed a naval force, built and building, which was stronger than that of any other power. This had been created in accordance with our announced policy to maintain a navy second to none, which policy came into being because of the fact that during the World War we were unable to maintain neutrality and did not have the power to compel it.

We felt deeply that our interest demanded this protection, and it was obvious that the wealth and industrial resources of the United States made it possible for us to provide it. At the Washington Conference we took the unprecedented course of surrendering voluntarily the naval supremacy which we possessed. We agreed to scrap 11 of the most powerful battleships and battle cruisers which have ever been designed. In addition, we took out of the line and agreed to scrap 20 completed battleships. In making this sacrifice we announced and demonstrated to the world that we were willing to forego supremacy and that we would be content with strength equal to that of Great Britain, but measurably greater than that of any other power. No other nation on earth has made a contribution which can approach the sacrifice made by the United States. Not only did we give up much more than has any other nation but in addition, in the years following the Washington Conference, we were very slow to build anything else, whereas each of the other great Navies has been built up in an orderly manner in the classes of ships within the limits and to the extent permitted by treaties. Other nations did not follow our lead to "disarm by example." On the contrary, they employed every facility to increase their respective navies.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. We performed our quantitative agreement. Did England do that also?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not know what England's contributions were. I assume that she made a contribution, but let me say that we made the largest contribution.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. TERRY. Has the gentleman figures as to how much the scrapping of those ships in accordance with that treaty cost us?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not remember accurately, but my recollection is that we had already spent over $300,000,000 on them. I know Congress had to appropriate approximately $20,000,000 to scrap the ships that we gave up to bring about a limitation of armament.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. And is it not true that while we were scrapping all these ships under that agreement, very largely the other nations were scrapping blueprints.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We took out of our line 20 ships that were manned by virile American sailors and scrapped them. We had in process of being built in the navy yards of the country 12 of the greatest ships ever designed by man, and approximately over $300,000,000 had already been spent upon them. We scrapped those.

The Treaty of London will, unless renewed, expire on December 31, 1936. The Treaty of Washington was to continue in force until denounced by one of the signatory powers. I greatly deplore the fact that one of the powers has seen fit to denounce the Washington Treaty. Unless there is a renewal in the meantime, the Treaty of London will automatically terminate on the same date. It is earnestly hoped that between now and December 31, 1936, another agreement will be reached to maintain the ratios that have already been established as necessary to maintain the balance of power between nations.

At Geneva we made a most determined effort to bring about further limitations, and at London we made a determined effort to bring it about; and in the recent conversation that took place last fall a determined effort was made to bring about reductions, but the other nations signatory to these treaties refused to reach the low level this Government has advocated.

Mr. HOEPPEL. And is it true that the Steel Trust had Mr. Shearer helping them over at Geneva?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I know nothing about Mr. Shearer or the Steel Trust. I have none of them in my district.

The United States would be the first to applaud limitation to a lower level and repeatedly has used every effort to accomplish such a reduction. We believe that the naval strength required for our security is relative to that possessed by other powers. But let me impress upon you with all of the force and earnestness at my command that we must maintain a navy of under-age ships substantially in the ratio now fixed by international agreement.

During Chief Justice Hughes' tenure of office of Secretary of State he presided over the Washington Conference. At this conference, in October 1922, he declared:

> This Government has taken the lead in securing the reduction of naval armament, but the Navy that we retain under the agreement should be maintained with efficient personnel and pride in the service. It is essential that we should maintain the relative naval strength of the United States. That, in my judgment, is the way to peace and security. It will be upon that basis that we would enter into future conferences or make agreements for limitations, and it would be folly to undermine our position.

And the bill that we passed last year is to carry out the language of the agreement at the Washington Conference, and the provision in this bill to make the appropriations for carrying that out is in accordance with and carrying out the policy announced at that time.

Thus it was openly declared that it was the Nation's policy and the understanding with which it gave up its predominant naval superiority that our Navy would be maintained at the strength and in the ratios prescribed by treaties.

Until the present administration, this policy has not been carried out. Instead, this country dropped well below the ratios prescribed and was building very few ships when President Roosevelt was inaugurated. With the enactment of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the President was authorized to construct ships for our Navy. Accordingly he set aside funds for the construction of 32 naval vessels. Each year since then he has given his approval for the allocation of funds to continue the construction of ships to build up in the categories in which we were deficient and to replace certain over-age and obsolete ships. With this program carried through to a conclusion, we will arrive at treaty strength in modern ships in 1942—6 years after the termination of limitation agreements. For the first time in the history of the country we now have a logical, orderly plan for the maintenance of the Navy at a level which is sufficient to provide against emergencies—and we must not deviate from this plan.

One of the fundamental objectives of the treaties for the limitation of armaments is to eliminate all suspicion of a naval race. We hoped for this after the Washington Conference and again after the London Conference. But to realize this hope it is essential that the balance so arrived at be maintained at all times. So long as we build steadily

with the avowed purpose of conforming strictly to the treaty ratios there can and should be no objection either here or abroad. Notwithstanding any agreement, or lack of agreement, we must maintain the accepted ratio, and by so doing we maintain the balance. To do so, the ships, as they become over age—and this means from the largest to the smallest or from the battleships, the backbone of the fleet, to the submarines—they must be replaced.

I call attention to the fact that every ship authorized to be laid down in the bill passed at the last session of Congress is strictly in accordance with the terms of the treaty. Each and every one of them is a replacement ship. There will be no naval race, unless some country goes beyond the ratio fixed by the Washington and London Treaties, and this country does not propose to go beyond those ratios.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BIERMANN. The gentleman says there will be no naval race. Does he mean to say that the United States Government, in increasing its expenditure $172,000,000 over last year for the Navy, will not encourage a naval race in the world?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It will not. It is already limited by the treaty. It may cost more in this country to build ships than it does in England or Japan, and the money question is not one that brings about a naval race. A naval race is brought about by building more than these treaties permit to be built.

Mr. BIERMANN. Great Britain is not up to treaty strength?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course not.

Mr. BIERMANN. And Japan is not.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. She lacks only 2,000 tons of it.

Mr. BIERMANN. And if we appropriate this extra money, will it not encourage Great Britain to appropriate more money?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all, for the simple reason that Great Britain's known policy is to build up to treaty strength, just like our treaty strength. Japan has already built up to it.

Mr. BIERMANN. Does not the gentleman think the bill in the last Congress was immediately followed by increased preparations in Japan and Great Britain, due, principally, to that bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all. Japan at that time lacked only a few tons of being up to treaty strength.

Mr. BIERMANN. The gentleman means to say that the Vinson bill had nothing whatsoever to do with the race between foreign countries?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Japan had already complied with her obligations to keep even keel on the balance between her nation and England and this country by building up to treaty strength. Now, if we build beyond treaty strength, then we will precipitate a naval race, but we do not propose to ask one dollar to build beyond the ratio fixed in these treaties.

As ships become obsolescent and require replacement, funds will be requested from Congress to carry on this work. It is therefore our solemn duty to provide the necessary appropriations. Failure to do so will accomplish indirectly what we refused to do directly at the preliminary naval conference last fall in London. That is, give up the 5-5-3 ratio.

Gentlemen, I ask you these questions: Are the people of this country willing to send their sons to meet an enemy in ships that are old, slow, and obsolete and inferior in strength in order to save a few dollars? Is the defense of our country to be jeopardized? Are the lives of your sons and grandsons to be offered up as a living sacrifice because you are unwilling to provide the funds for the support of a proper navy in times of peace? The answer to all is emphatically "No."

This country determined, by making certain concessions, that we needed a navy of that character and of that ratio as a defensive navy. Great Britain reached the same conclusion. Now, I say, to keep the balance it is absolutely essential that we maintain the same by building the ships up to that treaty ratio.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MAAS. Is it not true that we went further than any other nation in attempting to stop a naval race by example and that we were the only Nation which did?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. MAAS. And we have voluntarily remained below the treaty limit, while other nations have built up to their treaty limits?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. From 1922 down to 1933 we only built about 45 or 50 ships, while England and Japan and France and Italy were building hundreds of ships.

Mr. THOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. THOM. I wonder if the gentleman will incorporate in his remarks a list of the vessels that were built in the United States since the close of the World War and the cost of them?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think that is contained in the hearings.

Mr. THOM. No; it is not.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will be glad to get it and put it in the RECORD.

Now, let me call your attention to what the size of your Navy will be in 1942, when it is built up to treaty strength. This tells every ship and every kind of ship that will be under age and the numbers of them. This will constitute the Navy of the United States in its fighting line.

Our treaty-strength Navy will be composed of 15 battleships, 6 aircraft carriers, 18 eight-inch gun cruisers, 17 six-inch gun cruisers, 13 heavy destroyers, 84 light destroyers, and 38 submarines, with the necessary aircraft therefor—about 1,910 planes.

A navy, to be of any use in times of emergency, must be maintained throughout the intervening times of peace. There is a grave misunderstanding in our country as to what a navy must be in order to exert its full influence for peace. Almost invariably naval strength is spoken of in terms of the number of ships, without consideration as to whether they are manned or whether it is possible to obtain trained crews for them. Some people seem to think that a ship is always ready, whether she is manned or not. The building of a ship requires a long time. Then, when she has been completed, another long period, devoted to intensive training of her crew, is required before she can be considered ready to take her place in the battle line.

In case of war it will be necessary to expand immediately the Navy very greatly; to provide armed guards for merchant ships; to train crews for troop transports; to man submarine chasers and converted yachts and other auxiliaries necessary for the successful prosecution of a war. We cannot depend upon having an ally, as in the World War, to keep the enemy fleet bottled up while the necessary personnel is being trained. It is therefore imperative that sufficient personnel, both officer and enlisted, be provided to permit having a trained nucleus on our ships.

Mr. KENNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. KENNEY. As far as man power is concerned, is it not important that we have experienced naval enlisted men?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, no one has any experience in his first enlistment. I presume the gentleman has reference to Naval Reserves?

Mr. KENNEY. No. I have reference to the enlisted men. Of course, when he reenlists he is more valuable to the Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. Of course, he is more valuable than a man in the first enlistment.

Mr. KENNEY. As a part of the enlisted man's pay he was given an allowance, I think, of something like $100 when he reenlisted. Now, that has not been placed back in this bill, has it?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. The Economy Act cut that out. That was an inducement for men who have already served a period of enlistment to reenlist.

Mr. KENNEY. But it tended to keep good men in service?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly.

Mr. KENNEY. May I ask the gentleman this one further question? All of the other salaries have been put back, have they not?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Every Federal salary was restored on April 1.

Mr. KENNEY. Except this allowance to the enlisted men?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Well, that is a gratuity. It is not classified as salary or pay.

Mr. KENNEY. It is called that, but, after all, it was a part of the enlisted man's pay.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. Of course, it is an inducement to make him enlist. The longer he is in the service the more efficient he becomes.

Mr. HOEPPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. HOEPPEL. The last War Department appropriation bill carried a provision taking from the enlisted man his reenlistment bonus.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Well, I cannot yield on that now. The gentleman is talking about the Army.

Mr. HOEPPEL. A provision could be put in the Navy appropriation bill to restore to the Navy enlisted man his reenlistment bonus. This should be done by the Committee. As it is, the enlisted man is the only individual today who is suffering under the original Economy Act.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. When a man has served 4 years and retires to private life, he still forms a part of the Naval Reserve strength, does he not?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not unless he goes into it.

Mr. BLANTON. But as a trained man he can be called back to service in time of war.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not unless he joins the Reserves.

Mr. BLANTON. I am speaking about the situation in case of war.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The country would get the benefit of his previous training and experience in the Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. So when he retires with his 4 years' training and experience, subject to call in time of war, and another man takes his place, we would have two well-trained, qualified men with experience instead of one?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right; exactly. With such provision, the sudden and rapid expansion of the Navy during a major emergency, the fleet will not be crippled by the withdrawal of key men to man additional ships.

I measure my words when I say the personnel of the Navy is not surpassed in excellence or in technical skill by any corresponding body of men in the world. [Applause.] Time after time, from the earliest days of the Republic, this branch of the service has faced crises and emergencies with never an incident of which we should not be proud. However, the difficulty is that we have not enough of such men. The treaty Navy, including the necessary aircraft therefor, to be manned with 100-percent complement will require about 127,000 enlisted men and 7,941 officers of the line. Of course, it is obvious that we cannot, in time of peace, maintain the Navy on a war footing. Nevertheless, the active ships of the United States Fleet must have sufficient personnel to be ready to meet an emergency. This means that they must have not less than 85 percent of complement and they must be trained to the highest state of efficiency. To do this will require for the fiscal year 1936 a minimum of 93,500 men. As the Navy is built up to treaty strength, this number will have to be increased each year until the number will be about 111,000 men. Then, if the need for mobilization should come, expansion could be carried on without destroying the readiness for battle which had previously been developed. Unless trained crews are made available, the building of ships is a futile gesture, misleading to our own people and of very doubtful support to the national policies. Never again can we count on the assistance of some other fleet for a year or more while our own is being made ready.

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

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. The gentleman has made a most interesting statement. Speaking of personnel, we are getting an additional appointment to Annapolis to build up the officer personnel. As I understand it, there will be another additional appointment provided next year. Is that the thought?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will state to the gentleman that the Subcommittee on Appropriations has carried sufficient money to authorize every Congressman and Senator to make an appointment this calendar year, and he will probably enter the academy between now and September. Under the bill we have recently passed, the officer strength of the Navy, on account of the larger Navy, will have to be increased, but I am satisfied the Budget for 1937 will carry sufficient money to take care of the situation.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. And to increase it would require an additional appointee at the academy for each Representative and Senator.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is in the bill now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, for several days I have been intending to make a few remarks relative to the present policy of the new deal toward agriculture, and especially toward the cotton industry and its ultimate effect on northern agriculture in general. What I have to say has not been inspired in any respect by the controversy that has taken place in the last few days between our friends from New England and North Carolina. I am approaching this subject from an entirely different angle.

The people whom I represent are an agricultural people. We know very well that if the continued present policy of the administration destroys 40 percent of the cotton industry of this country that a great many millions of acres of rich agricultural lands in the South will be put into the production of diversified farm products and that in that section of the country there will probably rise a more intensified dairy industry. I know from the condition of the dairy industry in my section of the country that it cannot stand further competition; they are practically wiped off the map at the present time; and I am interested in helping them, rather than adding to their present burdens. We are, therefore, directly interested in any policy that cuts down the cotton-producing area of this country. My attention was forcibly called to this by the abrupt drop in the cotton market some little time ago. I was interested particularly in the statements given out by the publicists of the various departments in Washington, by which they tried to make the people believe that some kind of market manipulation, some anti-new-deal propaganda, had caused the decrease in the price of cotton, when, as a matter of fact, in my judgment, the reason was that the manufacturers, the growers, and the farmers had seen the statements that have been given out by the Department of Agriculture, the Census Bureau, and the Commerce Department, showing that we were losing our foreign markets.

To my mind, nothing so accurately illustrates the folly of the new-deal experimentations and their inevitable failure as the collapse of the cotton market.

Notwithstanding the efforts of the vast publicity machinery of the administration to make it appear that collapse was due either to some personal manipulation of the market or to the circulation of false reports, the facts are too evident to be concealed and too clear to be distorted.

Cotton interests in this country, from planter to exporter and fabricator, are finally face to face with the bitter realization that the agricultural policies inaugurated by this administration have brought, not merely present disaster to the American cotton industry but will, if persisted in, result in its permanent ruin. That explains the collapse of the cotton market. That is the only explanation.

For the army of administration publicity writers—paid for out of the pockets of the American taxpayers—to issue "canned interviews" with various governmental officials and new-deal politicians to the effect that the cotton collapse is due to anti-new-deal propaganda is only adding insult to injury.

It is not due to anti-new-deal propaganda that former large foreign buyers of American raw cotton are now buying from Brazil, India, Egypt, Soviet Russia, and other countries, with the consequent loss of 40 percent of our cotton export markets.

Government statistics furnished by the United States Department of Commerce and the United States Department of Agriculture show the 1934 cotton exports the lowest in 16 years, and to have been 43 percent lower than in 1933 and 44 percent lower than the 10-year average.

No bunk or ballyhoo about anti-new-deal propaganda explains away the fact that the British textile mills in 1933 took 584,000 bales of American cotton and only 24,000 bales of Brazilian cotton, whereas last year they took 249,000 bales of American cotton and 206,321 bales of Brazilian cotton, a loss of 57 percent to our cotton exporters and a gain of 760 percent to the Brazilian cotton industry.

Neither does it explain away the fact that Brazil is increasing its cotton acreage, and that it will produce 2,000,000 bales this year—the largest in its history.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNELL. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. A man in my home town, Waco, Tex., has a large number of presses throughout the country. He has been down in Brazil for some months. I have just seen a letter from him in which he said they had hundreds of gins down there, but that they were standing idle. He said further that the crop was being eaten up by insects.

Mr. SNELL. That does not do away with the actual fact that they have produced and sold this cotton in our former markets. These are figures that come from our own departments. Nor does it explain the fact that exports of Indian cotton are the largest for 3 years, the figures showing that for the first half of the current season India exported 1,197,000 bales of raw cotton against only 854,000 the previous season, or an increase of 40 percent.

Nor does it explain away the fact that Soviet Russia, which hitherto has been a cotton-importing country, has taken advantage of the situation existing in the United States to increase its cotton acreage to such a degree that it expects to export 2,000,000 bales this year.

Surely anti-new-deal propaganda does not account for the report issued by the United States Department of Agriculture under date of March 11, 1935, showing that Japan, which has been one of our greatest raw-cotton customers, is decreasing its purchases of raw cotton in the United States and increasing those from India. The figures given in this report show that the Japanese Spinners' Association in the last 6 months of 1934 increased its purchases of Indian raw cotton from 495,000 to 732,000 bales over the preceding 6 months, or an increase of 50 percent. In January 1935 its purchases of raw cotton from India jumped 100 percent over December 1934. At the same time Japanese purchases of raw cotton from this country during the last 6 months of 1934 were nearly 100,000 bales less than the corresponding period of 1933.

COTTON-GIN MACHINERY EXPORTS HAVE INCREASED 500 PERCENT

The explanation offered by the United States Department of Agriculture for this situation is contained in the following sentence:

> This steady decline (in Japanese purchase of American cotton) is attributed to price factors.

This is only another way of stating a very unpleasant fact, the discussion of which the new deal studiously avoids. The "price factor" referred to is the fact that other countries find they can secure their raw cotton from competing producing countries, such as India, Peru, Brazil, Egypt, and Soviet Russia, at cheaper prices than they can buy it in America.

Now, this is not a theory, it has actually been demonstrated—demonstrated by facts given out by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce of our own Government.

It is not anti-new-deal propaganda which is destroying the cotton-export market and bringing disaster to the cotton industry in this country, but the pro-new-deal agricultural policies which increased the domestic price of raw cotton far above the world price by arbitrarily reducing production and making Federal loans on that already produced.

The world is merely applying to the American cotton industry the free-trade theory of the new deal, which is that the American people should be permitted to buy their necessities wherever they can purchase them the cheapest. The new-deal tariff theory, as expounded by the "brain trust", is that those countries which can produce certain commodities more economically than they can be produced here should be permitted free access to the markets of this country, even though it be at the expense of American industry and American agricultural producers.

The cotton-consuming world now finds that other countries can produce and sell cotton at less than 12 cents a pound. Being true disciples of the new-deal tariff theory they buy of that country where cotton is produced the most economically.

The cotton crisis did not develop overnight. It was not occasioned by a wild rumor or a manipulation of the market by a clique or by a condition of the hour. The Roosevelt administration saw it coming weeks ago, when it was announced that Oscar G. Johnston, general manager of the A. A. A. Cotton Producers Pool, was being sent to Europe for the express purpose of endeavoring to prevent a further slump in our cotton export trade. That in itself was an admission of the break-down of the administration's agricultural policy insofar as cotton was concerned. It served as a storm signal to American cotton interests.

The A. A. A. policy is not only destroying the foreign market for raw cotton, which will mean ruin to the cotton-growing States and the cotton farmers, but it imperils the American textile industry. The pegged domestic price of 12 cents a pound plus the 4.2 cents a pound processing tax, plus other handling costs, makes raw cotton cost the American textile manufacturer almost 18 cents a pound. With what result?

Textile manufacturers are buying on a hand-to-mouth basis. Domestic consumption of cotton goods is decreasing. Stocks are piling up in the textile mills. A report appearing only a few days ago in the market section of the New York Times shows that on 38½-inch 64–60s print cloths, one of the most widely used styles, inventories at the mills jumped from 25,000,000 to 36,000,000 yards during the month of February, while unfilled orders declined from 29,000,000 to 15,000,000 yards. Unfilled orders of 39-inch 80-square cloths declined from 27,000,000 to 12,500,000 yards, and similar situations developed in other important styles.

With foreign textile manufacturers able to purchase cheap cotton from other countries and able to fabricate that cotton far more cheaply than it can be done in this country, the future of the American textile industry is seriously menaced. This is not merely a theory yet to be demonstrated. Statistics show that while the number of spindles in this country has decreased, the number in Russia has

increased by 2,000,000, the number in India by 3,500,000, the number in Japan by 6,815,000, and the number in Brazil by 2,702,000. These foreign spindles are actively at work, and every yard of textiles which they produce and sell in the world market decreases the possible market for American textiles by just that much.

It is not an academic proposition when, as a result of the new deal's agricultural policy insofar as it affects cotton, the entire social and economic structure of cotton-growing States and textile-manufacturing communities is being undermined. January 27, 1935, the press associations carried the statement of J. S. Wanamaker, of South Carolina, president of the American Cotton Growers' Association, that as a result of the cotton acreage reduction program of the A. A. A. 40 percent of the population formerly engaged in the cotton industry in the cotton-growing States had been forced upon public relief rolls. This includes not merely the tenant farmers but stevedores, shipping clerks, gin hands, and so forth. The situation in Arkansas because of the A. A. A. cotton-reduction program has been so critical that there has been talk of martial law being invoked in order to keep down public disorders.

The administration, instead of frankly confessing the failure of this program, as President Roosevelt stated early in his administration he would do in any instance where he found one of his experiments did not work, is bending every energy and using every resource to suppress the facts. There are at present on file with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration two official reports, made by its own representatives after a personal inspection of the situation in Arkansas and other cotton-growing States, which it refuses to make public because of the incredibly miserable human conditions these reports show existing as a direct result of the Agricultural Adjustment policies and practices. Proof that the A. A. A. cotton program is ruining cotton-growing States is furnished by the fact that southern Senators were instrumental in amending the work-relief measure so as to provide particularly for the tenant farmers and share-croppers in the cotton-growing States, and further by the passage of the bill now in the Senate providing $1,000,000,000 for relief of tenant and cropper farmers.

In addition to losing 40 percent of our cotton-export market, impoverishing hundreds of thousands of individuals dependent upon a prosperous cotton industry for a livelihood and imperiling the entire textile industry with its vast army of employees, the administration's cotton policies threaten additional disaster to northern agriculture.

And that is where it comes home directly to the people in my district of New York State, the use that is to be made of the land. Markets have been lost to such an extent that it makes it necessary for 40 percent of the land that is now producing cotton to be put into the production of some other agricultural commodity. This land is not going to grow up to weeds, and if it is put into production of diversified farm products it will eventually cause absolute ruin under the present situation to the farmers in the Northern States. Let me observe right here that notwithstanding the fact it was understood when the Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed a year or so ago, that where we paid the people for letting their land lie fallow it was not to be put into the production of competitive agricultural products. Yet I heard it stated yesterday on the floor of another body that they had planted just as many acres last year as they planted any year. This is something I cannot understand in connection with the carrying out of the agricultural program.

In other words, the administration's agricultural policy, insofar as it affects cotton, instead of solving the problem of the cotton industry, has not only brought that industry to the brink of bankruptcy but it is complicating the problems of northern industry and nullifying completely the program of the A. A. A. insofar as northern agriculture is concerned.

The whole underlying philosophy of President Roosevelt's program for relief of agriculture, as enunciated in several of his campaign speeches and repeated in several of his official messages, is that agriculture has been suffering from overproduction, and the remedy was a reduction of acreage planted to agricultural products as well as a decrease in the production of livestock and dairy products.

To put that program into concrete form, the Agricultural Adjustment Act was enacted. To pay the cost of this program, the processing taxes were imposed. These are merely a sales tax on food. To induce the northern farmer to reduce his acreage of crops and his production of cattle, hogs, and dairy products and to compensate him in some measure for such reduction, the Federal Government is paying hundreds of millions of dollars in benefits or bonuses in the northern agricultural States.

Yet its cotton program will inevitably bring into general cultivation more land than has been abandoned in the North at so great a cost to the American taxpayers. Thus, one policy of the new deal offsets and nullifies another policy, but that does not stop the annual expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars, charged to the taxpayers of the country in one form or another.

The administration's agricultural policies, insofar as they apply to northern agriculture, have failed almost as signally as they have in the cotton-growing States. The results are the same in kind, if not in degree. They are responsible for a sensational decrease in the foreign market of the northern farmer, and for even a more sensational decrease in his domestic market.

While we have been spending considerable money to limit the production from the southern farms, on the other hand, if you are to continue the present policy as outlined by the new deal perhaps we shall put the same southern lands into direct competition with the northern lands in the production of competitive farm products. In other words, we are spending millions and millions of the people's money, but we are not getting any benefits.

According to the report of the Division of Foreign Crops and Markets of the United States Department of Agriculture, our exports of 44 leading farm products in January were the lowest in more than 20 years, and less than one-half of the average of the pre-war period. On the other hand, for the first time in the history of the United States, we are importing foodstuffs for man and beast.

Reports of the packing-house industry for the month of February show the receipt of hogs for that month to have been the lightest in the history of the packing industry. During the entire month of February the receipt of hogs at 20 markets for the first 2 months of this year was less than half the 5-year average. This is due to a boycott of pork by the consuming public because of the high prices, and is the first time in the history of the United States that such a condition has existed. Heretofore, in times of depression, pork has been the poor man's meat.

Immediately following the World War, when we had an agricultural crisis precipitated by the Democratic administration deflating the farmer, there was a joint congressional committee appointed to investigate the entire agricultural problem. That committee consisted of members of both parties from both the Senate and the House. Four distinguished Senators who served on that committee are still Members of the Senate—Senators CAPPER, MCNARY, ROBINSON, and HARRISON. The report investigated production, prices, consumption, foreign markets, and so forth, from 1880 up to the time it was issued. One of the features of that report was its statement that the per capita domestic consumption of wheat and wheat products, beef and beef products, mutton and dairy products, all decreased during periods of industrial depression when the average family had to economize on their food bill, but that during the same periods the per capita consumption of pork and pork products did not decrease because, said the report, "pork is essentially a poor man's food", while "consumption of beef in this country bears a very close relation to urban employment and with the progress of the period of business depression and consequent unemployment, consumption of beef and beef products diminished."

The result is that the working classes are being compelled to forego even pork products as a direct result of the agricultural policies of the Roosevelt administration.

The Philadelphia Record, a Democratic paper whose editor is a personal friend of President Roosevelt, in commenting upon this situation said:

The Wallace way of raising prices, by creating an artificial shortage, benefits no one—not even the farmer. When food prices rise without wages rising the consumer can buy less food for his money. Consequently a new shortage is created and new crop limitation is required.

That is exactly the way the administration's agricultural policy is working out. It is destroying the legitimate and natural domestic market for farm products. It is compelling millions of people to substitute cheaper grades of food of less value as nourishment. The experience following the World War proves that it will require years of hard work and persistent effort to restore the domestic demand for the food products which are now being abandoned for cheaper substitutes.

The Housewives League of America has issued a warning that the women of this country will rebel against any further increase in food prices. The president of that organization on March 8 issued a statement in which she said:

If prices continue to mount, there will be organized opposition. Women will rebel. We won't buy and we can't buy. We wouldn't mind higher prices if our husbands' incomes were boosted too. The problem is being discussed everywhere. It's the main topic of conversation in women's organizations. We blame it all onto the A. A. A. and the Government.

We have stretched our household budgets as much as we can. Now we are rearranging our menus, buying cheaper foods and substituting lowly vegetables, such as parsnips and carrots, for better grades. More fish is finding its way to the table. It's cheaper than meat. In addition, people are not eating as much.

Another wholly nonpartisan organization, the Methodist Federation for Social Service, in a report carried by the press associations March 11, stated that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration's program is not only contributing to the undernourishment of the American people but it is actually injuring the American farmer. The report says:

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration is aiding a minority of wealthy farmers, but agricultural workers in general are not making or getting a decent living. In many sections the prices of staple articles farmers produce have advanced to such an extent that due to decreased consumption they are in little, if any, better position than a year ago. The farming sections are keeping near to solvency only because they have learned to go without more and more in order to meet the unescapable obligations which, if unmet, would ruin them.

Another matter I have noticed of late in connection with this situation is various pieces of propaganda that have gone out to the country advising the people how much better off the farmers are at the present time. As a matter of fact, there has been some increase in the price of farm products, but in the final analysis of the condition of the farmer the real test is the amount he owes. If the things he buys have gone up in even larger proportions than the things he sells, his financial situation has not been materially improved.

Proof of this statement is furnished in the March issue of the monthly bulletin issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. That report contradicts the persistent propaganda which has been put out by the publicity machinery of this administration to the effect that the financial condition of the farmer is constantly improving under the new deal. To the contrary, the farmer is being pushed further and further in debt by the various new-deal agencies, due to the fact that under the new-deal policies he is less able than ever before to make both ends meet.

That report gives outstanding agricultural loans of lending agencies, both private and governmental. It shows loans made by life-insurance companies, member banks, Federal Reserve System, joint-stock land banks, regional agricultural credit corporations, and emergency crop-loan agencies have decreased between 1933 and January 1935 in the aggregate amount of $559,000,000, but that loans to farmers of other governmental agencies have increased in the amount of $884,900,000, giving a net increase under the new deal of agricultural debt of $325,900,000.

The report does not include loans made and outstanding as of March 10, 1935, of the Commodity Credit Corporation—a Delaware State corporation organized by officers of the Government and initially financed by the Government by authority of an Executive order of President Roosevelt. As of March 10, 1935, the Commodity Credit Corporation had outstanding loans to farmers in the sum of $264,831,850.

Moreover, under the former agricultural marketing acts, which set up a revolving fund which still operates, there were as of October 1934, $57,000,000 of new loans outstanding over and above those in existence at the close of 1933. There were also as of October 1934, $25,000,000 of new loans outstanding made by banks for cooperatives.

These sums show that under the new deal, during the last 2 years, the debt owed by farmers either upon their land, their livestock, or their commodities made through established lending agencies had increased in the sum of $698,731,850.

This figure takes no account of the indebtedness owed to individuals. Neither does it take any account of indebtedness owed the Farm Mortgage Corporation, because that Corporation has not increased the farmers' debt. It has merely transferred it from individuals or other lending agencies to the Farm Mortgage Corporation.

The whole purpose of the Agricultural Adjustment Act was to restore the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar to parity. The Department of Agriculture itself admitted it utterly failed of its purpose in a statement issued July 9, 1934, after the Agricultural Adjustment Act had been in full force and effect for 1 year. At that time the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar was anchored at exactly the same spot it was in May 1933, 13 months before when the Agricultural Adjustment Act was signed.

Then came the drought, which in a few weeks did what the A. A. A. had failed to do in 12 months. Farm prices increased as did the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar.

The administration claims it was not the drought but its program of crop, hog, and cattle reduction which is responsible for an increase in the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar, by reason of the fact that that program increased the price of farm products. But if the administration claims credit for the increase in the price of farm products, then it must accept the blame for an increase in food prices to the point where undernourishment and even hunger is being forced upon millions of those who are still struggling to keep off the public relief rolls. The degree of this increase in food prices is given in the last report of the Department of Commerce, which quotes prices as of February 15, 1935, and shows the percent of increase since February 1933. That report shows there has been an increase of 34.2 percent in the price of all foods, 34.7 percent in the price of cereals, 41.5 percent in the price of meats, 29.9 percent in the price of dairy products, 80 percent in the price of eggs, 24.4 percent in the price of fruits and vegetables, and 19 percent in the price of miscellaneous food products.

Not only has the A. A. A. program failed of its purpose to increase the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar but it has failed of its promise to have this done by voluntary cooperation upon the part of agricultural producers. There has been much ballyhoo recently regarding the result of the referendum on the corn-hog contract. The statements released by the Department of Agriculture announced that approximately 69 percent of all producers voting in the referendum favored the continuation of the program.

That statement was not candid. It did not give to the country an honest picture. While 69 percent of those who voted in the referendum did vote for a continuation of the contract, only 45 percent of those who had corn-hog contracts participated in the referendum, and only 32½ percent voted for the continuation of the program.

Even then the referendum was not honestly conducted in some places. In those instances letters were written by agents of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to those holding corn-hog contracts notifying them of the time and place the referendum was to be conducted in their localities, but containing this warning: "If you are against

controlled production do not attend any of the meetings scheduled." That was a bald attempt at outright intimidation of the corn-hog farmer, because the letter was sent by the very individual who had to pass upon the right of the corn-hog farmer to which it was written to participate in the benefits of the program.

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

Mr. SNELL. I yield, but for a question only.

Mr. TABER. But none of those who produced hogs who had not been favored with a contract by the A. A. A. were permitted to vote.

Mr. SNELL. I tried to make that clear. The gentleman's statement is correct.

In addition, the new deal further coerces the farmer into accepting its program by making it impossible for him to negotiate either crop, production, or feed loans from any Federal agency until and unless he has signed A. A. A. contracts and agreed to abide by the bureaucratic rulings emanating from Washington.

The new-deal program has failed in every respect insofar as the production of cotton is concerned. Voluntary cooperation has been openly abandoned for the Cotton Control Act, which forces the cotton planter to come in under its provisions or be classified as a criminal, subject to Federal prosecution.

In order to carry out the pretense that this Russianized system was popular in the Cotton Belt, the administration made the gesture of referring to a referendum of cotton growers the question as to whether or not the cotton-control program should be continued. But a few days before the referendum vote was taken, the President promised several hundred thousand small cotton planters who were to vote, exemption from the provisions of the act if it were continued in force. In other words, the referendum ballot box was stuffed even before the polls were opened.

Now, that does not leave the farmer very much latitude to exercise his own judgment. It is a definite order regimenting our farmers at the present time; and they cannot get away from it.

Summing it up, the agricultural program of this administration, after 2 years of uninterrupted operation, has resulted:

First. In a decline of 40 percent in the cotton export market, and a decline in the domestic consumption of cotton goods.

Second. A decline in general exports of agricultural products to the lowest point in 20 years, a point which is less than one-half the average for pre-war levels.

Third. A decline in the domestic per capita consumption of wheat and wheat products, beef and beef products, dairy products, and pork and pork products, due to the tremendous increase in prices of those products as a direct result of the destructive program of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

Fourth. An increase in imports of both cereals and meat products that are used for human food as well as forage for animals.

Fifth. An increase of practically $700,000,000 in the mortgage indebtedness of the American farmer.

Sixth. Hundreds of thousands of agricultural producers on public-relief rolls the object of charity.

Yet this program is called "planned economy."

What kind of "planning" is it which sacrifices the foreign markets of our agricultural producers and at the same time forces the importation of foodstuffs which could be raised here on the land which is being abandoned under the arbitrary legislation of the new deal?

What kind of "planning" is it which throws hundreds of thousands of small farmers and croppers onto the public highways, making tramps out of them, because they are not permitted to raise the foodstuffs and the agricultural commodities which are sorely needed by the millions of people living in our cities?

What kind of "planning" is it which pushes up the price of food to the American housewives to a point where they are compelled not only to reduce the amount of food which they buy, but buy cheaper substitutes?

What kind of "planning" is it which has forced the American farmer further and further in debt, to the point where in desperation he is supporting a program that calls for the outright repudiation of what he owes, as the only way in which he can hope ever again to get on his feet? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain tables I have prepared and a letter sent out by the Democratic National Committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, we have now progressed nearly through the fourth month of the legislative session and, while perhaps it was not in good taste on the first day of the session to recite all of the progress accomplished by the Democratic administration, we have now reached a point where, in view of the fact that our Democratic colleagues are attempting to explain some of their failures, but without success, it is time for us to take stock of the Nation and see just where we are at.

We are accused by our friends on the Democratic side of having leveled nothing but destructive criticism. Let me say to my Democratic friends that there can be no destructive criticism of the destructive policies of the Democratic administration.

Now let us see how we have progressed under the self-called new deal. They have imposed upon the country the N. R. A., which General Johnson, its lord and master for about a year, pronounced "dead as a dodo" a little while ago. The N. R. A. has stifled and destroyed the small business man. It made those who kept faith and lived up to their bargain the goats and destroyed them; it reduced the pay envelopes of the workers; it raised the price of merchandise to the consumer to such an extent that the consumer has been unable to buy and the channels of trade have been clogged.

They passed the A. A. A., a scheme to put a processing tax on the farmer for the goods he raises. Only in rare instances, such as where they have pegged the price of cotton by Government loans and where they have spent a lot of money and destroyed the brood sows of the country, have they been able to raise prices to the farmer. As a general rule the farmer has paid the processing tax. His price on wheat was reduced by the tax in 3 weeks from $1.25 a bushel to 95 cents—the exact amount of the tax—and it has never gone above that figure since for more than a day or two perhaps. By it they have destroyed our foreign market for cotton, wheat, and pork. They have driven millions of agricultural workers on relief.

America became a land of plenty and prosperity entirely because the people who came to this country were able to produce a lot of things and because the workers received good wages. Now with reduced wages the volume of trade has dropped off. I want to quote from last week's Department of Commerce bulletin. They say that business activity, according to the New York Times, in dollars was just the same as last year. Freight-car loadings were approximately the same, although they have been lower most of the year; steel production was lower; lumber production lower; cotton receipts lower; commercial failures higher; Federal Reserve bank member loans lower; steel-ingot production lower; and automobile production alone higher; and with all that situation to face, the price index had gone up, according to the Department of Labor combined index, from 73.3 percent to 77.2 percent—an increase of 3.9, or an increase in prices of 4 percent. Mr. Fisher's combined index indicated an increase in prices of 6.5 points, or 8 percent. This whole

picture indicates a decrease in the volume of business of a year ago of approximately 5 to 6 percent.

The Democratic Party calls itself a "party of progress." It is a party of progress, and here is the schedule of the way they have progressed in the last 25½ months:

First. They have throttled private business to the point where employment is at a low ebb. The number of unemployed has increased by at least 1,500,000.

Second. They have placed the Government in business in every possible way.

Third. They have looted the Public Treasury and obtained money from Congress for the purposes of using it for relief and have spent it for personal rackets in which the President himself and his friends were interested in promoting, upon factories, upon reclamation projects, and all sorts of things which would not provide employment and which should be paid for out of the regular appropriations of the Government or not spent at all.

Fourth. They have produced a continuously mounting relief roll. The number on relief has increased from 13,057,329 in May 1933 to 22,000,000 at the present time—almost double. They have increased the cost of relief per month from $100,000,000 in 1933 to upwards of $300,000,000 a month at the present time.

Fifth. They have piled up a public debt from $20,000,000,000 to a total of $48,000,000,000 when they have completed spending the funds which are now appropriated and the guaranties which are now authorized go into effect.

Sixth. They have taken off duties from those things which the farmer produces and which our factories manufacture and thereby they have destroyed values for the farmer and for the workingman in the factory.

Seventh. They have unbalanced the Federal Budget so that we are raising only about $3,000,000,000 where we are spending $8,500,000,000.

Eighth. They have increased the number on the Federal pay roll from 916,000 to approximately 1,800,000 today, and we see this morning that 100,000 more are coming to Washington, with no place to live.

That is the record of progress: providing jobs for the faithful. They have adopted a very fancy system of bookkeeping. I wish I had the ability, but I would hate to say I had the inclination, to work a thing like that out. In order to see how the farmer had progressed I asked the Department of Agriculture for a statement of the gross income on farm products and they wanted to give me the total farm income, including the A. A. A. so-called "benefits paid to farmers." And here they are:

Total farm income, including the A. A. A. payments:

1932	$5,331,000,000
1933	6,256,000,000
1934	7,163,000,000

Gross income from farm production, not including A. A. A. payments:

1932	$5,331,000,000
1933	5,994,000,000
1934	6,464,000,000

You will note that the increase attributed to the A. A. A. for 1933 was $262,000,000; that the increase for 1934 was $699,000,000; a total through December 31, 1934, of $961,000,000. Then, in order to check on the "high faluting" bookkeeping, I called the A. A. A. and found that they claimed the total benefits to farmers, including removal of surplus and rental and benefit payments, only ran $697,000,000. Where the other $263,000,000 came from you do not know, and I do not know, and they do not know, but this is progress. It will be noted that the increase in the income of the farmer for 1933 over 1932 was $663,000,000, or about 11 percent, but the increase in the price index ran more than 11 percent, so that the volume of stuff sold was much smaller. The increase from 1933 to 1934 in the gross farm income was $470,000,000, or about 8 percent, and the price of agricultural commodities was supposed to have advanced 15 percent, indicating a much smaller production.

You will note, also, that we have progressed in this way: While they have been plowing under cotton, corn, and wheat, and paying the farmers for not planting it, we had a drought come along and, instead of having our customary reserves, we were unable to meet the demands of the people and resorted to imports. Maybe this is progress, but it is progress away from recovery and not toward it.

The farmer, with his small increase in gross income, is not in as good a position as he was before, because the price of the things he has to buy has gone up so much more than the price of what he has to sell.

The Democrats are in this position: They have progressed remarkably well in preventing recovery. They have spent loads of money, but they have offered no constructive programs which would lead us out of the depression. No ray of hope has come from the Democratic Party. No ray of hope ever came from them, and none ever will. Their only object is to pass appropriations out of the Federal Treasury which will permit them to buy up the next election.

In 1933 they appropriated $3,300,000,000; in 1934 they appropriated $1,426,000,000, and this was supposed to be used for relief, but it was used last fall by allotments to buy up the election of a Democratic Congress. This year they have appropriated $4,880,000,000, ostensibly for work relief, but really for the purpose of buying up the 1936 election.

The Democratic Party put itself forward as a party of the people, supposed to represent them. When it came into office it followed the lowest practices of any political pirates in the history of the country. They pretended that those who participated in political activities could not remain on the Federal pay roll. And still we have General Farley at the head of the Democratic National Committee after the little fellow has been forced to quit. But that was nothing but a little bit of publicity to save the face of the President himself, because the Democratic National Committee, in violation of what I supposed the law to be in most States, against solicitation of funds from officials, and against what I know the law to be on the Federal statute books, that no Government official shall solicit a subscription for political purposes from another Government official. When General Farley was Postmaster General, on stationery bearing his name, the Democratic National Committee caused to be sent out to those who were working for Government corporations this letter which I have here, and which I am going to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, advising the recipient that they must "necessarily look to the beneficiaries of the Democratic Party to assist in financing its activities." While the letter was not signed by General Farley, his name was used on the letterhead for that purpose and in the body of the letter in such a way as to make it perfectly apparent that there could be no doubt that he approved and countenanced this solicitation, which was clearly in violation of the law. Has any Democratic district attorney, or any other district attorney, prosecuted Mr. Farley for this action? No; because the Democratic Party has practiced this sort of thing, and probably always will. It is bred in their bones. Only the rawest and dirtiest kind of politics seem to appeal to the operatives of that crowd.

This is a copy of the letter:

[Democratic National Committee, National Press Club Building, Washington, D. C.; James A. Farley, chairman; Emil Hurja, assistant]

23 CHURCH STREET,
New Haven, Conn.

DEAR FRIEND: This is to advise that I have been appointed a member of the finance committee of the Democratic National Committee, and as such it is my duty to solicit funds in support of the committee.

The headquarters of the committee in both New York and Washington, as you must realize, are maintained at great expense, and we must necessarily look to the beneficiaries of the Democratic Party to assist in financing it's activities. Therefore I hope to receive your check for whatever amount you care to contribute for the maintenance and operation of these headquarters, the affairs of which have been so efficiently and capably administered by National Chairman James A. Farley and his able assistant, Mr. Emil Hurja.

Please make checks payable to James W. Gerard, treasurer, and send to the writer at the above address.

Thanking you for any assistance you may care to render in this connection, I am, with kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK J. GOODE.

This is my program to bring back recovery:

First. Stop wild expenditures which unbalance the Budget.

Second. Stop tinkering with the protective tariff and letting in foreign merchandise to close down our factories and farms.

Third. Abolish the N. R. A. and the A. A. A. and restore the liberty of the American people and their opportunity to work. In the days when we followed sound principles the workingman received better wages than he receives now and the farmer received better prices for his products than he receives now.

Fourth. Return to sound economic principles and get things back to the point where we are producing more goods and the people consuming more goods. We must increase the volume of goods if you are going to increase the wealth of the people.

I hope that the people of this country will wake up to the progress which we actually have made toward the destruction of American agriculture and the destruction of American business and the complete bankruptcy of the American people, both financial and moral, which the Democratic Party has been trying to bring about.

Only by the elimination of the Roosevelt administration from power can we return to sound principles, American liberty, and prosperity. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, as a preface to my remarks I desire to add my commendation of and congratulations to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARY], chairman of the committee conducting the hearings on this bill, and the able helpers he had on his subcommittee, for the efficient work they have performed. They deserve the thanks of this Congress, and the thanks of the people of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to go from the sublime to the ridiculous, but to show you it is necessary that the Congress be alert at all times in watching things that go on in the District of Columbia, I call attention to an excerpt from the Washington Post of last Sunday. It has a big headline reading, "District may have corps of admirals for its navy."

I quote from the article:

E. Barrett Prettyman, corporation counsel, has informed the District Commissioners they may appoint a corps of admirals for the District's navy. Accordingly admirals soon may become as plentiful in the District as colonels in Kentucky.

Prettyman's study was made on request of George E. Allen, District Commissioner. The Commissioner said:

"Kentucky has its colonels, and other places have honorary offices."

Prettyman answered: "The term 'admiral' is a title—not a job. Its use has been largely preempted by nations having battleships, cruisers, and submarines, but this preemption is a custom, not a law. In my opinion, an admiral need not necessarily have a navy, nor even a rowboat. But why worry about this, anyway, because it is a fact that the District of Columbia has its navy. Every sovereign citizen of this District feels great pride in Washington's fleet."

From the Post last Sunday we learn that this ridiculous proposal has gone so far that they had an engraved die made of the commission that the District Commissioners were going to issue to the admirals of the District of Columbia navy. The Post reproduced this engraved commission last Sunday. It reads as follows:

In the name and by the authority of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia (seal of District of Columbia):

To all who shall see these presents, greeting:

Know ye, that Herbert G. Shrimp, having been duly appointed aide on the Commissioners' staff, with the rank of admiral in the navy of the District of Columbia, such appointment to date from the 22d day of January 1935, we hereby invest him with the full power and authority to execute and discharge the duties of the said office; and to have and to hold the same, with all the rights thereunto legally appertaining, for and during the pleasure of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

In testimony whereof we have caused these letters to be made patent and the seal of the District of Columbia to be hereunto affixed. Done at Washington the 22d day of January, A. D. 1935, and in the fifty-seventh year of the District of Columbia.

Then there are places for the signatures of the three Commissioners of the District of Columbia, with the imprint of the seal of the District of Columbia and a line for the secretary to sign.

Then it is stated at the bottom:

Admirals of the District's navy, consisting of a fire boat, police launch, rowboats, etc., will get a commission like this, all properly filled out.

Mr. Chairman, I wrote to the Commissioners calling their attention to this foolish propaganda going out to the country in this crucial hour of the Government's history. I wanted to know if anything like that was going to be put through, because if it were it was about time for Congress to stop it. I got a letter, I am glad to say, from the president of the District Commissioners reading as follows:

COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, April 23, 1935.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BLANTON: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of April 21, 1935, in regard to the commissioning of admirals in the government of the District of Columbia.

The Commissioners appreciate your frank statement and interest in this matter, and assure you that they have no intention of commissioning admirals in the District of Columbia.

Thanking you for your letter.

Very truly yours,

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.
M. C. HAZEN, *President.*

There ought not to be any such silly foolishness as that going out to the readers of this paper, which brings not only the Commissioners of the District into disrepute but reflects upon the Congress of the United States, which has the sole power and authority under the Constitution to control legislative matters in the District.

Of course, the Washington Post is unreliable and unauthentic. You cannot believe much you see in that paper. [Applause.] Did you notice these pictures in the first early edition of this morning's Post? Here is a facsimile picture of His Excellency Demetrios L. Sicilianos, the new Minister from Greece to the United States, but under it there is this statement: "This is the first picture of Gen. Hermann Goering, Nazi leader, and his wife the former Emmy Sonnemann, on their honeymoon in Germany." There is no wife there and there is no Gen. Hermann Goering, Nazi leader, shown. It is all balled up. I wonder how the parties interested liked it.

Elsewhere in the early first edition of this same unreliable, unauthentic, and misleading Washington Post, this morning on another page they carried a facsimile picture of General Goering, the Nazi leader and his wife, with the false heading "New Greek Minister Arrives", and underneath the picture it carried this misinformation:

His Excellency, Demetrios L. Sicilianos, the new Minister from Greece to the United States, is shown on his arrival on the *Europa* in New York, where he was met by Greek officials from New York and Washington.

Of course, they had to correct all of the above errors in a later edition of this morning's Washington Post. I wonder how long the Washington people are going to stand for such unreliable, misleading information.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say one more thing in conclusion. I notice our good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], is going to speak, and I am glad he is to follow me, because I want him to explain one thing. He has in what he calls his "death house" my bill to stop all immigration for 10 years. If we could get that bill up here for consideration, we could amend it, providing for a registration of the unlawful aliens in this country and for sending all of them back to the countries where they belong, and with that done we could find in America a job for every single American not employed. I want to appeal to the gentleman, who holds that great means of bringing relief to the unemployed in his hands as Chairman of this great Immigration Committee, when he is all powerful on the subject, to rescind the action that he took one day before I was going to file a

petition to discharge his committee and bring the bill on the floor for consideration, at which time he hurriedly called his committee together and tabled my bill. But he did not stop my petition. I appeal to him to rescind his action, and report and pass that bill, and help us to protect American jobs for Americans.

On February 21, 1935, I placed on the Clerk's desk here a petition to discharge his committee from further consideration of that bill. Such petition needs the signatures of 218 of you colleagues. Some have signed it, but most of you have not. If 218 of you will sign that petition, we can get this bill up and pass it, and then recover enough American jobs from foreigners to give a job to every unemployed American in the United States.

When we go home after adjournment do not tell your constituents that you are in favor of stopping immigration when you have not signed that petition. Because they will ask you why you did not sign it. Every Member here who is sincerely in favor of stopping immigration will sign that petition, because otherwise there will be no chance whatever to pass a measure in this Congress to stop it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I have obtained permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein certain excerpts, so as to enable me to reply to the speech and extension of his remarks about me made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

All of my colleagues in this House, who are old-timers and have served here since the war Congress, know that in every session through my entire service I have made a determined, uncompromising fight to pass legislation that would stop all immigration from foreign countries to the United States, and which would deport from the United States the millions of aliens who are here unlawfully.

It has been absolutely impossible for any of us to get such a bill approved and reported to the House by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. All of such bills are put in what he calls "his death house" by the chairman of said committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

He says that on February 18, 1935, I kept him from passing his bill, H. R. 3472, which he calls his "repatriation bill." He is correct. I did stop him. And I stopped him because it was a bill to benefit aliens, and not the people of the United States, who want unlawful aliens deported, and who want to stop immigration.

He says that I stopped him again on March 4, 1935, and kept him from passing this measure. He is correct. I helped to stop him. But I had help. Let me quote from the RECORD of March 4, 1935, page 2901, the following showing exactly what occurred, to wit:

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill H. R. 3472, to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask a question of the lady from New York. This is the Dickstein bill?

Mrs. O'DAY. One of them.

Mr. BLANTON. Under the present law the right is limited to 3 years? Those 3 years have expired. This bill proposes to remove all limitation. I cannot agree that such a proposal would be sound legislation. Instead of increasing the rights and privileges of aliens, I am in favor of stopping all of them from coming here for at least 10 years. It is true, is it not, that under the present law they are limited to 3 years?

Mrs. O'DAY. I think that is so.

Mr. BLANTON. Is not that so? I ask the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. It is limited to 3 years?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The way the bill was first introduced was to extend that time to 5 years.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That was a year ago.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the committee struck out 5 years and left no limitation at all, and they could have been here for 40 or 50 years and still be sent back and have their way paid by the United States. Such a bill ought not to pass this House. It establishes a bad precedent. I objected to it before. It will take three objections now to stop it, and I hope we will get the other two. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CARTER. I object.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

I learned about the unsalutary features and unsoundness of the above bill from my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. DIES], who is one of the best-posted men in this Congress on immigration, and the necessity of getting these millions of aliens deported out of the United States.

Then the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] said that he tried to pass his other bill "to repatriate 30,000 Filipinos" and that I stopped him on February 18, 1935, and also on March 4, 1935. I did stop him on March 18, 1935, because it was a bad bill, because I had a reliable estimate that it would cost $900,000, and would accomplish no good, but merely furnish an excursion trip home on our people's money out of the Treasury, and cause twice that many more to come over here. And I did help to stop it again and to finally kill it on March 4, 1935. Let me quote from the RECORD for that date as to what happened:

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve the right to object. This is a bill that will force the United States, if it is passed, to pay the expenses back home of 30,000 Filipinos who have gotten homesick and want to spend the summer holidays in the Philippine Islands, and there will be 60,000 more of them come back here, and this bill sets a bad precedent and ought to be killed.

This bill will cost the United States Government a tremendous sum of money to start with, and it will set a precedent the end of which will not be seen for the next 50 or 60 years. It is a bad bill and ought not to pass. I objected to it before, and it will now take three objectors and I hope we will get them. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], from this floor on February 19, 1935, admitted that he not only put my bill to stop all immigration in his "death house" but that it was his vote in the committee that killed the Dies bill, and kept it from being reported and passed. I quote the following excerpts from the debate that day:

Mr. DIES. That was on a bill introduced by myself, which provided for a reduction in quota to 60 percent and undertook to do what the gentleman from New York always said he wanted to do.

Mr. BLANTON. And his vote killed it?

Mr. DIES. That is true.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. May I say that there was a bill introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE]. There was also a bill introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. These two bills were considered together. They were H. R. 4114 and H. R. 8222.

* * * * * * *

The two bills were beaten by 1 vote in committee, and I was simply carrying out a message from the American people.

Mr. DIES. I think the gentleman will agree that there are a number of aliens in this country illegally who ought to be out of the country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DIES. I think our committee has found that to be a fact time and time again.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is no question about the gentleman's statement.

Mr. DIES. Is the gentleman in favor of excluding all new seed immigration if we reunite families?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am in favor of reuniting families.

And here is what Chairman DICKSTEIN that day said about putting in his "death house" my bill to stop all immigration:

There were a number of bills before the committee, and we unanimously agreed to put all the other bills in the "deadhouse", if that is the proper term, and take up House bill 4114, which was the Dies bill, dealing with all the questions.

And then, after putting in his "death house" all of the numerous bills pending before his committee to restrict and stop immigration, except the Dies bill, then Chairman DICKSTEIN by his vote broke a tie and killed the Dies bill and kept it from being reported.

Then Chairman DICKSTEIN in said debate admitted that he had been so zealous in "reuniting families", that in his district, full of foreigners, there is not a family in his district that has a relative on the other side. He has been

able to bring all of their relatives here from foreign countries. Here is what he said:

Mr. DIES. Except I do not think the gentleman is bona fide in favor of restriction, and I do not blame him; he represents a district where 80 percent are opposed to it. We might as well be frank about it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Suppose I told the gentleman that there is not a family in my district that has a relative on the other side.

To which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] replied:

Mr. DIES. The gentleman always votes against anything in favor of restriction.

No Member of this House knows better the attitude of Chairman DICKSTEIN on restricting immigration than does my colleage [Mr. DIES], as they served on the committee together for a long time, and only recently has Mr. DIES been promoted to a position on the powerful Rules Committee of this House. And in that debate on February 19, 1935, the following is what Mr. DIES had to say about Chairman DICKSTEIN not offering to exclude aliens, to wit:

Mr. DIES. Yes; there are 3,500,000 illegally in the country, but the gentleman is not offering to exclude them; he is not in favor of that; he is in favor of their becoming American citizens regardless of how they came into the country.

Let me again repeat what I said in this House on March 13, 1935. We must deport these 3,500,000 aliens who are here unlawfully. And we must stop all immigration from coming here.

And just as Bruno Hauptmann did, these 3,500,000 aliens now in the United States unlawfully, violated our laws when they came across our borders, and are continuing to violate our laws by staying here unlawfully, for they are here illegally, and every one of them either has a job, taken away from some American, or else is on the relief rolls, taking relief that should go to the hungry wives and little children of American citizens.

And in addition to the 3,500,000 aliens here illegally—and in fact there are many more than that number here—there are about 6,500,000 aliens in the United States who came here lawfully but who have not thought enough of the United States to take out their citizenship papers. And all of them either hold jobs, taken away from Americans, or else they are on our relief rolls being fed and warmed and housed and clothed by this Government, when there is not another country in the world that will do such things for aliens or allow them such privileges.

We must take steps at once to require all aliens to register, and we should immediately deport every alien here unlawfully, and we should deport all aliens who have been lawfully in the United States as long as 3 years who have not become naturalized citizens. If they are not willing to fight for our flag they should not be allowed to stay here.

This is America, not Russia. This is America, not Greece. This is America, not Italy. This is America, not Germany. This is America, not Hungary. This is America, not Czechoslovakia. This is America, not Poland. This is America, not Mexico. Yet you would not think so if you visited certain parts of our big cities, where aliens from these foreign countries speak here in their native tongues, read daily newspapers published in their native languages, maintain the customs and cook their foods as they did in their home countries.

Let me again quote what Mr. Theodore Andrica, Cleveland reporter, who in his Around the World in Cleveland, not long ago said:

CLEVELAND SECOND IN UNITED STATES IN NUMBER OF ITS FOREIGN-LANGUAGE PUBLICATIONS—53 MONTHLIES, WEEKLIES, AND DAILIES REPRESENT 13 NATIONALITIES

In no other American city except New York are there more foreign-language publications printed and edited than in Cleveland.

To be exact, 53 foreign publications have their editorial and printing offices in Cleveland. Of these, 12 are dailies, 23 are weeklies, and 18 are monthlies.

Thirteen language groups are represented by these publications, namely: Czech, German, Hebrew, Hungarian, Italian, Lithuanian, Polish, Rumanian, Russian, Saxon, Serbian, Slovak, and Slovene.

Seven nationality groups have dailies here—the Bohemians, Germans, Hebrews, Hungarians, Italians, Poles, and Slovenes.

REACH ABOUT 150,000 DAILY

According to the publishers' sworn statements to the United States Post Office the total circulation of all the foreign-language dailies printed in Cleveland is between 100,000 and 150,000 daily.

The average size of a foreign-language paper is 6 pages. On special occasions the edition contains as high as 40 pages. In most cases the publications are official organs of fraternal or religious organizations.

Of the 18 monthlies, 10 are of religious character. Of the 23 weeklies, 4 are religious and two-thirds of the others are organs of some fraternal groups.

The dailies print, besides current world news, much news of old country affairs or of world events with special bearing on their particular nationality.

Most of the dailies take a definite stand on old-country politics. The Socialists have 1 weekly, the Communists have 1 daily and 1 weekly, and the I. W. W. Party has 1 weekly and 1 monthly.

Is it not ridiculous to talk about deporting Communists when we allow Communists to publish daily Communist newspapers?

If aliens want to read here their daily newspaper published in foreign languages, they ought to go back to their own country and not steal jobs from Americans.

Now, I have a bill pending to stop all immigration for 10 years. That will give us a chance to assimilate the lawful aliens we already have in this country, millions of them, before we take on new ones. Are you in favor of that? If you are not in favor of it, of course, you will let things rock along, and if you are in favor of it, you will go up to the desk and sign a petition which I have placed there to take this bill away from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and take it up on the floor of this House and pass it. [Applause.]

We will not ever pass it in any other way. Chairman DICKSTEIN would not let us. He put my bill in his "deadhouse" in the last Congress, and he has tried to do it again in this Congress.

It is under one of Chairman DICKSTEIN's bills that Commissioner of Immigration MacCormack has allowed some of the most noted Communists in the world to come here and stay here, and has refused to deport them. Let me again call your attention to some more of the facts I mentioned on February 19, 1935.

I want to get Mr. MacCormack's statement in the RECORD. Back in 1917 we deported two of the most noted anarchists in the world, who had been causing much trouble in this country. They were both deemed dangerous anarchists. It took us a long time and cost us a lot of money to deport them. One of them was named Emma Goldman and the other Alexander Berkman. We put them back in Russia, where they belonged.

In my friend's subcommittee, when they got after Mr. MacCormack about letting her come back, here is what he said:

I am frank to say that the Strachey admission was at my own instance. The first of those cases was, as I recollect it, that of Emma Goldman. She applied for permission to come to this country to speak on literature.

A noted anarchist, deported from the country because she was an anarchist and a dangerous anarchist, and deported back to Russia, wanted to come back here and speak on literature. What kind of literature do you suppose?

We were given definite assurances that she would speak on literature and keep off the political subjects, and particularly subjects dealing with anarchism. I took the position—and on that position urged her admission—that it was very much better, as long as she was not going to discuss subjects which are prohibited to an alien under our law, to let her in than to give her the publicity for her books and writings which would attend her exclusion; and after discussion in the Department, it was agreed that that be done.

Emma Goldman had been a great figure, and so we let her into the United States.

She was a wild-eyed anarchist, but when she came into the United States we permitted her to move around freely. We held her down to a gentleman's agreement that we had with her, and with the people who were sponsoring her stay, that she was merely a nice old lady who was traveling around the country telling her past experiences.

There was a case of Tom Mann, a British Communist labor leader. He applied for admission into the United States to address a conference on peace—specifically on that—a "conference against war", or something like that, it was called. I looked over the

group of organizations participating in this peace conference, and I saw the usual group of labor organizations, parlor Socialists, and many serious organizations, all concerned in this conference. I inquired whether Tom Mann was going to talk communism or discuss anything that would be received with displeasure in this country. They said, "No; he was going to talk on peace." And again I urged that he be permitted to come in.

We had before our subcommittee a very distinguished military man from California, Adjutant General Howard. I read from the printed report of the hearings, beginning at page 435. General Howard is testifying and telling about a strike called out in California and about the trouble it put them to. He said, and I am quoting from the hearings on this bill:

We immediately sent out a call and assembled about 5,000 of our troops on the San Francisco front and across the bay at Oakland and Berkeley.

The malcontents tied up the entire outside country so no food could be brought in and no gasoline for the trucks. We had out there a condition of absolute revolution for a period of 3 days.

At the same time, at Los Angeles, we had a similar strike and some longshoremen went out.

It was necessary, in making our demonstration in San Francisco, for us to pull the troops out of Los Angeles and take them to the northern city, which left the city of Los Angeles, a territory with well over 2,000,000 people, absolutely destitute of protection.

Of course, the city and county of Los Angeles wanted us to replace those troops, or get them back there.

The police department immediately added 1,200 policemen to their force. But you can imagine what 1,200 policemen would be able to do in a serious situation. That is about the size of a regiment of infantry.

They took charge of the situation insofar as that particular strike in that part of the State was concerned. But we were utterly helpless to go down there to help them.

We would have had to resort to the drafting of men. We would have had to resort to calling for volunteers and trying to get arms and ammunition, but, of course, they had no uniforms, to try to save the State of California, as we were really in a situation of revolution.

I think the question of national defense should be given consideration as a national proposition, and I should like to say something about our position as the frontier of the Nation on the west coast, in the case of any trouble with a foreign country.

Mr. BLANTON. Before you leave that subject, let me ask you this question: How many men were there who caused that trouble—that revolutionary condition? Approximately how many union men were there?

General HOWARD. In the neighborhood of 1,300.

Mr. BLANTON. Then 1,300 union men put California and the country to all that trouble and expense?

General HOWARD. Yes; there were only a very small number of actual agitators originally; less than 300, I should say.

Mr. BLANTON. That is a situation, in my judgment, that is ruining and menacing the whole world.

Mr. BOLTON. What has been done with those men?

General HOWARD. The ringleader, who went around in San Francisco with a bodyguard of 14 men, is now the president of the union. He is a citizen of Australia, and we have never been able to topple him from his high perch. He still controls things out there.

Mr. BOLTON. Has the Department of Labor taken any steps in reference to that matter?

General HOWARD. No, sir; we inquired during the trouble of the Department of Labor and the Secret Service as to what could be done with this man, because I wanted to pick him up. I was told it would be better to let him alone, because the Federal authorities were trying to get something on him.

Mr. SNYDER. You said he was the president of the union; what union is that?

General HOWARD. The Longshoremen's International Union.

I would say that at least 60 or 70 percent of the people who actually caused this trouble were not American citizens.

And concerning the bill which Chairman DICKSTEIN has been trying to get us to let him pass, the following is what Commissioner MacCormack says:

We have stayed deportation in approximately 1,200 cases of persons of good character who would be the beneficiaries of the legislation if enacted.

I now want to quote an excerpt from the splendid statement made by my able colleague from Texas [Mr. DIES] at the time he introduced his present bill, H. R. 5921, which contains the same provisions that were in his bill H. R. 4114, which Chairman DICKSTEIN killed in the last Congress by his deciding vote, to wit:

Mr. DIES. I have just introduced a bill that will not only end the organized and even subversive propaganda called attention to by the Dickstein Nazi committee, but will strengthen existing deportation statutes as urged by the Department of Labor, deport gangsters and racketeers convicted of possessing machine guns, permanently exclude aliens convicted of crime and lawbreaking, require eligible aliens to become citizens or depart, further restrict immigration by reducing the existing quotas 60 percent, and applying them to countries of this hemisphere, take care of law-abiding aged parents and near relatives of foreign born in this country by reserving the quotas for them, and deport aliens engaged in smuggling and bootlegging aliens into this country.

Last year's immigration statistics show an increase of 50 percent in quota immigration—that is, new seed immigrants—an 8-percent increase in total aliens admitted, and a 60-percent decrease in alien deportations. During the last 10 years of quota restriction over three and a half million aliens have entered the United States, and our last census revealed the largest number of foreign born, over 14,000,000; the largest foreign-stock population, over 40,000,000; and the most aliens, nearly 7,000,000, in our history. While the alien departures reported by the steamships and railroads do exceed the alien arrivals counted by our immigrant inspectors, our alien population has continued to increase by surreptitious entries and by the atrocious, alien deserting seamen hole in our existing legislation that my bill would plug up.

The bill I have just introduced would also deport alien Communists by making any alien deportable who is a member of communistic organizations. Most of the leaders of indefensible strikes like the recent general strike on the Pacific coast are aliens with "red" records, and of such we have quite enough of our own naturalized and even native born without importing any more or permitting them to operate in this country, just as we have enough unemployed and dependents without importing any more or permitting aliens to swell their ranks. Each country should care for its own dependents, delinquents, defectives, and unemployed. Charity should begin at home, just as employment should.

The deportations in 1931 were 18,142. In 1932 they were 19,422. In 1933 the deportations were 19,865. But since our good friend from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] has been passing his amendments, the deportations last year were only 8,879.

If I were Chairman of the Immigration Committee, I would get reported promptly and would pass here in this House a bill to stop all immigration for 10 years, and a bill to deport every Communist, and a bill to deport the several million aliens who are now in the United States unlawfully, like Bruno Hauptmann, and a bill to deport several more aliens who are here lawfully, but who do not think enough of our flag to fight for it, when called on, or to take out citizenship papers and become Americans. And I would pass a bill to stop the publication of Communist newspapers in New York and Cleveland and everywhere else in the United States.

I hope sincerely that every Member of this House who wants to save American jobs for Americans, and who wants to take such American jobs away from foreigners and give them back to Americans, would sign the petition which I have on the Clerk's desk, to discharge Chairman DICKSTEIN'S committee from further consideration of my bill, and then we can get it on this floor, as soon as 218 Members sign that petition, and pass it. And then we will preserve American jobs for Americans.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] anticipated I was going to talk on immigration, so he thought he would get a march on me by talking about immigration himself. It so happens that I did not rise today to talk about immigration. I rose for something entirely different. Since the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has discussed the question of immigration and his bill, may I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the Committee on Immigration tried to bring about repatriation of over 100,000 aliens? I caused this bill to put on the Consent Calendar of the House and my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] objected to consideration by the House on February 18, 1935, and he again objected on March 4, 1935, and so this House has been prevented from voting on this bill. My friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] will not let the Members of this House even consider this meritorious bill.

I think it is significant that just recently a former Federal officer, Edward Corsi, formerly immigration commissioner at New York, has publicly testified in a hearing in New York to the effect that there are over 32,000 alien families in New York City alone receiving public relief, and he estimates—notice I say he estimates—that about a million and a half aliens are on Government relief rolls throughout the United States.

But the most significant statement by Mr. Corsi during his examination was that he advocated the policy that it would be better for the Federal Government to use relief money to send these indigent aliens back home instead of supporting them here in the United States. He said many of them would be glad to go back home, and he estimated it would cost about $90 for each alien who wants to go.

This is the purpose back of H. R. 3472, which my friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] objects to this House considering on its merits.

Mr. BLANTON. And I do not believe the House will ever pass it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I refuse to yield, Mr. Chairman.

I brought up another bill to repatriate 30,000 Filipinos and send them back to the Philippine Islands. They could not come back here because they would have to file a pauper's oath. I brought that bill before the House on the Consent Calendar and my good friend [Mr. BLANTON] objected to that on February 18, 1935, and March 4, 1935.

Every bill as reported from the Immigration and Naturalization Committee and put on the Consent Calendar has been objected to by a troop of objectors, who set themselves up as dictators of this House and prevent the enactment of legislation much needed now.

Mr. BLANTON. Since the gentleman has mentioned my name, will he not kindly yield? He mentioned me in a derogatory way.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I did not intend to do that. I am simply stating facts and calling attention to the effects on legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman said I killed two much-needed bills, when the bills I killed were bad ones.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not want to yield just now.

Mr. BLANTON. Please be fair enough to yield for a proper correction.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If I have the time I shall yield later.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If I have the time I will yield later.

Mr. BLANTON. Then please do not mention me in connection with certain bills without yielding to me to correct erroneous statements.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want to repeat to this House that several weeks ago the Committee on Immigration unanimously reported out a bill to repatriate aliens who are stranded in the United States, who are willing to return to their native lands, who are on relief rolls, and one month and a half relief to these aliens would take them back to their homes and keep them there, but consideration of this bill was objected to on the Consent Calendar day by my good friend, Mr. BLANTON, who talks so much about making jobs for American citizens by keeping out aliens. Why does he not permit this House to vote upon this bill which would get rid of some of the aliens who are here and are willing to go home?

Mr. BLANTON. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield for one short question.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask my friend if it is not a fact that we killed those bills dead as hell because they needed it?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not understand your language at all.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, that is pretty plain but understandable language—"killed them dead as hell"—because they would not do what we wanted done about immigration.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak about certain matters that were mentioned on the floor of this House yesterday afternoon. I hope some day in the very near future BLANTON and I will have another opportunity to match wits on the question of immigration. I want to say this, however, with respect to restrictions upon immigration matters, at least, I want honest restrictions. I do not want professional restrictions so as to go out on election day and say that I have kept this alien out or that alien out. I am willing to have restriction, yes; but let us do it in a sensible way. Let us not deprive people of some of their rights to have families together in their homes on American soil.

On yesterday before this House the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], who is rather on the Blanton side, made this statement:

> I thought it was the unusual prerogative of my good friend from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] to defend the United States against communism, but I see the Navy Department is competing with the activities of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

In other words, the gentleman from New York says that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization is in competition with the Navy to rid this country of communism. Well, I am happy to say that he has put me in good company.

Then he talks about the fact that we have six gunboats out in China and that the admirals of the Navy are trying to prevent communism in China. But he fails to emphasize that the quotation he read, referred to protection for Americans in China against the use of force and violence upon them by Chinese Communists. Does he disapprove?

I want to say to the gentleman from New York that I am not interested in communism in China or Japan. I am interested in preventing the spread of communism within the United States when it seeks to overthrow our Government by force and violence.

I do not know whether or not the gentleman intended to appear to criticize me because I have taken the position, both in the committee and on the floor of this House, that it is our duty as Members of Congress to do everything possible to prevent the spread of communism within the United States. But I may say to him that while I am a Member of this House I shall do everything in my power to prevent the spread of this un-American doctrine.

In their own booklets we can find that the Communists hold out as a part of their program in the United States this strange proposal—I quote from one of their own books:

> The revolutionary workers' and farmers' government—an alliance of the working class with the other toiling sections of the population—will establish a real democracy for the overwhelming majority of the toilers and a stern dictatorship against the capitalists and their agents. It will confiscate the banks, the factories, the railroads, the mines, and the farms, and the big corporations.

This quotation is taken from a Communist booklet which indicates the contents are the manifesto and principle resolutions adopted by the eighth convention of the Communist Party of America.

Our Committee on Immigration and Naturalization reported another bill to this House and the purpose of that bill was to assist the Department of Labor to get rid of people who come here for the purpose of spreading propaganda about communism, nazi-ism, fascism, and other isms, which may work in foreign countries but will not be tolerated in this country, which for over 150 years has prospered under democratic principles of government of our own formation.

But the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] was instrumental in preventing this House from considering that bill on its merits on March 4, 1935, and again on April 1, 1935. That bill is known as "H. R. 5839."

Let me call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] that a special committee of this House, appointed by the Speaker—the late Mr. Rainey, of Illinois—spent considerable time investigating these subversive activities in our midst and that committee recommended to this House, among other measures, as follows—I quote that committee's report:

> That Congress should enact a statute conferring upon the Secretary of Labor authority to shorten or terminate the stay in this country of any visitor admitted here under temporary

visa, whenever in the judgment of the Secretary such visitor shall engage in the promotion or dissemination of propaganda or engage in political activity in the United States.

I cannot for the life of me understand why anyone should want to prevent this House considering a measure designed to carry out that recommendation.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] yesterday made certain charges against Mr. Hearst. I have heard a number of charges against Mr. Hearst because he has printed in his newspapers a certain attack upon certain teachers in our public schools, and this gentleman yesterday said that he more or less defied anybody to protect Mr. Hearst. I am not here to protect Mr. Hearst, but I am here to say this for Mr. Hearst: His newspapers to a great extent were instrumental in exposing the infiltration of, and teaching of, communism within certain schools of higher education in the United States, and for his patriotism in this particular publicity he is to be commended rather than being subjected to criticism.

My good friend then went on to state that he has no Communists in Wisconsin and, quoting his own language, he states:

Stop these glaring inequalities and communism would wither and die. Continue them and no man can foretell the consequences. Out in my country we do not know what a communist is and we care less. We have no interest in communism. We do not need it at all. If you talk to a farmer out in the Mississippi Valley about communism he would laugh at you. Why? Because he has never had any contact with it; because he has more pressing problems; because he is interested in getting the cost of production for what he raises.

Well, that is just the trouble, my friends, because he has apparently come to believe that his constituents have no communism in Wisconsin, that does not mean we have not communism in Boston or in New York or in New Jersey or down East. I would like for some of these gentlemen who never saw a Communist to have a chance to look at them and see some of the activities they conduct in the East. Let them look at some of the soap-box platforms and listen to some of the speeches they make. I say more power to Hearst if he is conducting a campaign to expose a lot of aliens and other persons whose efforts are subversive to our form of Government and who seek, through our institutions of higher education, to destroy our Government by force and violence. I say that we should at least give Mr. Hearst credit for conducting a campaign of patriotic purpose and intent.

I have not the time now, but under the grant to extend and revise my remarks I am going to give you a partial list of documentary testimony dealing with Communist schools. They have their own educational system in this country.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman include in that list a list of names furnished in the Red Network?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am just going to list some testimony given before the Committee on Un-American Activities as a result of information that committee received and some of it secured through the committee's own agents, bearing directly on certain activities in various schools. I do not charge all of the schools and I do not charge all of the teachers with being un-American.

However, let me point out to my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] that perhaps the pressing problems that he says are troubling the people of his State, in common with the people of many other States, may be conducive to, and fertile ground for, the propagandists and agitators of the Communists to get a foothold among his constituents before he is aware that the subtle influences are at work out there.

Some very significant facts are obtainable from the printed literature of the Communists. They are quite frank in some of their statements to their own members.

In his annual report and remarks at the last annual convention of the Communist Party of the United States, the executive secretary of that party, in part, says—

From the beginning of this movement, the Communist Party safeguarded itself against all the lying accusations of its enemies by having a large majority of non-Communist individuals in every controlling committee of the movement.

At another part of his report the executive secretary said in part:

Another auxiliary movement of growing importance that has appeared as a serious factor only in the last 2 years, is the revolutionary movement among students. * * * The movement began principally in the higher institutions of learning with predominantly middle-class composition. It has rapidly spread into the secondary schools and involved a large number of proletarian students in its activities. Led and organized by the National Students' League, this movement has established a base in hundreds of high schools, colleges, and universities; it has become national in scope; it has exerted a great and growing influence upon all intellectual circles. From the beginning it has been clearly revolutionary in its program and activities. * * * By organized participation in helping strike actions, defense movements, the Scottsboro case, etc., the students have been brought close to and participation in the general class struggles and taught them the practical meaning of working-class leadership.

And later in his statement to that convention, we find this statement, in part, as follows:

The broadest movement of mixed-class composition has been the American League Against War and Fascism. * * * The American League in its program proclaims that the working class is the basic force in the struggle against war; from the beginning it has never tried to avoid the issue of Communist Party participation in its broad, united front. It is our task to see that the American League, organizationally, gets that working-class foundation and active participation of the Communists for which its program provides.

Here, gentlemen, we have the official statements made, to the Communist Party in convention assembled, by the executive secretary of the party, all of which show how close the Communist movement is to all this agitation among the students and teachers in our schools, colleges, universities, high schools, and other institutions of education.

Here we have from their own official booklets the very broadest confirmation of all that Mr. Hearst has brought out in his newspaper articles. There certainly is reason to believe that a great part of what Mr. Hearst has said on this subject is based more on fact than on fiction.

While I do not want to say that I agree whole-heartedly in everything that appears editorially or otherwise in the papers under the control of Mr. Hearst, I do believe he is to be commended for his patriotic service in bringing this tragic situation so graphically before the American people in his effort to arouse all of us to the subtle seriousness of this communistic influence in our educational systems.

There are thousands and thousands of teachers and professors in our institutions of learning against whom no charge of Communism could be placed. These noble men and women need no defense on the floor of this House—their place is assured in their own communities and in their own schoolrooms. Their conscientious devotion to duty is honorable.

Many of these instructors and professors and teachers have affiliated themselves with organizations against which no just criticism can be placed. Others have united for legitimate purposes with the American Federation of Labor for mutual employment improvements, such as the American Federation of Teachers. This latter organization is highly regarded both by the American Federation of Labor and by the National Education Association and I join in expressing my regard for their Americanism.

However, the subtle influence of communistic propaganda reaches out to plant the alien Communist philosophy of government and economics within the ranks of otherwise upright and legitimate Nation-wide organizations.

President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, made the following significant statements on December 17, 1934, when he testified before the special House Committee on Un-American Activities. In part he then said:

This statement is based upon my experience in dealing with them in the American Federation of Labor movement. Communists and communistic philosophy thrive in America very largely because of a lack of understanding on the part of the public of the communistic philosophy. It is deceptive, insidious, and misleading, for as a rule the subsidiary organizations organized for the purpose of carrying on communistic propaganda in the labor movement, and among other groups conceal their real purpose. They base their activities upon something extraneous, something misleading, for the accomplishment of a single purpose—the advancement of the Communist philosophy. To be ac-

complished through the gradual acceptance of the plan they may outline, and to effect in the ultimate acceptance of the Communist philosophy."

At another part of his testimony, Mr. Green was asked as follows:

Mr. Green, you made the statement that they were boring into the American Federation of Labor. Apparently it is a situation, which as you say, requires your constant vigilance and is always a source of danger?

Mr. Green replied that—

it does require constant vigilance and they are annoying.

Continuing in the same thought, Mr. Green added, in part:

They attempt to influence the local union to espouse the closest approach to Communist philosophy that is possible, always keeping it within what they think is the opinion of the local union. They adopt resolutions. These, on their face, seem to be innocent and perhaps constructive. Then some of their periodicals will immediately make public the fact that local so-and-so of the American Federation of Labor adopted a resolution espousing this and espousing that which was a near approach to communism. That is their method of procedure.

Thus, may I call your attention to the fact that this Special Committee on Un-American Activities received testimony way back in last December which practically confirms most of what Mr. Hearst has published with regard to the subtle boring into the educational system of this country by those who are either Communists or persons who sponsor some or all of the basic communistic philosophy which advocates the ultimate use of force and violence for the overthrow of this United States Government, as well as all other organized Governments which do not accept the Communist theory of government and economics.

So you will see that even local groups of every legitimate organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, the National Education Association, and others which, like them, are adhering to the American principles of government and economics must be ever watchful of their own local members and how their local group contributes to or sponsors activities at home proposed to them by organizers and agents whose distant affiliations are not fully known, since perhaps a trap may be laid which may later convey to some persons erroneous impressions of the local group and may with reasonable interpretations erroneously imply wrong motives upon their national organization without any real foundation therefor.

The subtleness of the plans followed by some people engaged in this communistic propaganda in this country should be understood by more of our citizens so that proper safeguards may be made effective in our cities and communities.

I do not see why such a fuss was made yesterday because somebody wanted the teachers to take an oath of allegiance. I would not object to taking the oath of allegiance every day to the flag of my country. What is the trouble with the teachers taking it?

Mr. SCOTT. Why do you not make the doctors of the country take it?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, the gentleman is splitting hairs.

Mr. ENGEL. I will tell the gentleman why: Because the doctors do not teach young America.

Mr. FLETCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does the fact that a teacher refuses to take an oath of allegiance indicate any disloyalty on his part?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Certainly not. However, the more loyal a school teacher, a university professor, or college instructor is, the more willing he should be to take the suggested oath in his selfish interest to prevent any unjust criticism gaining headway against either himself or against the institution which pays him his salary. The loyal, faithful teacher will not resent taking an oath to support and safeguard American institutions—he or she lives such an oath, anyway, whether it is demanded or not.

I see a lot of fuss is being made in some quarters because some teachers have been asked to take an oath of allegiance as a prerequisite to the continued performance of teaching duties. I do not see why anyone should object to this proposal.

Now, I said something earlier about Communist schools. If you had seen some of the officials who appeared before our investigating committee, trying to explain what was taught in these Communist schools, you would have wondered how those schools were permitted to go on teaching their seditious principles.

I submit here a partial list of cities and places where these Communist schools carry on:

Los Angeles Workers School, Los Angeles, Calif.; San Francisco Workers School, San Francisco, Calif.; New York City Workers School, New York City; Boston Workers School, Boston, Mass.; Detroit Workers School, Detroit, Mich.; Chicago Workers School, Chicago, Ill.; Oklahoma City Workers School, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Cleveland Workers School, Cleveland, Ohio; St. Louis Workers School, St. Louis, Mo.; Richmond Workers School, Richmond, Va.; Seattle Workers School, Seattle, Wash.; Agricultural Workers School, Bismarck, N. Dak.; Milwaukee Workers School, Milwaukee, Wis.; Washington Workers School, Washington, D. C.; Philadelphia Workers School, Philadelphia, Pa.

I will insert here an extract from testimony given during the last few days of the life of the special committee in Washington:

Communism is penetrating into our public schools, colleges, and campuses. Its influence almost reaches the cradle, taking boys and girls into the movement at the age of 8. The Communists maintain their own 300 or more schools in the United States, where revolution, strike tactics, and hatred to our Government and its institutions is taught.

The Workers School in New York City, located at 31 East Twelfth Street, opened with an enrollment of 1,500 students. This school, the leading school in the United States of the Moscow-directed rebels, is headed by A. Markoff, who is also "Grand Klegel" of the entire Bolshevik school system in the United States. Among the New York schools' numerous instructors are Art Stein and W. W. Martin. The executive committee of the Communist Workers' School consists of Max Bedacht, Scott Nearing, Sam Darcy, William Z. Foster, William Weinstone, and Beatrice Carlin. The national advisory council includes John J. Ballam, Cyril Briggs, Rev. William Montgomery Brown, Prof. John D. Passos of Columbia University, Robert Dunn, Elizabeth G. Flynn, Joseph Freeman, Ben Gold, Mike Gold, A. Heller, J. Jerome, Robert Minor, M. J. Olgin, Mark Rosenberg, Grace Hutchins, Anita Whitney, Mary Heaton Vorse, and S. De Leon. This school has 57 instructors. Over 63 courses are given in Communist Party functions and history, including strike strategy and military communism.

Max Bedacht, chairman of the executive committee, says, "The course of studies in the school are for the training of young workers in the Marxist and Leninist teachings so as to help in the development of trained revolutionists who will be able to effectively lead the working class in the performance of its historic role to overthrow the capitalist system of society and to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat."

The instructors in these Communist schools should most assuredly be called upon to take an oath of allegiance to the United States Government before they are permitted to instruct young men and women or even grown men and women.

The insistence of this oath of allegiance being taken by these teachers would perhaps act as deterrent in their methods of instruction and might even have a beneficial effect upon the courses of studies which they willingly teach.

The loyal, conscientious teacher fully in sympathy with the institutions of the United States and our philosophy of government and economics would not object to the requirement of taking an oath of allegiance to the United States and its flag. Many of them will consider that as an additional badge of honor to their profession.

If the requirement of such an oath of allegiance from any person or group of persons, who instruct our growing young people in the formative stage of their lives, arouses objection from any who may actually be imbued with a belief that their position as a teacher justifies the teaching of communistic philosophy and results in the removal of such from the teaching staff of our tax-supported educational institutions, I say that the wide publicity given this treacherous subject by Mr. Hearst will be a blessing to this country.

As I stated earlier today, while I may not whole-heartedly support everything that may appear editorially or otherwise in the papers under the control of Mr. Hearst, I think his effort in this subject of Communist influence getting into

our public schools and tax-supported institutions of educational instruction is a most worthy exposure and he should be commended for his patriotic utterances on this subject.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada, a member of the committee [Mr. SCRUGHAM].

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the principles involved in this naval appropriation bill are of vital importance to the national welfare and should be clearly understood by every Member of this Congress. The announced objective of the Government, as stated by the Secretary of the Navy in his annual report to the President, is as follows:

To maintain the Navy in sufficient strength to support the national policies and commerce and guard the continental and overseas possessions of the United States.

Admiral Standley testified before the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations to the effect that—

The operations of our naval forces are carried out, as thoroughly as funds permit, in such a way as—

(a) To exercise and train the units of the fleet to the highest state of efficiency;

(b) To organize the Navy for operations in either or both oceans so that expansion will be necessary only in case of national emergency;

(c) To protect American lives and interests in disturbed areas;

(d) To cooperate fully with other departments of the Government and with the States;

(e) To cultivate friendly international relations; and

(f) To encourage civil industries and activities useful in war.

In the interpretation of these clearly stated objectives there exists a wide difference of honest opinion. On one hand we have a school of thought who advocate an American Navy equal or superior to any in the world, practically regardless of expense entailed.

To this point of view the majority of the naval personnel naturally are not opposed. The warship builders, manufacturers of munitions, and allied interests all add their bit to the big-navy propaganda.

On the other hand we have another extreme element who sincerely and literally believe in total disarmament, and an application of the doctrine of brotherly love to all foreign nations. They would immediately stop all expenditures for materials of warfare.

In compiling this naval appropriation bill our subcommittee, under the strong leadership of our chairman, Mr. CARY, has formulated a measure which, in our opinion, fulfills every requisite of national defense and with due regard to the following principles:

First. A balanced program of construction of airships, airplane carriers, battleships, cruisers, destroyers, submarines, and so forth.

Second. Recognition of the fact that the rapid advances of military and naval science will render nearly every piece of construction and armament more or less obsolete in a very few years.

Third. The cost of the program will exceed $500,000,000 a year for many years to come.

Fourth. There should be no dependence upon foreign nation for any of the essential raw material supplies needed in time of war.

Fifth. Encouragement of civil industries and activities useful in war.

Probably the weakest point in the naval program, and to a lesser degree the War Department program, has been the dependence upon foreign sources of supply for many of the strategic minerals necessary for military and construction purposes. The principal items are as follows:

Chromite having origin in Rhodesia, Cuba, New Caledonia, Greece, and India, and used for alloy steels for tools, electric plating, and pigments.

Tin having origin in the Malay States, Bolivia, Dutch East Indies, Siam, and China, and used for bearings, food containers, solder, cables in aircraft construction, inside of salt water pipes, bomb fuses, in bronze, and for journals and castings.

Tungsten having origin in China, Bolivia, and Burma, and used for high-speed cutting tools in all kinds of machine work.

Optical glass having origin in Germany and France, and used for cameras, binoculars, periscopes, telescopes, and range finders.

Nickel having origin in Canada and New Caledonia, and used in steel for making guns and armor plate.

Antimony having origin in China, Bolivia, and Mexico, and used for bearing metal, battery plates, paints, and chemicals.

Manganese having origin in India, Russia, Brazil, Cuba, Gold Coast of Africa, and Egypt, and used for propeller hubs, propeller blades, engine frames, gears, gun-mount castings, and torpedo-tube castings.

Quicksilver having origin in Italy and Spain, and used for explosives, paints, drugs, and electrical apparatus.

It is proposed to purchase adequate stocks of these materials produced and processed in the United States.

This policy of accumulation of reserve stocks of strategic minerals of domestic origin is recommended by the National Resources Board in its recent report to the President, page 416, and is also authorized and directed by inference in an act of Congress, Public, No. 428, Seventy-second Congress, title III, section 2.

Another item worthy of special comment is the additional support given the Naval Research Laboratory.

The committee has increased the estimate for this establishment from $210,000 allowed by the Budget, to $310,000. Of the increase, the sum of $30,000 has been allocated for the employment of additional scientific personnel.

The construction of a modern warship requires the application of practically all of the arts and sciences. The improvements in the designs of the future will depend upon the scientific advancements and their applications. Naval research should be aggressively prosecuted in times of peace in order that the benefits of science be available for use in war, because months and often years are required to incorporate the results of research into the fleet. Mobilization for war is too late for the mobilization of science for long-time problems.

The character of naval matériel requires that the Navy look to itself for a large part of its research, particularly that part which is secret or has no commercial application. In the solution of its research problems the Navy should be unhampered by pressing current needs in other directions; in other words, the Naval Research Laboratory should have adequate funds for research work, independent of the Bureaus' appropriations. The class of problem that now suffers most is the difficult, expensive, and often long-time problem that requires the establishment of new facts for the solution.

In conclusion, let me express the opinion that this bill as presented represents the best judgment of the entire subcommittee, free from partisan or sectional bias, and for the best interests of the whole Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRUAX].

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I did not rise to say anything about communism, but since the subject has been so recently discussed, I want to say a word.

Of course, you have Communists in New York and in Boston and other large cities. We have some in Cleveland, in Toledo, and other cities.

You always will have some Communists, but be sure that the quickest way to end communism in this country is to give every man a job and give every man who is willing to work an opportunity to earn a decent and honest living.

In Ohio we gave them a ticket at the election last fall. In Ohio we had a communistic ticket. We had a communistic candidate for Governor, a candidate for Senator, and a candidate for Congressman at Large. As I recollect it, my opponent on the Communist ticket got 17,000 votes out of the entire total vote of 2,000,000.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRUAX. Not now. I did not intend to say anything about the farm situation, but now since this subject has been mentioned with criticism leveled at the Democratic administration, I feel compelled to say something at this point.

You have been told that the processing tax is a failure. You have been told that the herculean efforts of the Roosevelt administration have gone to naught insofar as recovery of the farmer is concerned.

I call attention of the House to the price of hogs. In 1932, the last year of the Hoover administration, I sold hogs from my farm for 2½ cents a pound. Today hogs are selling in my country for 8½ cents a pound. That does not include the processing tax, which means an additional $2.75 per hundred. Do you mean to tell me that you can go out into Ohio, that you can go into Iowa, or into Nebraska, and tell those hog farmers that they are not more prosperous than they were in 1932? Do you mean to tell me that you can go into the South and say to the cotton growers that the processing tax and the triple A is spelling their doom? All you need is to remind them that in 1932, the last year of the Hoover administration, cotton was selling for 5 and 6 cents a pound; that they had a surplus then of around 12,000,000 bales; and that today cotton is selling for better than 11 cents a pound and that the carry-over, or surplus, has been reduced to about eight or nine million bales. The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and I say to you that all we need is a crop year; that the restored prosperity of the American farmer will, in another year, be reflected in every avenue of trade, every channel of commerce; and you cannot stop it.

I have not posed at any time as a champion or defendant of Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, but I do believe in giving the program and the administration all the credit and praise that is due, because, for the first time in many years, not only an attempt has been made but a real constructive program has been adopted and put into force that is bringing this prosperity back to where it first belongs—namely, down to the grass roots of the country. [Applause.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRUAX. Not now. I have a letter here from a man in Darke County. Darke County is the largest and richest agricultural corn and hog county in the State of Ohio. This letter is dated April 18. He says:

> Certain industries, financial interests and parasites of the agricultural industry, are at the present moment bringing great pressure to bear upon the public and its representatives to discredit the A. A. A. programs.
>
> I wish to assure you that the A. A. A. programs have been the means of restoring the confidence of Ohio agriculture in itself and its future.
>
> The support you have given the agricultural program in the past has been greatly appreciated.
>
> To drop the programs at the present time would mean the loss of what stability has been attained in rural Ohio.
>
> Your continued active support of the interests of rural Ohio is necessary to the future prosperity of Ohio farmers.
>
> The statistics being quoted by nonagricultural interests as proving the A. A. A. a failure, and showing that the processing tax is the cause of the excessive retail prices of controlled products cannot be substantiated when all the facts are considered.
>
> May I not urge your careful scrutiny of all material presented to you for the purpose of discrediting the agricultural programs?

This letter is signed by Dale C. Williams, president of the Darke County Corn and Hog Control Association. That is the answer to all of this criticism that is now hurled at the administration farm policy. Eight and a half cents for hogs as against two-and-a-half-cent hogs under the policy of do nothing, under the policy of letting the farmer work out his own salvation and having him lift himself over the fence by his own boot straps.

Mr. Chairman, last night a meeting was held in the city of Detroit that was not only of interest to the citizens of that city, but was of like interest to the citizens of that State and to the entire citizenship of the country. I refer to a meeting that was held and sponsored by that fighting radio crusader, Father Charles E. Coughlin. I read in the newspapers today that Father Coughlin was attempting to found a third party. I do not believe it. I am not in sympathy with third-party movements at this particular time. I am in sympathy with many of the aims and the objects proposed in his program and his League for Social Justice. I wonder if many of you have read that program very carefully? I wonder if you fully understand what is proposed in that program, and feeling that no Member of this House will take offense at a brief recital of the program I shall give it to you:

> No. 1. I believe in the right of liberty of conscience and liberty of education, not permitting the State to dictate either my worship to my God or my chosen avocation in life.
>
> No. 2. I believe that every citizen willing to work and capable of working shall receive a just and living annual wage which will enable him to maintain and educate his family according to the standards of American decency.
>
> No. 3. I believe in nationalizing those public necessities which, by their very nature, are too important to be held in the control of private individuals. By these I mean banking, credit and currency, power, light, oil, and natural gas, and our God-given natural resources.
>
> No. 4. I believe in private ownership of all other property.
>
> No. 5. I believe in upholding the right to private property, yet of controlling it for the public good.

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

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. TRUAX (continuing):

> No. 6. I believe in the abolition of the privately owned Federal Reserve Banking System, and in the establishment of a Government-owned central bank.
>
> No. 7. I believe in rescuing from the hands of private owners the right to coin and regulate the value of money, which right must be restored to Congress, where it belongs.
>
> 8. I believe that one of the chief duties of this Government-owned central bank is to maintain the cost of living on an even keel, and the repayment of dollar debts with equal value dollars.
>
> 9. I believe in the cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmers.
>
> 10. I believe not only in the right of the laboring man to organize in unions, but also in the duty of the Government which that laboring man supports, to facilitate and protect these organizations against the vested interests of wealth and of intellect.
>
> 11. I believe in the recall of all nonproductive bonds, and thereby in the alleviation of taxation.
>
> 12. I believe in the abolition of tax-exempt bonds.
>
> 13. I believe in the broadening of the base of taxation, founded upon the ownership of wealth and the capacity to pay.
>
> 14. I believe in the simplification of government and the further lifting of crushing taxation from the slender revenues of the laboring class.
>
> 15. I believe that in the event of a war for the defense of our Nation and its liberties, there shall be a conscription of wealth as well as a conscription of men.
>
> 16. I believe in perferring the sanctity of human rights to the sanctity of property rights. I believe that the chief concern of government shall be for the poor, because as it is witnessed, the rich have ample means of their own to care for themselves.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I fail to see a single thing in this program or this platform that cannot be accepted and adopted by any real progressive, liberal citizen in this country of ours.

Mr. FOCHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRUAX. Not now. I am sorry.

Naturally, we all believe in the liberty of conscience, education, and of religion. Thomas Jefferson, more than a century ago, laid the cornerstone of progress upon those very principles. Eleven million men who walk the streets today seeking a job that does not exist but is only a mirage, are not greedy when they ask for a decent living wage. What matters it to them if they are employed for only a few months in the year at good wages, but during the balance of that year must go to the Federal relief rolls for food and clothing? I say to you that the workingman who, after all, creates all of the wealth and pays all of the taxes, is as fully entitled to a decent annual wage or living as is the millionnaire with his tremendous wealth and gold.

Why should we not nationalize the banks of this country? Why should we not nationalize the public utilities of this country? Within a few days I hope to have an opportunity to give you my views upon nationalizing the banks, but at this moment I will confine myself to nationalizing public utilities. Why should Mr. Morgan, Mr. Rockefeller, or Mr. Sinclair come down to my farm or my neighbor's farm back

in Wyandot County, Ohio, and have the privilege for drilling for oil and gas and then, if they strike that gas, paying me or some other landowner 15 cents per 1,000 cubic feet for that gas? They pay for only one-eighth of it, and then they mix that gas with a generous supply of air and they sell the consumer in the city the entire eight-eighths of that gas at a price ranging from 65 cents to $1 per 1,000 cubic feet. Why should those powerful vested interests go down to the rivers of my State, to the Sandusky River at Ballville, Ohio, and there harness that mighty power that has lain there slumbering and transform that into electric energy and then peddle it to consumers in the cities at prices which will render them magnificent profits?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Chairman, these most wonderful resources ever found in any country belong to all the people, instead of to the favored and the overprivileged few.

Who is there, my friends, who honestly believes in the perpetuity and perpetuation of the privately owned Federal Reserve banks? Founded upon a capital of $140,000,000, those privately owned Federal banks collect from the American people and taxpayers an enormous total every year. It is not the bankers that I condemn, but it is the system under which they operate. It was that system which enabled those American bankers, when the collapse of the banks came in 1933, to show on their books deposits of $44,000,000,000, when, as a matter of truth and of record, there were less than five and one-half billion dollars actually in existence in this country. It was that same iniquitous system that enabled those same bankers in 1929, when the country was at the peak of its supposed prosperity, to show book deposits of $59,000,000,000, when there was still less than $6,000,000,000 actual money in existence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRUAX] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TRUAX was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRUAX. I continue with other sections of the Coughlin program.

Fourth and fifth. I, too, believe in private ownership of all other property, but never private monopoly.

Sixth, seventh, and eighth. I repeat, who believes in perpetuating the privately owned Federal Reserve Banking System? Do the farmers, the tillers of the soil, those who keep the Nation's bread basket full, believe in it? Do the 50,000,000 wage workers believe in it? Do the 11,000,000 unemployed believe in it? No; the vast majority do not believe in it nor those outside of the banks themselves or direct beneficiaries of the banks. They do not believe in it and will not make so bold as to defend it. They believe in the abolition for once and all time of such an iniquitous system.

Ninth. Certainly no fair-minded man or woman will disagree with the principles enunciated here. Personally, I have fought for the past 15 years for cost of production of farm products. I fought for it way back in 1923, when as director of agriculture for the State of Ohio I warned the people, who at that time were mostly nonbelievers, the calamity that would befall this Nation if agriculture was to continue producing food and the raw materials for clothing at a financial loss. I urged, implored, and begged the people not only in my own State but in many other Corn Belt States to believe in and support the McNary-Haugen bill. Back in those early days of pioneering for farming quality, so-called "leaders", the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and others agreed with Coolidge, Mellon, and Hoover that the farmer must work out his own salvation, that he must pull himself up over this fence by his own boot strap. Back in those days, instead of talking about cost of production, we called it a "minimum prices." That is what we are fighting for today, minimum fixed prices that would cover cost of production plus a reasonable profit. That is what Father Coughlin, of the National Union for Social Justice, fights for today.

Tenth. Is nothing more nor less than approval and endorsement of section 7 (a) of the National Industrial Recovery Act. It is endorsed by the American Federation of Labor, it has been endorsed by President Roosevelt, it was endorsed by Donald Richberg, but due to his willful misinterpretation section 7 (a) has lost its teeth and fangs and remains impotent insofar as fulfillment of that pledge to labor is concerned.

Eleventh and twelfth. Who does not want to recall and cease to issue tax-exempt bonds which are responsible for the most staggering burden of debt ever unloaded upon a long-suffering people. A monstrous burden of debt that is not only crushing to the ground the struggling taxpayer of today but the generations of taxpayers that are to follow him and the generations to come. When generations yet unborn shall wade through the musty pages of history they shall find there written in words as unerasable as they are enduring, that the curse, the scourge, the demolition of a country once powerful and strong was that grim destroyer—tax-exempt bonds.

Thirteenth. Translated into simple language, this means the taxing of wealth. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the all-American kingfish, the Honorable HUEY P. LONG, is too modest, too mild, in his slogan of "share the wealth." I do not want to share it with the plutocrats. They did not share it with me. Did they share it with you? Did they share it with the farmer when he was about to lose his farm? Did they share it with the unemployed workman when he was about to lose his home? Did they share it with the boys who fought their country's battles and upheld the Nation's glory and honor when they demanded their pensions and bonus? No; they did not share it with them, so why should we share it now. I would conscript wealth the same as we conscript men in time of war.

Fourteenth. I am heartily in accord with the principles enunciated. I would lift the crushing taxation of the laboring class by an adequate and proper tax imposed on wealth.

Fifteenth. In the McSwain bill recently passed in the House of Representatives we did conscript the wealth of the plutocrats and industrialists the same as men were to be conscripted. Then after voting in all those good amendments, which constituted the best antiwar profit and antiprofiteering bill ever enacted, we turned squarely around and voted to strike out all the good amendments that we had adopted. So I would go one better than our friend Huey in the other end of the Capitol and conscript wealth and not wait for war but do it now.

Sixteenth. The rich do not need my help; the holders and owners of vast wealth and of special privilege do not need my assistance. I am for the common people.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to say that it has been a great pleasure to work with the distinguished gentleman on the Navy subcommittee in the preparation of this bill. The chairman, Mr. CARY, of Kentucky, proved himself to be not only a fine presiding officer but fair and unprejudiced in all respects, and Mr. DITTER, of Pennsylvania, and myself, of the minority, are happy to have served under him. At the same time I want to compliment our subcommittee on having the services of Mr. John Pugh, the efficient and able clerk. All who have come in contact with Mr. Pugh and who have had an opportunity to observe his work will agree with me in saying that the committee could not have had the assistance and valued cooperation of a higher-qualified or better-informed expert on the question involved. His deep and exhaustive knowledge of fiscal affairs and national defense have earned our keenest admiration.

Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to call to the attention of the Members of the House my observations as to the methods and manner in which certain "emergency" funds are being used by the various Government departments to defray normal operating expenses, which ordinarily would be included in regular appropriation bills.

The operation of our Government is a most serious business, influencing as it does, with most far-reaching effects, the varied actions of our daily routine. In the proper con-

duct of the affairs of our Government there is no room or place for the false fronts and painted screens of stagecraft. I want to concur with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] when he said constructive criticism of the acts of the administration is desirable.

Stage props and clever devices for fooling the public are justly a part of the theater producer's trade, but when used by a government they become mere shams and result in an inexcusable and unforgivable deception where only the soul of honesty and integrity should exist.

The present administration has shown by more ways than one that it is an adept at borrowing pages from the book of filmdom. Imitation and adaption of cinema-studio technique to Government routine began with the age-old practice of hiring professional ballyhoo artists. Just as an actor or a showman of the stage have employed press agents to help "sell" them to the public, so has the administration engaged the services of a veritable corps of "Government press agents" and "public relations counsels" to sell various phases of the new deal to the voters.

The latest innovation is the "stage-prop" budget. For many years the country managed to get along with one Budget. Our expenditures were all classified in such a simple and straightforward manner that any taxpayer could tell just how much the Government was spending and how the money was being spent. Those days passed with the inauguration of the double-budget system.

Taking the cue from theater technicians, the administration has adopted a dual budget accounting system for Federal expenditures. When Mr. Citizen looks at the mounting tide of Government spending, he is comforted by the cheerful and brightly painted stage scenery set to create the illusion of thrift and economy in normal governmental expenses.

He is told that normal expenditures are being kept down and that the enormous outlay which arouses his nervous instincts is occasioned by "emergency" expenditures. His natural fears are calmed by the soothing assertion that the billions of dollars he sees being spent are but temporary and necessary means of fighting the depression. He is told that these "emergency" figures are not to be confused with the ordinary operating expenses of his Government.

These statements sound plausible to Mr. Citizen. Why should they not? The speaker who tells him these things is his own Government. In his Budget message, did not the President say:

> If this Budget receives the approval of the Congress, the country will henceforth have the assurance that, with the single exception of emergency relief, every current expenditure of whatever nature will be fully covered by our estimates of current receipts. Such deficit as occurs will be due solely to emergency relief, and it may be expected to decline as rapidly as private industry is able to reemploy those who now are without work.

Mr. Citizen is not in the moving-picture theater where mere show is the expected and accepted practice. He does not possess the time nor the facilities, usually, to penetrate behind the false front of glittering figures set up by those who owe him the highest measure of faithful and honest service. He is obliged to accept the statement of those in whose hands have been entrusted the affairs of his Government.

Ever since the United States Congress began to function, bills have been passed periodically, carrying certain well-defined appropriations to defray the operating expenses of the various branches of the Government. These appropriations formerly gave an accurate picture of the expenses of Government departments. This is no longer the case under the present "stage prop" budget system and the spending methods it engenders.

For instance, the pending naval appropriation bill calls for an appropriation of $457,786,261 to run the Navy for the coming fiscal year. Anyone, however, who accepts the total of this appropriation bill as indicative of the cost of the Navy for the coming year will be greatly mistaken. To arrive at the true total, the inquiring citizen will have to wend his way past the props and painted budget scenery which obscure the facts.

Once past the stage paraphernalia, he will notice a busy hum of activity, financed by so-called "emergency" funds. He will find regular operating expenses, ordinary maintenance, ordinary and necessary repair work being paid for out of P. W. A. and N. I. R. A. funds.

During the recent hearings on the naval appropriation bill before the House subcommittee it was brought out that although $500,000 was appropriated last year for machine tools, none of this money was spent. Instead, a grant of $1,451,220 was received from N. I. R. A. "emergency" funds and expended for necessary replacements of worn out and obsolete machine tools.

Naval experts estimated that $2,525,000 would be required during the coming fiscal year for machine tools for construction and repair. Did the appropriation bill call for this amount? It did not. Why should it, when "emergency" funds would be available? When the final estimates were sent to the Appropriations Committee by the administration the amount had been reduced to but $350,000.

The following excerpts from the committee hearings will help to throw some additional light on this subject. I read from page 459 of the hearing:

> Question. This $2,525,000 was the estimate submitted to the Secretary of the Navy?
>
> Admiral LAND. To the Navy budget officer.
>
> Question. It was refused by the Navy budget officer, not by the Bureau of the Budget; is that correct?
>
> Admiral LAND. I am not prepared to answer that.
>
> Question. Is it your hope that you will be able to receive part of this $2,525,000 from N. R. A. or P. W. A.?
>
> Mr. CARY. He has already answered that. He said he hoped to get all he could out of it.
>
> Question. No; not on this particular item. He has not answered that.
>
> In other words, of the request you made of $2,525,000, all you had in this bill was $350,000. Is it your hope that you will receive a part of that $2,525,000 from P. W. A. or N. R. A.?
>
> Admiral LAND. It is my personal hope that if any money is allocated to the Department, some of it will go to this project; and I understand that in various projects, with their priorities, that have been prepared by the Department as a whole, that item is listed.

This example is not an isolated exception. The adroit camouflaging of ordinary and regular expenses by means of the painted screenwork of our so-called "emergency" budget is becoming the established rule.

In corroboration, I would like to cite these additional facts concerning the use of "emergency" funds for essential repairs at the Naval Academy, which were brought out during the hearings on this bill. I read from page 276 of the hearing:

> Question. Would you say that all of it (the repair work) was definitely necessary?
>
> Answer. I would; yes, sir. The two big items pertaining to the wharves, amounting to over $85,000 out of the $88,622, were absolutely necessary. I know that, because I got there in time to see the finish of the wreck. The wharves were badly mauled by the high tides and heavy winds.

If further substantiating evidence were wanted to show that "relief" funds are being diverted for ordinary running expenses of the Government, it would be found in the following excerpt from the same hearings. I refer to page 281 in the hearings:

> Question. Do you believe that sum of $830,000 (spent on the Naval Academy) should have been included in the appropriation bill last year?
>
> Answer. Yes, sir.
>
> Question. You think it should have been included in the Appropriation bill instead of being provided for from P. W. A. funds, where it improperly belongs. It is strictly a Navy appropriation bill item, is it not?
>
> Answer. It is strictly a Naval Academy matter.

These citations serve to give some idea of what really exists behind the stage pieces of the "emergency" budget. The only difference between the artificial settings of the administration technicians and those of the theatrical producers lies in the fact that the former conceal a scene of busy activity while the latter merely hide vacant lots and empty spaces.

While these questionable practices are tantamount to outright and willful deception of the public, it is a deplorable fact that they are probably technically legal. By no stretch of the imagination, however, would it be possible for even the most prejudiced "new dealer" to claim with accuracy and truth that these tactics are either morally honest or justifiable.

These obscuring and deceptive screens labeled "emergency", which have been placed before Government expenditures, are nullifying and destroying the effectiveness of our Federal Budget system.

I have mentioned the naval appropriation bill at some length, not because I criticize or disapprove the expenditures themselves, but simply as an illustrative example of what is going on in our Government today. The Navy Department is in no sense to blame. It is bound to receive the money it needs from whatever source may be designated by the administration. Actually, the Navy Department is only one of the many branches of the Government whose expenses have been distorted and disguised by a dishonest resort to bookkeeping legerdemain.

A report recently submitted to the Senate by the Treasury Department lists some astonishing uses which have been made of funds made available under the $3,500,000,000 Public Works Appropriation Act which became operative on June 16, 1933.

This document shows that without even the specified approval or knowledge of the Congress, although under the blanket provisions of the far-reaching act, the Executive branch of the Government created the Federal Alcohol Control Board and allocated a half million dollars for its administrative expenses.

One million dollars was spent to establish retail stores in the Tennessee Valley to sell electrical appliances in competition with private dealers.

The following list is illustrative of some of the other instances in which public works "emergency" funds have been used instead of applying for expense money in the regular way:

Office of Adviser on Foreign Trade, $350,000.

Immigration and Naturalization Service, $88,000.

United States Employment Service, $1,300,000.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, $10,000.

Office of Secretary of Labor, $16,000.

Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, administrative expenses, $1,141,000.

Public Health Service, $43,698.

This same report also shows that $830,000 of the "emergency" funds went for administrative expenses of the Oil Code.

When we take these plain facts into consideration, it at once becomes apparent that the talk of one budget for emergency and one for operating expenses is sheer absurdity. The result is utter confusion.

This practice of attempting to disguise normal Government expenditures by labeling them "emergency" is chiseling away at the very elements of enlightenment and honesty upon which all good government depends. This rank deception cannot be excused by saying that these expenditures were necessary. That is not the issue. The point is that the people have been grossly misled by the administration into believing that funds were being spent for emergency projects when the question of emergency was not even involved. The unpalatable fact remains that a dishonest pretext has been resorted to for the sake of concealing the true operating expense of the Government. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN], 20 minutes.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, in the Seventy-third Congress I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 32, which was passed June 15, 1934. This resolution provided that the Federal Trade Commission conduct an investigation of the milk industry. The investigation was begun last July. Because of limitation of funds allowed by Congress the inquiry was confined to the State of Connecticut and to the Philadelphia milk sheds, comprising eastern Pennsylvania, Delaware, and parts of New Jersey, Maryland, and West Virginia. My original resolution called for an appropriation of $150,000. With that sum it was anticipated the investigation could be carried on as a Nation-wide inquiry. Unfortunately the amount requested was cut down to $30,000 at the suggestion of the Bureau of the Budget. Had the sum I requested been granted, it would have been unnecessary for me to come before you today.

On April 5, 1935, the Federal Trade Commission filed its report with Congress. It is my hope that every Member of Congress, at least every Member in whose district there is a single dairy farmer or a milk consumer, has read that report; and, if not, I hope that you will within the next few days. I wish I knew of some way that would compel this report to be read by every consumer of milk and by every farmer in America. In my humble judgment, this would compel as nothing else the cooperation of the people with every milk producers' cooperative organization in America, to the end that their efforts on behalf of the farmer and the public may be strengthened through the activity of our Government. At this very moment I have information from a very high source in the industry that the Milk Trust is actively at work engaged invisibly in a well-planned drive to defeat any legislation attempted by this Congress which would bring about a further and complete investigation by the Government into the malpractices which today obtain in the milk industry.

But before I go into the detail of this report, I want to point out the importance of the dairy industry to this country. In the first place, milk is produced in each one of our 48 States. Secondly, more than 3,000,000 farmers are engaged in the production of milk and sell the product in one form or another. Thus more than half of this Nation's farmers are producers of milk. The majority of these 3,000,000 dairy farmers depend upon milk as their sole source of income.

Dairying is the most important agricultural enterprise in these United States! Almost 25 percent of all the money farmers receive in this country comes from milk. No other single crop or livestock product gives the farmer as much money as milk does.

But what has happened to the money the farmer receives? From 1929 to 1933 the farm prices of butterfat declined 58 percent. The farm price of butter declined 54 percent. The farm price of milk sold at wholesale by producers decreased 49 percent. And the purchasing power of dairy products fell from 92 percent in 1929 to 63 percent in 1933. Thus with a given volume of dairy products the farmer could buy in 1933 only 68 percent of the manufactured and industrial goods he could have bought in 1929. Do you get the picture? The purchasing power of the dairy farmer fell over 30 percent, while on the other hand, the profits of the distributors and processors continued outrageously higher and higher.

Mr. Chairman, the dairy situation today is no better than it was last year or the year before. Prices of dairy products have only increased slightly in the past year. But this increase has been offset by the higher prices which farmers must pay for feed and other things that go into producing milk. The result is that thousands of dairymen are being forced off their farms. While this is going on, the city milk supply is being endangered. It costs money to produce milk in accordance with modern health requirements. Our milk producers are not being paid enough to meet these increased costs.

From the report of the Federal Trade Commission I learn that while many farmers have been receiving low average prices for their milk and many of them have been reduced to financial distress, the majority of milk distributors have been prosperous all through the years of the depression, and in many instances have paid enormous dividends in addition to high salaries. In other words, no matter how little the farmer received for his milk, the trust has always made sure that it gets a huge slice with which to pay high salaries and healthy profits.

The distributor has been selling milk for all that the traffic could bear. Out of this he has been taking his chunk. And the little that was left went to the farmer. That is the way this milk business is run. That is the way it is in spite of the farmer cooperatives and other bargaining agencies designed to get for the producer a fairer share of the money paid by you and me for milk.

I have the highest respect for the cooperative milk marketing associations which for more than 15 years have been fighting the battles of the milk producer. These organizations represent the individual farmer in demanding that distributors pay dairymen fair prices. The cooperative milk marketing associations have done a wonderful piece of work in stabilizing marketing conditions and improving returns to farmers. But in spite of all that has been done, the battle for decent and fair returns for farmers has not been won. The milk producers cooperatives have not gone far enough, and as long as they have to deal with the present methods in which milk distributors do business, the hands of these cooperatives will remain tied.

At the present moment the only way that a farmer cooperative can sell milk to distributors is by playing ball with the trust. The distributors are on top of the pile and are in position to dictate to each and every farmer. The Federal Trade Commission's report shows how the trust first dictates the price of milk sold the consumer, then, after counting on a healthy margin for itself, sets the price to be paid the farmer. Because of the perishable nature of his product, the milk producer is powerless to do anything to correct the situation. The investigation disclosed that farmers who protested against the action of their cooperative or of their distributors often found themselves without a market for their milk. The investigation also showed that in some instances directors of cooperative milk producers' associations were favored as against other members of the organization.

Mr. Chairman, the milk distributors and dairy-products manufacturers have been hi-jacking both the farmer and the consumer in spite of our Federal laws against price fixing. The investigation developed beyond a shadow of doubt that the Dairy Trust interests have been acting together in fixing prices and in eliminating competition.

Ice-cream manufacturers in Pennsylvania were found by the investigation to have agreed on prices. Concrete evidence of this was found in a letter from Mr. Harry Williams, Jr., treasurer of the United States Dairy Products Corporation, to W. J. Kennedy, president of W. J. Kennedy Dairy Co., of Detroit, Mich., a subsidiary of the United States Dairy Products Corporation. This letter was dated June 28, 1934, and reads in part as follows:

> You will probably be interested to learn, in the event that you have not already been advised, that shortly after Walter assumed the "reins" of management he tackled the Philadelphia ice-cream price situation by personally interviewing the operating officials of the Abbott, Supple, and Breyer Cos. in Philadelphia, and as a result thereof succeeded in having a meeting called for the consideration thereof last Tuesday. This meeting was held as arranged and resulted in an increase from 84 cents per gallon to 92 cents per gallon, to be effective July 1. While Walter was disappointed that he did not get the price restored to $1, at the same time he stated that the feeling prevailing among the competitors as a result of this get-together meeting has been greatly improved, and he is hopeful that it will result in further benefits to our future operations.

I wish to explain that the "Walter" referred to in this letter was Walter Justin, who was elected executive vice president of the United States Dairy Products Corporation on June 6, 1934, with the responsibilities and duties of president, the office of president being vacant at that time.

Price fixing and elimination of competition in the dairy industry are quite common practices. The Federal Trade Commission in its investigation found that a subsidiary of a large distributor operating in Philadelphia was a party to an agreement between and among the dealers of Norfolk, Va., eliminating competition in bidding on supplies for the Naval and Marine Hospitals. The following excerpt is taken from a letter found in the files of a large distributor in Philadelphia which owns and operates subsidiaries in other milk sales areas. I quote:

> Mr. Halstead does not like to sign the second clause in the supplementary. He is afraid that this clause might at sometime give us trouble, as it refers to the Naval Hospital and Marine Hospital and to the spread of 15 cents per gallon to be given us on the sale of milk to these Government agencies. While he expects to carry this out without question as we agreed, he does not think it advisable to place same in writing, in view of the fact that if the Government should ever find out that any agreement or understanding had been made to control the price of milk furnished them they would bar us from the Government agencies in the future and possibly cause us other trouble.

Mr. Chairman, this excerpt which I have just read shows conclusively that even the Government hospitals cannot get a chance or even a fair deal from the Milk Trust.

The Federal Trade Commission found evidence of a hard and fast agreement between and among the milk distributors in Detroit. Let me read you another letter written by W. J. Kennedy, president of the Kennedy Dairy Co., of Detroit, a subsidiary of the United States Dairy Products Corporation. The letter was found in the files of the United States Dairy Products Corporation and was written April 20, 1932. Mr. Kennedy wrote:

> For the past week I have done hardly anything except try to stabilize the milk prices. I took it upon myself to call all the dealers of Detroit together at a special meeting at the Statler Hotel last Friday. I am pleased to say that every dealer in Detroit was present with the exception of the National and the Borden, who I asked not to attend this meeting.
>
> I wanted to see what could be done with the Independent group first. * * *
>
> When I went into this meeting, I drew up an agreement, as per the attached copy, and toward the finish of the meeting I asked each man to sign it. But before signing it I wanted them to read it very carefully as I did not want any distributor to sign this agreement without he absolutely intended to carry it out to the letter, so I am pleased to say that each and every man signed up to start the new program this morning, Tuesday, April 19.
>
> I then called a meeting for the National and Borden for Saturday morning at 10 o'clock, and they were more than pleased with the outcome. I then demanded from them that they absolutely agree not to put on any stores for a week while we were trying to put over this program. Our mutual friend Ebling, a director of the National Dairy Corporation, was so much impressed with what had been done with the other dealers that he wanted to take a copy of the agreement down to McInnerny, president of the National Dairy Products Corporation, as he was leaving on Monday for a National directors' meeting in New York.

By way of explanation, I wish to say that the agreement referred to in the excerpts from Mr. Kennedy's letter, which I have just read, was signed by individuals representing 25 distributors in which they agreed that they would keep up the prices to stores and prices to the public. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, this certainly shows the intolerable conditions existing in the Detroit milkshed. I further point out that only by mere chance did the Commission discover evidence of price fixing and throttling of competition in milksheds other than Philadelphia and Connecticut where the investigation was centered.

Mr. Chairman, we often hear the charge made that milk and dairy products are in the hands of a trust and monopoly. Let us look at the picture. Take the National Dairy Products Corporation. This is a holding company incorporated under the laws of Delaware in 1923. Since its organization the National Dairy Products Corporation has acquired the most profitable independent milk distributing companies. One by one it has picked them off until today the National Dairy Products Corporation is the largest distributor of milk and dairy products in the world. Since its organization this corporation has acquired, either through acquisition of capital stock or of physical assets, 194 separate corporations which, with their subsidiaries, represent 331 separate units. Practically all of these holdings were obtained by the exchange of stock of National Dairy Products Corporation. Little, if any, cash was ever paid. By a process of consolidation and elimination, National Dairy Products Corporation, at the end of 1933, consisted of 144 separate corporations. This huge corporation distributes milk, cream, and ice cream in 30 States and Cuba. It sells cheese and butter in every State in the Union and in the Dominion of Canada.

The Federal Trade Commission investigation showed that the National Dairy Products Corporation came into Connecticut in 1928, and during 1928, 1929, and 1930 acquired the two largest milk dealers in Hartford and two large deal-

ers in New Haven, paying for them with paper only. The National Dairy Products Corporation brought no money into Connecticut. True to its policy, the corporation bought what were among the largest and most efficient independent and home-owned milk companies in the territory. Through these four milk companies National Dairies distributes approximately 40 percent of the milk sold in Hartford and 30 percent of the milk sold in New Haven.

Let us look into the affairs of another big milk company, the Borden Co. This is another holding company. In making acquisitions the Borden Co. acquired either the capital stock or properties and assets of more than 100 independent companies which have been reorganized and consolidated into approximately 60 operating companies.

In Connecticut the Borden Co. acquired two milk companies in Bridgeport and Norwalk and now controls the distribution of 33.5 percent of the milk sold in Bridgeport.

Since National Dairies went into Connecticut, the Federal Trade Commission has found that they have paid farmers per quart for all milk regardless of use, less than the average prices paid by the independent distributors.

The Federal Trade Commission's investigation shows that the companies have engaged in every questionable practice.

Mr. Chairman, the Commission has uncovered a story of coercion and threat which put the best of such stories to shame. The Farmers' Cooperative Dairies, Inc., was organized in Connecticut by a group of farmers to process and market their own milk. This new producers' cooperative had a contract with Hotel Garde at Hartford to supply it with milk and cream. The Garde Hotel is owned by the Travelers Insurance Co., of Hartford, one of the largest and best insurance companies in the world.

The Federal Trade Commission's files of the investigation disclose that Mr. Harris, manager of the Garde Hotel, told John Rankl, manager of the Farmers' Cooperative Dairies, that the National Dairy Products Corporation threatened to withdraw its insurance business from the Travelers' Insurance Co. if the Hotel Garde did not stop buying from the Farmers' Cooperative and resume buying its milk and cream requirements from R. G. Miller & Co., a subsidiary of National Dairies. Needless to say, the Travelers' Insurance Co., faced with the threat of losing the business, including group insurance of so large and powerful an organization as the National Dairy Products Corporation, stopped business with the small group of farmers who were struggling for their existence.

I wish I had the time available to tell you of the many other ways in which the farmers of this country are being deprived of what is rightfully theirs. You would hear the story of how artificial milk surpluses are created by the trust through the importation of milk and cream from distant producing areas in order to depress prices to local producers. You would learn how milk producers are cheated in their weights and butterfat tests; how farmers have to pay milk station and hauling charges which, as a side-line business, nets certain distributors handsome returns in excess of actual costs. All of these practices and more are revealed in the Federal Trade Commission's report. May I say quite frankly that this report is so striking, so startling, that it reads like a novel. Those of you who have the interests of the farmer and the milk consumer at heart would do well to read this report.

Mr. Chairman, a while ago I mentioned the fact that thousands of dairymen are being driven off their farms because of conditions within the industry. I pointed out that while the price of milk sold by farmers has been declining, the milk distributors have always made sure of getting their slice, and the price to the consumer has remained at a constantly high level.

During all of the depression years the milk distributors of the United States have been living in their own land of plenty. During these same depression years our milk producers have been driven to the wall of despair—to live in want and poverty. And during these same depression years we find that housewives in our cities—millions of them—have been unable to buy fresh milk for their children because the price has been too high. And this during a period when farmers were practically giving their milk away to the trust.

Mr. Chairman, there is something radically wrong with the present system under which our dairy industry operates. When a product produced by 3,000,000 farmers is literally kept from tens of millions of men and women and children in our cities because of practices in a man-made distribution system which benefits but a small group of operators, the situation should become one of wide-spread public concern.

The investigation developed facts showing that milk distributors have been generally prosperous. Their officers have received generous salaries and most of the dealers have paid dividends to their stockholders regularly. The president of the National Dairy Products Corporation receives in 1 year a salary which I know is not equaled by what is earned in a year by 100 average milk producers combined. In 1931 the National Dairies president received a salary of $187,947. In 1932 he received $171,099. In 1933 and 1934 he received $108,000 each year.

It was found that in 1933 that officers of the National Dairies and subsidiary companies, not including the president, received salaries ranging from $10,000 a year to $75,000 a year. In 1934 officers of the National Dairies and subsidiary companies, not including the president, received salaries ranging from $11,250 a year to $60,100 a year.

The Borden Co. paid its president $108,030 in salary in 1931. In 1932 he received $108,350, and in 1933 he received $100,000. In 1931 other officers of the Borden Co. received salaries ranging from $30,000 to $107,225 per year, and in 1932 officers' salaries, including the president, ranged from $20,000 to $63,200 per year.

But high salaries alone do not tell the story. In addition to the enormous salaries paid officials of subsidiary operating companies the investigation has revealed that these subsidiaries have paid the parent company handsome dividends. For example, the General Ice Cream Co., the subholding company operating National Dairy plants and subsidiary milk companies in Connecticut and other New England States paid the National Dairy Products Corporation $10,030,396.50 in dividends during the last 6 years.

This is but one of the 144 separate units of the National Dairy Trust.

The National Dairy Products Corporation operates two subsidiaries in Philadelphia. These are the Supplee-Wills-Jones Milk Co. and the Breyer Ice Cream Co. From these two subsidiaries National Dairies collected a total of $27,453,337.50 in dividends during the last 6 years.

Mr. Chairman, all of these enormous earnings were made and huge salaries and large dividends were paid by milk distributors during depression years while thousands of farmers have gone broke, and while millions of people in our cities could not obtain milk because the price was too high.

And yet, when we talk about improving these conditions for the benefit of both the milk farmer and the milk consumer, and when we take steps in that direction we see the leaders of the vicious Dairy Trust standing on the housetops shouting their condemnations against our efforts to stop these abuses and protect the farmer and the people.

Right now the various manufacturer and distributor interests in the dairy industry have ganged up against the farmer and against the consumer. Witness the activities of the Dairy Industry Committee in its drive against any and all measures which are designed to give the milk producer and the milk consumer a better break than they have had in the past. The Dairy Industry Committee, Mr. Speaker, represents six national trade associations comprised of distributors of fluid milk, and manufacturers and processors of butter, ice cream, cheese, evaporated milk, and powdered milk. All of these distributors and processors—members of the Dairy Industry Committee—buy their milk from farmers and sell either directly or indirectly to the consumer. What chance has an individual milk producer or an individual milk consumer to stand up against such powerful interests? That is why the milk distributors and the milk processors

are in the saddle. That is why they are riding high, wide, and handsome, fearless of the farmer, fearless of the consumer, and disrespectful and fearless of the law.

Mr. Chairman, milk is the most important article of food consumed by human beings. Babes, invalids, the poor, and all classes of people are largely dependent upon milk. It has a greater nutritive value than steak and various other articles of food which bring larger prices on the market. It is necessary and vital that the consumers obtain milk at a price that the poorest can afford to pay in order that those who need it most may have this life-giving fluid unstintingly. The farmer, who produces and ships to the urban centers this necessary commodity, is doing society a great service and should be encouraged. He cannot stay in this business at a loss and if the Members of this Congress will scrutinize closely the report of the Federal Trade Commission you will find that his profit, if any, is so infinitesimal as to be unworthy of the name of profit. While on the other hand the distributors are waxing rich. The Federal Trade Commission has been able to investigate only in two milksheds. The result of their investigations show conclusively that there should be a Nation-wide survey so that the next session of this Congress may have a composite picture of this important industry not limited to two milksheds in the same section of the country but covering milksheds in every section of our land.

Was the investigation worth while? Did the Congress act wisely in passing the resolution calling for the investigation? Did the money spent by the Federal Trade Commission bring any immediate results? Was the time spent in this investigation thus far of any benefit? The answer to each and every one of these questions is emphatically "Yes." Time will not permit entering into many of the details which are in the report, but let me give you just one, only one, of the many accomplishments and results emanating from this meager investigation.

The Federal Trade Commission discovered in the year of 1934 alone, without regard for what happened in all the years before and for what is happening today, in the Connecticut and Philadelphia markets—not in all the other markets of the country; just these two—that the milk distributors had underpaid the poor and defenseless farmers $600,000 by a system of cheating. If the $30,000 we paid out for this investigation did nothing else, it at least returned to farmers a 2,000-percent dividend. Within 24 hours, in my State of Connecticut, after this information was brought out, the Connecticut State Milk Control Board issued orders calling upon distributors to return the money to the farmers or suffer punishment through the courts. They even went so far as to publish the names of those offending distributing companies, so that everybody might know them. I expect that if this investigation is permitted to go on, and if the Milk Trust lobby is not able to crush the further investigation through any influence it may bring to bear upon Congress, not only will all the other farmers of the Nation be returned moneys which undoubtedly they have been cheated out of but all the other malpractices will be uncovered and the legislation necessary to correct the many, many evils which are still existing in the dairy industry will be enacted.

It would be calamitous indeed if the investigation stops at this point. To this end I am preparing and will shortly introduce a resolution calling for an appropriation sufficient to enable the Federal Trade Commission to continue its good work and to make a close and rigid investigation into the milk industry on a Nation-wide scale. It is necessary and vital that this course be pursued, as I say to you in all seriousness that from the standpoint of the producer the milk industry is prostrate and practically destroyed. The farmer cannot be expected to produce milk and supply it to the dwellers in the cities at a loss or at the insignificant profit which he is now receiving.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I join with the ranking minority member to pay my respects to the genial chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARY], to thank him and also the majority members generally for the courtesies they extended to us. Throughout the hearings every possible courtesy was extended to the minority group. I believe the chairman of the subcommittee did a good job. He was conscientious and painstaking, and I have the highest regard for him. He deserves the commendation of the House. [Applause.]

Yesterday I ventured to supply for the gentleman from Iowa figures showing the amount we were spending for maintenance as compared with Japan and Great Britain, which I then felt, and now believe definitely reflect the cause for the greater amount spent in America for maintenance of the Navy as compared with Great Britain and Japan. I cite these figures by way of comparison: The pay in the United States Navy of a chief petty officer is $126 per month. The pay of a man in a similar grade in Great Britain is $58.81 a month, and the pay for a man in a similar position in Japan is $15.79.

The pay of a first-class seaman in America is $54 a month, in Great Britain it is $27.89 a month, and in Japan it is $3.73 a month.

A second-class seaman in the United States Navy receives $36 a month, in Great Britain $19.10 a month, in Japan $3.80.

In other words, in America we are paying to our second-class seamen practically 12 times the amount paid to second-class seamen in Japan, and more than 14 times as much to our first-class seamen. These figures definitely bear out the assertion which I made yesterday that the maintenance cost of the Navy of America reflects in a very large degree the salaries we are paying our enlisted personnel. This increase is further reflected, however, in the matter of the cost of shipbuilding. I tried to secure authentic figures as to the construction costs per ton in the United States, Great Britain, and Japan. The Naval Intelligence Department could not give them to me with a degree of accuracy which would permit of their being used here today. I shall direct the attention of the House, however, to an item which I believe can be used as the basis for a reasonable comparison. The bids on the steamship *President Wilson*, made by firms in the United States, Great Britain, and Japan afford this very interesting comparison: The per ton bid in the United States was $364.29, in Japan $141.38, in Great Britain $288.17. On this basis the cost of shipbuilding in America is 158 percent greater than in Japan.

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

Mr. DITTER. I yield.

Mr. BIERMANN. Was the ship built in Japan?

Mr. DITTER. No; the ship was not built in Japan.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DITTER. I yield.

Mr. BIERMANN. I was interested in what the gentleman said regarding the pay of the personnel of the Navy. On pages 24 and 25 of the report is set out in detail the cost of pay, subsistence, transportation, maintenance, and a great variety of other items. The total appropriation recommended in the bill for these items is $185,000,000.

If we paid our personnel nothing, allowed nothing for subsistence, nothing for transportation, and all these items, the bill would still carry an appropriation of $282,000,000, which is $81,000,000 more than Japan spent for her Navy in 1934.

Mr. DITTER. Of course, the gentleman has not taken into consideration the difference in the cost of ship construction which I have just mentioned and which is an important factor in the present appropriation bill.

Answering the gentleman further, his premise is so fanciful, imagining that we are running a charitable institution in the Naval Establishment, that I really believe he is not serious in presenting his argument.

Mr. BIERMANN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania gave us the idea that the cost of pay and subsistence of the enlisted personnel is what brought up these totals in the

amount carried in this bill for the next year. I pointed out that if we did not have to pay anything for personnel, or subsistence, we would still be appropriating $81,000,000 more for our Navy for next year than Japan spent on her navy in 1934.

Mr. DITTER. But the gentleman certainly should recognize that the increase is not reflected entirely in this item. It is reflected also in the cost of ship construction, in the cost of repairs, and in every one of the items which go into the maintenance of the Navy.

Mr. BIERMANN. The gentleman undertook to account for the increase by citing differences in rates of pay in the different countries.

Mr. DITTER. I used those only as examples.

Mr. BIERMANN. The gentleman undertook to show that it was cheaper to build ships in Japan than in this country, cited bids on the steamship *President Wilson*, and then said that the ship was not built in Japan.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman certainly cannot be using that as an argument that we should close our shipyards and have our ships built in Japan, is he?

Mr. BIERMANN. Not at all. I am arguing now along the line that we are spending $457,000,000 a year to defend ourselves against Japan; and I still would like to direct the question to the gentleman from Pennsylvania or to any other member of the committee: Against whom are we preparing and against whom are we going to spend these billions and billions of dollars? Will the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. DITTER. First, let me counter with this suggestion to the gentleman: In view of his attitude, and in view of the number of requests which I have for appointments to the Naval Academy, I do wish that he would transfer to me the appointment privileges which are his as a Member of Congress.

Certainly, in view of the present attitude of the gentleman, he would not want to appoint any men to Annapolis. I have good use for these privileges and would certainly be happy to build up the appointments at Annapolis with men who I believe would stand for a navy second to none and such a navy as the committee supports in connection with this present program.

The fanciful enemy the gentleman is trying to bring to our attention now is something I cannot answer. I can only refer him to the very able declaration made by the chairman of the committee when he said very positively that we were not in any way attempting to create in the mind of anyone the fear of an enemy, but we do feel a preparedness program is the best protection. [Applause.]

Mr. DARROW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DARROW. In making these comparisons with Japan, is it not fair to take into consideration the London Treaty which gave Japan 3 to our 5 ships, with their navy not as large? Consequently, they would not have as many ships or as much expense in keeping them up to treaty strength.

Mr. DITTER. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion. He will probably concur in the further observation that just recently Japan definitely repudiated or at least served notice that she would no longer be bound by the treaty which she had previously entered into, and as of 1936 she would no longer consider herself obligated under the agreement.

Mr. BIERMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BIERMANN. There are 5,000 miles of ocean separating Japan from our western coast. Does the gentleman imagine if the Japanese fleet were twice the size of ours that Japan could land hostile forces on our western coast?

Mr. DITTER. May I answer the gentleman by saying that he as a member of the majority should direct an inquiry of that kind to the Secretary of the Navy. I do not presume to know what the purposes of the Navy Department are with reference to the operations of the fleet. I think that is a matter of administrative policy. I would not presume to imagine just why the present administration feels that the operation should be in the Pacific, or what potential danger faces America in the Pacific or elsewhere.

Mr. BIERMANN. Then the gentleman believes this Congress should vote whatever appropriation the Secretary of the Navy asks?

Mr. DITTER. I believe this Congress should vote every dollar that is necessary to provide a Navy that is second to none for the adequate defense of America. [Applause.]

Mr. BIERMANN. If the gentleman proceeds on that theory right along, he will find himself voting more and more appropriations for the Navy as long as he is in this body. We are voting half a billion dollars this year, and in a few years I predict the Navy will be wanting a billion dollars.

Mr. DITTER. I do not care to enter into an argument with respect to policy, but may I just give the gentleman this further information which I believe is pertinent. I wish the gentleman would study the hearings and examine the character of food provided for the enlisted personnel of the Navy of the United States. I wish he would submit that to somebody who might be qualified to pass upon the subject of food values. A comparison of the ration components of Japan, Great Britain, and the United States discloses some interesting facts.

An estimate of cost discloses that the price in this country is estimated at 45 cents; in Japan, where the menu is largely made up of fish and rice, the cost is 15 cents; in other words, one-third of ours; and in Great Britain the cost of 26 cents.

May I make the further suggestion to the gentleman that he examine the bill and ascertain the amount that is being provided for the American enlisted man for welfare and recreational activities, none of which are provided for by Japan. I wish he would look into the amount that we provide for hospitalization and medical service, and then try from that compendium that he quoted from yesterday, to secure a figure as to what Japan is doing with reference to the care of its enlisted personnel; comparing those figures with the cost of the care that the United States provides for its enlisted personnel. Recreation, welfare, and the well-being of the American seamen were considered by those of us who support this present bill. We are willing to pay the price in order to provide the privileges for the American seamen, ignored entirely by Japan in its program.

Mr. Chairman, I want to spend a little of my remaining time to make some observations on the new-deal Navy policy. We have a new-deal Navy procedure. I want to give encouragement to the gentleman who has been so much concerned about lotteries and the contribution they may make to the well-being of America. May I say to the gentleman that he should be one of the most encouraged Members of the House today. In season and out of season, he has declared with consistency his belief in a lottery program. I honor him in his opinion. I feel he has a right to that opinion. I may not agree with him, but he is to be admired for his persistency.

I want to call his attention to the fact, however, that the Navy Department has already adopted that program. In the past we let contracts for naval construction on the basis of the most responsible and lowest bidder receiving the award. We have inaugurated an entirely new policy. Instead of doing this in the regular order, the Department now gathers together the individuals who desire to submit Navy bids. We put their names in a hat, or else their names are placed in capsules. Then, on an appointed day, we have a great sweepstakes affair in the Navy Department. Havre de Grace, Bowie, and all the other racing places have nothing on what the scenes at the Navy Department are on that day. I can just imagine the scene down there as the contract jockeys bring out their horses to run in the race to see whether or not they are going to get the award of a fat, juicy contract as a result of pulling names out of a hat.

Mr. KENNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KENNEY. Does the gentleman know that the Kingdom of Italy raises money by lottery for the support of its Navy?

Mr. DITTER. I tried to indicate to my genial friend from New Jersey that I was in no way taking exception to the program he is sponsoring. I rather wanted to encourage him; that under this new deal there was a hope of his program being adopted, in view of the fact the Navy Department has already taken it over, body and soul. We were once told that the money changers were to be driven out of the temple, but we were not told that the contract chance artists were to be invited to take their place.

Mr. KENNEY. I thank the gentleman, and will the gentleman yield to me to submit a unanimous consent request to insert in the RECORD the revenues for her navy derived by Italy through lotteries, as well as the revenue of some of the other countries from lotteries?

Mr. DITTER. I should not care to have that inserted at this point. I feel confident that if the gentleman will address his request to my genial friend, the chairman of the committee, in due course and at its proper place, he will find he can have it inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. KENNEY. May I say to the gentleman there is no time remaining.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman well knows that in due season, when we go back into the House, he can address a request to the Speaker to have the matter inserted as an extension of his remarks.

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

Mr. DITTER. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARLAN. The situation the gentleman is describing is due to the fact that under the new industrial picture that we now have, the bids are all approximately the same and all come from firms that are equally reliable.

Mr. DITTER. As to the first premise, I must agree with the gentleman. As to the second premise, I have no knowledge whether that premise is correct or not.

I will agree with the gentleman that uniformity of the bids results from the N. R. A. program, and as has been testified in the hearings, is the direct result of previous bids being placed or filed with code authorities, so that those bids may be either uniformly high, as they are in many instances, or else a similarity exists with regard to all of them. Competition is destroyed and monopolies and exorbitant prices result.

Mr. HARLAN. In view of that situation and assuming that such a condition exists, over which the Navy has no control, of course, how would the gentleman suggest that the Navy select one contractor over another?

Mr. DITTER. I should suppose that those characteristics of stability which have been evidenced in times past as a result of the contractual relationship existing between the Government and certain bidders would appear as to reputation and reliability and prompt those in authority to award the contracts on the basis of worth and value rather than adopt this hit-or-miss policy, which is the direct result of the N. R. A. and the new-deal program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. DITTER. I have only 5 minutes. If I have a moment at the end of my remarks, I shall be pleased to yield. I want to point out just one or two things that I believe are pertinent. This is the new-deal method of awarding contracts and saving the taxpayers' money. It is the new-deal theory of economy in government. Let me quote from the hearings:

Mr. CARY. Now, what would happen if a number of concerns bidding on an article got together and filed with the code authority excessively high prices, and then came to your Department and they all had the same bid, and it was an excessively high bid? What would you do then?

Mr. DITTER. That is exactly the line of inquiry that I was going to follow, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral PEOPLES. My dear Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, that the principle, the theory upon which the code system was based, was to prevent unfair and cutthroat competition, to prevent unfair practices, and so forth.

Mr. DITTER. I am glad that you used the word "theory" there.

Admiral PEOPLES. And I lean the other way, and think that industry makes a mistake when it does not provide for the possibility of having competition as between themselves.

I believe that there should be certain restrictions; I believe that there should be a certain minimum wage per hour, and a certain maximum number of hours of work per week, and then, all in between that, leave it up to the initiative, the facilities of the firm to get the business. In other words, cause competition.

Mr. McLEOD. You have seen competitive bidding, also, in your experience? In other words, you have witnessed both during your term of experience in this capacity?

Admiral PEOPLES. I think that I can very properly answer your question by saying that, in my opinion, I believe lower prices would have been obtained.

Mr. McLEOD. And money would have been saved to the Government thereby, had it not been for these codes; is that correct?

Admiral PEOPLES. That naturally follows.

Mr. McLEOD. The money would have been saved to the Government; is that correct?

Admiral PEOPLES. That naturally follows.

* * * * * * *

Mr. DITTER. Would you not say that the operation of the steel-furniture group tended to that?

Admiral PEOPLES. I think that under the system of filed prices at that time they were trying to take advantage, but it did not result that way.

Mr. DITTER. Just to get back again to my question, does not competition tend to create monopoly? The fewer the competitors there are, that must of necessity mean that the field is limited; and the narrower the field the greater the opportunity of absolute control, which is monopoly. Is not that true?

Admiral PEOPLES. As a general proposition.

* * * * * * *

Mr. DITTER. Now, with respect to those ships building in navy yards, in those instances the materials, as I understand it, were purchased from certain contractors, steel contractors and other contractors.

Admiral LAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. DITTER. Plates would be bought from certain steel mills.

Admiral LAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. DITTER. And other materials going into the construction of ships.

Admiral LAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. DITTER. Now, will you tell us what policy was followed by the Navy with respect to the selection of the companies to whom those contracts for materials were let?

Admiral LAND. You are talking about navy-yard ships now, are you not?

Mr. DITTER. Yes.

Admiral LAND. In the selection of them, it was a matter of wide-open competition—no selection.

Mr. DITTER. There was bidding, was there not?

Admiral LAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. DITTER. When the codes first went into effect, they were quite rigid with regard to the cost of those particular pieces of steel, but they were all according to specifications.

Admiral LAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. DITTER. And there was a certain degree of rigidity with regard to price, was there not?

Admiral LAND. I think that is true.

Mr. DITTER. Even to the extent that there prevailed in many instances a uniform price in the bids as they were made. Is that true?

Admiral LAND. I do not know about the uniformity, although I think that is correct; but in the making of our contracts, they were awarded by taking names out of a hat.

Mr. DITTER. By taking them out of capsules.

Admiral LAND. That is a new name.

Mr. DITTER. They were taken out of capsules, hats, or they were drawn in some other way, were they not?

Admiral LAND. I believe that is correct.

Mr. DITTER. It is a fact that with respect to the letting of contracts for plates and other materials going into the navy-yard shipbuilding program under the P. W. A., it was a matter of lottery or chance with respect to the awarding of the contracts.

Admiral LAND. That has been the case in many instances; yes, sir.

Mr. DITTER. It is also a fact that in practically all cases, or in a large number of cases, the estimated prices for pieces of steel or steel plate were exactly the same in 1933, particularly, and, also, in a part of 1934. Is that true?

Admiral LAND. That is my general understanding; yes, sir.

Mr. DITTER. Four, five, six, or more companies used prices that were exactly the same. Is that correct?

Admiral LAND. On ordinary steel, I think that is correct.

Mr. DITTER. Now, with respect to those items on which there might be absolute uniformity of price, after this codification procedure that you have just referred to, how is an award made to bidders if more than one bidder is on exactly the same price level?

Admiral PEOPLES. If the prices are all uniform, the award is made by lot publicly drawn.

Mr. THOM. Now, let me state your position as I see it. First of all, you are opposed to codes. Now, I do not propose to discuss them. Let us eliminate them. Secondly, if, having codes, they produce equivalent prices, then I think the Army and the Navy are perfectly justified in pulling the bids from a hat and drawing out, for their own protection, the names of the successful bidders;

because otherwise, if the bids were equivalent, the man that awarded that contract would be under suspicion and would be charged with all kinds of wrongdoing, and his only defense is to put the bids in a hat and proceed to draw.

Now, we come to the second situation, in which you say that the drawing process has resulted in two companies getting most of the awards of contracts for steel plates, and that necessarily raises the question whether the scheme of putting the bids in a hat and drawing out the successful bids has been conducted with fairness and equality. That is where your argument is directed, and that is the eventual conclusion of it.

Mr. DITTER. That is correct; and I offer this further observation: Whether, if it has to be done by drawing from hats, it would not be better, under the motive of P. W. A., to spread those contracts over larger areas and provide larger opportunities for employment, rather than centering them in one district under this lottery scheme.

Mr. THOM. That is a perfectly fair question.

Mr. DITTER. Now, let us assume—and, understand, I emphatically say that I have no knowledge, no intimation, that the thing has not been done absolutely honest, and I am not imputing in any way that it has not been honest, for I have a high regard for the Secretary of the Navy, and Admiral Peoples impresses me very highly—but supposing, Mr. THOM, that we have this equality of bidding, and instead of pulling the bids out of a hat, you have a steel concern in your State, and I have a steel concern in my State, and Mr. CARY has one in his State, would not we probably carry out the purposes of P. W. A. and these emergency allotments to provide employment better by having some go into your State, some into Mr. CARY's State, some into Mr. McLEOD's State, and some into my State, rather than presenting the possibility of luck providing all to go into Mr. CARY's State?

I wonder whether the House knows that 29 percent of the allotments requested as of February 27, 1935, by the Secretary of the Navy for emergency funds, are for projects outside the United States.

It was my understanding, and I have heard it repeatedly stated, that these emergency funds were to provide for reemployment here in America. I ask the Membership of the House to what extent reemployment is going to be provided by the expenditure of vast sums of money in Hawaii and Cuba and Puerto Rico and Guam and Alaska. Twenty-nine percent of the amount requested by the Secretary of the Navy is to go overseas. We have spent of P. W. A. money, we have spent of N. R. A. money, such a sum, in addition to the regular appropriation, that I think my distinguished friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN], if he really got into the figures, would probably be prostrate as a result of the examination.

Thirty-one million seven hundred seventy-one thousand two hundred and fifty dollars has been requested by Mr. Swanson of P. W. A. money for projects in Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Panama, Alaska, Samoa, Guam, and Cuba, and if you think that $31,000,000 spent over there is going to give us reemployment, I cannot agree with you.

I wish you would go into these hearings and find the admissions that have been made in these hearings on the result of the N. R. A. program. I again refer my friend on the question of costs to what N. R. A. means to the Navy in this respect—how much our equipment costs, how much our food costs, how much our construction costs have been increased over the amounts which would have been estimated had it not been for these fantastic schemes of your administration to raise prices.

Mr. BIERMANN. The gentleman voted for the N. R. A. bill, did he not?

Mr. DITTER. I voted for it? I did not.

Twenty percent in construction, 18 percent in equipment, 15 percent in foodstuffs, is the percentage, with the admission throughout the record of the hearings that they can be definitely attributable to codes and other programs of a fanciful character to create a spirit and a philosophy of scarcity in this land of plenty.

Mr. BIERMANN. But the increase in the appropriations for next year over this year is more than 60 percent.

Mr. DITTER. Well, I suppose they figure down there that the N. R. A. and the silver program and a lot of the other "brain trust" programs are going to bring about more increases.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 8 additional minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I quote further from the hearings on the subject of codes as they affect the maintenance costs of the Navy and thus have a double barreled effect on the pocketbook of the American people:

Mr. McLEOD. Is the cause of the increase in the cost of food due to the increased number of men?

Captain SCHOFIELD. No; to the increase in the unit price of food.

Mr. McLEOD. Would you say that the increase in the price of food is due to the codes?

Captain SCHOFIELD. Well, I would not be able to say what the price is due to, but the rising prices of food will probably be more fully explained when we come to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, they have to do more with those things, but it was contemplated in this and, I understand, other appropriations that the prices of the commodities would be higher in 1936 than they were in 1935.

Mr. McLEOD. When this budget was submitted to you by the various departments under your jurisdiction, and this increase in the cost of food and maintenance was included, what was your assumption that it was due to—the codes themselves?

Mr. CARY. You did not have to assume anything at all, did you?

Captain SCHOFIELD. No. Whatever it was due to, it would not affect my figures. I simply expected that there would be an increase.

Mr. McLEOD. But you did not form any opinion as to what the increase would be due to?

Captain SCHOFIELD. If I had formed an opinion, I would have said that it was due to the codes.

Mr. DITTER. Admiral, you were connected with this procurement division prior to the time of the codes, were you not?

Admiral PEOPLES. No, sir; commencing just about the same time.

Mr. DITTER. Did you not have some experience in the matter of Government purchases prior to that?

Admiral PEOPLES. Oh, yes; I have had experience for 30 years, sir, in purchasing for the Navy Department, particularly.

Mr. DITTER. Do you know whether or not the number of bidders supplying the various commodities bought by the Government has increased or decreased since the time that the codes have been put into operation?

Admiral PEOPLES. Frankly, Mr. Ditter, I have not noticed any difference. In other words, it has not been brought to my attention in any way whatever that there are fewer bidders under the codes than there were prior to that time. In fact, I think that in many respects it would show the other way. I know of the purchase of a lot of brass pipe for the Navy Department, where there were 78 tie bidders.

Mr. McLEOD. All equal?

Admiral Peoples. Yes, sir.

Mr. McLEOD. And that is due to the code?

Admiral PEOPLES. That is absolutely due to the code, to the system of filing open prices before the bidding.

Mr. McLEOD. Which is a phase of the question that you do not agree with—is that a fact?

Admiral PEOPLES. Exactly, sir.

Mr. McLEOD. The question of open-price bidding as provided in codes, therefore, would have a tendency to increase the prices rather than to decrease them, would it not?

Admiral PEOPLES. Mr. McLeod, the theory of it is that there is competition in advance of the opening of bids, the idea being that bidder A files a price of $1 a pound—that is the open price for him—and you come along as bidder B, and you say, "That fellow is going to bid $1, I will bid 90 cents"; and bidder C says, "I can underbid them, and make it 80 cents"; and bidder D will say, "I will make it 75 cents", and there we know the thing stops, and the lowest filed price then is 75 cents a pound, and then they all bid 75 cents.

Mr. McLEOD. And if this were not done, there might be a bid below 75 cents?

Admiral PEOPLES. Yes.

Mr. McLEOD. That none of the other bidders would know about?

Admiral PEOPLES. I will take the closed method.

The program of the Government to bring the Navy up to treaty strength has received the general approval of the country. Our people, however, continue hopeful that the international arms race may be terminated, and that all nations may refrain from resorting to war for the settlement of international disputes. America has done its part honestly and conscientiously in these laudable endeavors. Those who sponsored these endeavors deserve the commendation of all men. We have adhered to the spirit as well as the letter of the Kellogg Pact. We have endorsed the declaration by which the parties to that agreement condemned "recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and renounced it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another."

We have endeavored to translate the idealism of world peace into the realism of accomplishment. We have accepted the solemn assurances and covenants of other nations without reservation. We have evidenced our confidence in

these covenants by specific and positive acts. Disappointment and disillusionment have been our portion. Upon the other nations rests the failure of the altruistic hopes of mankind for the limitation and the reduction of the armed forces of the world.

Hope for the peaceful adjustment of differences among the nations springs from the nobler endeavors of men and women throughout the world. It is the soul-cry of all people who have suffered from the ravages of war and who have paid an enormous tribute for the panoply of arms. Would that we might end this tribute! Would that we might forever hush this soul cry of despair and anguish! We are not surrendering our hopes for a discontinuance of competitive arms building. The goal toward which we will ever strive and toward which we hope the other nations of the world will turn again is that we may "beat our swords into plowshares, and our spears into pruning hooks; that nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall we learn war anymore." We still pray that fear and suspicion may be dispelled.

I believe we should strive to develop means of avoiding the use of death-dealing agencies with as much fervor as we employ in devising improved methods for carnage and destruction. But, in the light of present world movements, adequate preparation for defense is a primary obligation of our Government. We must ever be mindful of the fact that one of the most solemn obligations placed upon the Federal Government by the Constitution is "to provide for the common defense." Our Navy must always be the most important factor in our national preparedness program and in our defense plans. This does not contemplate a delight in resorting to the fiendish passions resulting from a participation in a struggle of arms. It does not mean that we approve of the atrocities of war or that we invite the somber shadows and mournful incidents growing out of carnage and battle.

Our present program is not founded upon an appeal to fear, nor upon the creation of prejudices, and certainly it is not founded upon the glorification of war or the chivalry of arms. Our purposes are not prompted by the propaganda of war lords or those who profit from human misery. We are still eager that the best efforts of men shall be directed to the enjoyment of the arts of peace.

We love peace, but not peace at any price. There is a peace more destructive of the manhood of living man than war is destructive of his body.—Jerrold.

There are interests by the sacrifice of which peace is too dearly purchased. One should never be at peace to the shame of his own soul, to the violation of his integrity or of his allegiance to God.—Chapin.

I subscribe whole-heartedly to this doctrine.

There is truth in the admonition given by Washington, "To be prepared for war is one of the most efficient ways of preserving peace." From the standpoint of defense, our naval forces must be adequate for our national needs. We endorse the declaration that our program should be "to maintain the Navy in sufficient strength to support the national policies and commerce, and guard the continental and overseas possessions of the United States." Failure to maintain a naval establishment of this character invites difficulties and threatens national safety and security. The maintenance of a greater force imposes an economic burden which cannot be justified. No one will deny that the justifiable strength must perforce depend upon world conditions, upon the comparative naval establishments of the other nations, and upon the attitude of other nations as expressed in their armament programs.

On December 29, 1934, Japan declared its intention of terminating the Naval Treaty of Washington. It is, therefore, a certainty that as of December 31, 1936, Japan will no longer be bound by the limitations provided for under the Washington agreement. Japan has already adopted a program and made the necessary appropriations to bring her naval establishment up to treaty strength in 1936. Great Britain has also inaugurated a program of naval construction which will insure its position on the seas. These nations have been joined by the other leading nations of the world in pursuing a policy of increased construction of naval armaments. We cannot ignore these evidences of activity. We dare not invite the disastrous consequences of unpreparedness. We have but one safe course to pursue, to maintain a Navy in conformity with treaty provisions.

Our national defense, however, depends not alone on battleships, cruisers, submarines, and aircraft. Men, more than materials, will determine the adequacy of our defense. Security is not primarily dependent upon the size of either our Army or our Navy. The strength of America rests upon the sturdiness of the character of her people. The strength of America is measured by the courage, the industry, the thrift, the honesty, the self-reliance, the loyalty and the devotion of her people; homely virtues which have always been the warp and woof of dependable American character. The strength of America depends upon a regard for her traditions, upon an appreciation of her accomplishments, and upon a love of her institutions.

We should not build units for the fleet and at the same time tear down fiber for character. It is inconsistent to expect adherence to peace pacts abroad and at the same time repudiate solemn pledges at home. It is impossible to develop national zeal and at the same time destroy individual initiative.

It is difficult to dispel suspicion among the nations and at the same time foster doubt and uncertainty among our own people. We have as much responsibility in providing for the sinews of character as we have in appropriating for the instruments of war. With the building of fleets let us build men. Let us reestablish an assurance that virtue is more worthy than depravity, that industry is more desirable than indolence, that ambition is more deserving than indifference, that thrift is more profitable than prodigality, and that self-reliance is more estimable than dependency.

Let us strive for a reincarnation of the spirit of the American pioneer and patriot; let us rededicate ourselves to the principles of constitutional government and depend upon the assurance which springs from a conviction that justice, morality, reason, and experience will continue to be the motivations of our national life. Supported by this spirit, our forces will be invincible and our security assured. [Applause.]

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SISSON].

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, I am totally unable to account for the large attendance of Members at this sitting of the Committee this afternoon, except possibly upon the theory that it leaked out that I was going to make a speech. I had intended to keep it a secret. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], who just preceded me, said a good many things with which I agree. He couched in very elegant words, beyond my power and ability to describe—and he was right about it—the feeling the great majority of the American people have for the other countries of the world, and he quoted from the Scriptures about beating the spears into pruning hooks and the swords into plowshares. I wish those eloquent words of his might get to all the nations of the world; but I am very much afraid that the other people of the world, the other governments, are going to see only the fact that we are making an appropriation of $457,000,000 for a Navy for the next year; that we are establishing a policy, as Admiral Standley said at the hearings, involving an expense of $558,000,000 in each and every year to keep up this Navy. And that we will in all probability appropriate for another year pretty nearly, if not quite, a billion dollars for the preparation for war.

Our friends on the committee and my other friends who do not quite agree with me say that it is a preparation for peace and security.

Now, I am sorry I have not anything—I am going to be frank about it—that I am going to be guilty of making a few general remarks and not be able to discuss the details of the bill in its technical aspect.

I think there are very few Members of the House—and this is no reflection on their intelligence and ability—there are

very few who, when they come to vote on the bill tomorrow, are going to know much of anything about it.

As I say, I do not mean any reflection whatever on the very fine subcommittee headed by my friend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARY]. I think they have done a splendid piece of work—only I do not agree with them that $457,000,000 at this time is necessary. I cannot see it, my friends. And I do not mean by that to criticize the committee for the fact that this bill and report were not available until a few minutes before the bill was called up the other day. I do not know whether the hearings were available or not. I did not try to get them, because it has been my experience that it is not of much use to read the hearings until you have the bill and report.

But there were nine hundred and more pages in the hearings. It was a monumental piece of work, and they did the work well.

I do not agree with my friend.

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

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman will certainly admit that if the bill or the hearings were out long before the consideration of the measure that these "war lords"—to which he has referred—would have had a greater degree of opportunity of influencing the Members of the House than otherwise would be possible.

Mr. SISSON. Oh, I don't think so. I think that the munition makers, the steel manufacturers, the Army and the Navy know pretty much all about it. They were your witnesses called before your committee. I did not read the report, but, as I recall the list of witnesses, the only witnesses who appeared before the gentleman's committee were the rear admirals and the other naval officers, and various officers in the Navy Department, including the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Henry Roosevelt, and—oh, yes; there was another gentleman that the committee heard, who was the head of a manufacturing concern that manufactured jackets for propeller shafts. The committee heard him complain because his profits were being cut down by competition from the New York Government Navy Yard. You are not getting very far in taking the profits out of war when the committee does that.

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

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. We heard him because one of the gentleman's distinguished colleagues addressed a request to the chairman of the committee, and the courtesy existing between Members of the House would certainly require the chairman to grant his colleague's request. May I ask the gentleman this further question?

Mr. SISSON. And may I interrupt there to say that I do not intend any criticism of the chairman of the subcommittee or of the gentlemen on the subcommittee for hearing him. I think you ought to have heard him, only when the gentleman makes the statement that if all of these had been made available 2 or 3 weeks ago there would have been some enormous influence exerted by the munitions lobby, I do not agree with him.

Mr. DITTER. Did the gentleman request the privilege of appearing himself?

Mr. SISSON. No.

Mr. DITTER. Or of gathering in any of these groups?

Mr. SISSON. No; I was too busy with another committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, and I would say that that committee is more guilty than the gentleman's. I am not intending any adverse criticism of the chairman of the subcommittee. The practice indulged in the other day is a practice that has grown up, and my own committee is more guilty than the gentleman's, but I think it is a practice that ought not to be permitted.

Mr. DITTER. And may I encourage the gentleman with this further observation: That during the course of the hearings I was visited by some very delightful ladies who are keenly interested in this peace program and who brought all the wiles and charms at their command to try persuade me to their cause?

Mr. SISSON. But the gentleman remained adamant, nevertheless?

Mr. DITTER. To join in the cause in which they are interested, so that they did have an opportunity indirectly to present their cause, and they had their day in court.

Mr. SISSON. I am not saying they did not have opportunity. I was merely replying to the gentleman's observation that if this had been made available for study earlier the war lords would have gotten in their work more effectively than they did.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SISSON. I know that the gentleman is capable of making a better speech than I am, but I have to make a part of this speech myself, because it is in my system and I must get it out. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ZIONCHECK). The gentleman from New York has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I repeat, to make it more emphatic, in what I have had to say and what I shall say I intend no criticism of the subcommittee, who simply have followed a practice which has grown up here which I believe does not afford adequate consideration for important bills.

It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for anyone not versed in the lore and technique of naval tonnage, to compare what this bill will accomplish with the maximum limits of the Washington and London Naval Treaties. As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN] has well said, "The only comparison between our naval force and that of the other great powers, which makes any sense to the lay person, is in the amount of money that we are spending on our Navy, and have spent on our Navy, since the end of the World War, in comparison with what the other nations are spending and have spent since the World War. And as has already been pointed out in the general debate upon this bill, we have already, during the years from 1923 to 1934, inclusive, spent $4,052,000,000 on our Navy alone, as compared with $3,342,000,000 expended by Great Britain on hers, $937,000,000 expended by France, and $1,357,000,000 expended by Japan. If we did not already, prior to 1935, have a Navy second to none then we have been wasting a good many hundreds of millions of dollars.

It is also very difficult and probably impossible for most of the Members of this House to really grasp the significance of this bill, the possibilities of its evil influence upon world psychology at this time when there is so much danger that war hysteria and the fear of each of several nations of the others, may again sweep the world into a war that will be the end of civilization. Instead of doing our part, a part which we are in a better position to perform than any other nation of the world, to act as a stabilizing and a friendly and peace-promoting influence, we are, in passing this bill, doing what is best calculated to cause each of several other great powers to speed up their armament race and do that which is best calculated to bring on war through preparation for war.

I say it is difficult for most of the Members of the House to grasp the significance of this bill and understand or discuss it, because of the way in which the bill has been prepared and the manner in which it has been brought before the House.

My good friend, Governor Tobey, of New Hampshire, pointed out, the other day in making inquiry about this bill, that this bill making an appropriation of $457,000,000 was brought before the House without even a Member of the subcommittee having seen the bill or the report, and that Members had asked for the bill for several days prior to the time when it was called up and for the report on the bill and had been turned down. Members of this House should not with complacency acquiesce in the perfunctory passing of a bill making up nearly a billion dollars for Navy and Army, in preparation for war in a single year, without having more time than has been afforded to study the bill, the report, and the hearings held by the committee. I obtained, on the day that the bill was called up a copy of

hearings held by the subcommittee. They contained 956 pages of printed matter. It is usually not of much use to read the hearings on a bill until you have the bill and the committee report on it. I have read only a small part of the hearings on this bill. I read enough, however, to note that the witnesses, who appeared before the committee were admirals, rear admirals, retired admirals, or other naval officers, with very few exceptions. All of them, of course, were interested in a navy second to none or a navy bigger than all the others combined program. The few exceptions were Assistant Secretary of the Navy Henry Roosevelt, a far more strenuous advocate of brandishing the big stick than his kinsman, the late Theodore; some instructors from the Naval Academy and other members of the Navy Department; and, last but not least, one or more representatives of naval armament manufacturers, one of whom appeared before the subcommittee to protest against what he called the unfair competition to which his particular corporation was subjected in the manufacture of propeller-shaft sleeves for naval vessels by the Government navy yard in New York. When representatives of armament makers are given hearings before our committee on naval affairs to complain because they are not making enough profits, it would appear that we are not going very far, as yet, in our effort to discourage war by taking the profits out of it.

Personally, I think it might be enlightening, even to some of the Members of Congress, if this Congress were to pass a law to compel Army and Navy officers, who are here in Washington, to protect us against invasion and to provide for our defense, to wear their uniforms when appearing before congressional committees or watching the proceedings from the House and Senate galleries or otherwise busying themselves about the Capitol and House and Senate Office Buildings.

I read the following significant statement from pages 1 and 2 of the report:

> The Budget estimates of appropriations for the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1936 will be found in detail on pages 471 to 508, inclusive, of the Budget, and in House Documents Nos. 102 and 138 of the present session. In the aggregate they amount to $485,443,847, which not only seems but is a huge sum, and particularly so when contrasted with the total amount ($284,658,799) carried in the Naval Appropriations Act, fiscal year 1935, and with the totals of such annual measures for prior years; but, of course, a substantial expansion of the naval budget is a natural and anticipated sequence to the attainment of a Navy of the proportions contemplated by existing international agreements to which this Government committed itself when it ratified the Washington and London Treaties and to which end it has more recently committed itself through both funds made available to the Chief Executive for employment in naval building programs and legislation of scarcely more than a year ago authorizing the provisions of funds to build and maintain in under-age status the whole number of our treaty quota of naval vessels and such number of aircraft as may be deemed commensurate with a treaty navy.

That language is somewhat misleading because it implies that what is intended to be a maximum limit is something to which we obligated ourselves in the Washington and London Treaties; which, of course, is not the case. We obligated ourselves not to build beyond it. I am in favor of an adequate Navy for defense, but against whom are we preparing to defend ourselves?

With Canada, a peaceful neighbor on the north, with no defenses, either naval or otherwise, except the custom boats on the Great Lakes maintained by either country between us; with Mexico on the south, certainly against whom we need no Navy; and bounded by the Atlantic and Pacific on either side; we are in no danger of having to maintain a defensive war of any real proportions. And yet, situated more advantageously than any other nation in the world, so far as security is concerned, we are spending more upon our Navy than even England, whose dominions and colonies extend around the world and upon whose territory the sun never sets.

I intend no unfair criticism of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, which held the hearings upon and brought out this bill. The language of their report, which I have previously referred to, would appear to indicate that, as was stated in the press a few days ago—

> The committee itself believed that the huge amount carried by this bill was considerably more than was necessary for defensive purposes.

Whether that was the fact I do not know. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARY], is an able and useful Member of this House. The gentleman was courteous and considerate in extending to me and, I think, the others ample time in general debate on this bill. I intend no personal criticism of him because the bill and report were not available for study long enough before the conclusion of this general debate, so that we could make better use of the time in the debate to inform the House. In his comprehensive remarks in explanation of the bill on Tuesday, he said in part that had we spent a few millions additional for the increase of our Navy in 1914 and 1915, we never would have been drawn into the World War, and implied that proper preparation and defense would have saved the world from the World War. That statement is contrary to the history not only of the World War but of all wars. Germany did not believe that we would ever go into the war, and a great German propaganda was maintained in this country, perhaps not as effective as the propaganda of some of the Allies. We all know now, as we did not know then, as we never know at a time of war hysteria, that it was unnecessary for us to go into the World War and that not one good thing was accomplished either by us or by the other nations.

The effective means of preventing war and securing peace are institutions for the settlement of disputes between nations, just as we have institutions for the settling of disputes between individuals and between our 48 States. Preparation for war breeds war, not peace, just as the preparation of Germany helped to bring on the World War in 1914. Preparation for war such as the gentleman advocates would not have stopped us from going into the war in 1917. It would have unquestionably brought us into the war much earlier than 1917, and the loss in money, lives, and suffering would have been simply that much greater.

A navy second to none would not have saved us nor the rest of the world from the World War. A world court or a league of nations, to which the slight upon the honor of Austria, by the assassination of her Archduke by a Serbian student, in that little obscure town might have been submitted—a place where the nations' representatives might have met around a table and threshed out their differences might have saved the world that fearful catastrophe. It is a pleasing custom among some who cannot reason from cause to effect and discern the end from the beginning nowadays, or was until 1934, to sneer at any attempts to secure the settlement of disputes between nations and to secure international justice through an institution created for that purpose such as the World Court. But no fair-minded, intelligent man can deny that except for the League of Nations a European war would have been brought on in December, last year, by the assassination of King Alexander, of Yugoslavia, and the Premier of France. The causes were equally as potent as those in 1914. Indeed, the editorial opinion of nearly every newspaper in this country was that in December 1934, the League saved the world from another world war.

A navy second to none will not save us or the rest of the world. Naval competition in armament building will not save us nor the rest of the world from another world war. We have done less to promote peace, to secure justice among the nations, far less than we should have done, far less than it has been within our power to do. If you pass this bill in this form, you will be adding just that much to the lack of understanding, the misapprehension, which the nations have of us and which to a great extent we have of them. What are the causes of war? Economic conditions, rivalries, high tariffs, tariff walls. It may all be summed up in a lack of understanding. I cannot guarantee that if we should join the World Court, if we should add the great influence

which we have to that institution, that we could save ourselves and the rest of the world from another war, but I do know that that is the only means by which war can be prevented. We might be able to keep out of another war if our business men and our munition makers are willing to help us preserve our neutrality, but it will be at a fearful price. I am in favor of paying that price rather than again sending our boys to fight on foreign soil. We may be able to keep out of another world war, if one comes, provided that the fountains of information are not again poisoned by the Hearst newspapers and other jingoes. I wonder how long our people will tolerate, I wonder how long this Congress will allow Hearst to influence our foreign policy. More than anyone else, either in this country or elsewhere, Hearst was guilty of inducing this country to get into the war with Spain in 1898. I recall, because I was so eager to get into a silly and unnecessary war that I ran away from home and tried by lying about my age to enlist. I recall the contemptible methods, the lies which Hearst used to create hate against Spain. When he thought that he was not going to be able to force McKinley into the war he called him the living, breeding, embodiment of crime in the United States. He finally did succeed in forcing McKinley into the war. In 1916 he again tried to force us into war; this time with Mexico and as usual for his own personal gain.

I think the amount carried in this bill should either be substantially reduced or the bill should be defeated.

I hope that a motion to recommit will be made, with instructions at least substantially to reduce the amount carried in this bill. The means that we should adopt to secure peace should be such, as advocated by my friend MAVERICK, of Texas, and such as advocated for the past several sessions in this body by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS]. It was never intended that a little group of the United States Senate, one more than one-third, should have it within their power to defeat the will of the people of this country and keep us from adding our influence, our power, to the strength of such an institution for securing justice between nations and preserving the peace of the world as the World Court. The Congress, by a majority vote, has the power, with the approval of the President, to enable us to take our part in that institution for securing justice between the nations. I urge rather than a navy second to none or bigger than all, the support and passage of the bill that was introduced last year in this body and again this year by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS], providing with proper stipulations and conditions for our entry into the World Court.

So far as a navy for defense is concerned, I am for it. I want to repeat what I have said before in this House—that in all the wars in which we have engaged, we have never waged a defensive war. We have never had to defend our own borders. We have never been engaged in a war since the time when we threw off the rule of England, which was necessary for us to get into. I do not except the War of 1812. I do not except even the Civil War. I certainly do not except the Mexican War or the Spanish-American War, both of which were wicked and unjustifiable for us to carry on.

Unless the committee sponsoring this bill is willing to substantially reduce this appropriation, I urge the defeat of the bill.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I have been watching with interest the controversy over the cotton-processing tax. At first blush this might appear to be a private fight and of no particular interest to those parts of the country which neither produce nor process cotton. The vital principle involved, however, is not one of interest alone to those engaged in the cotton industry but is of importance to all producers of agricultural products, particularly those upon which processing taxes are now being collected. If as a result of this controversy the cotton-processing tax should be done away with, it would mean in the end that all processing taxes would go and that the benefits now being paid to farmers under the A. A. A. program would cease. This is not, in my opinion, a political question, but is purely and simply a matter of economics. However, speaking from this side of the aisle, and coming from the banner Republican State of the Union, I do not intend to say anything, nor will it be necessary for me to say anything in the course of these remarks which is not entirely consistent with good Republican doctrine as exemplified in the past.

For many years we Republicans in the Middle West have voted for protection because we believed in it as a matter of principle. We may have had our doubts at times as to whether we were getting as much out of it as other sections of the country, particularly New England, but we stood for the principle just the same and consistently voted in Congress for Republican tariff bills. In our innocence we thought for a long time that other sections of the country which stood for protection were for it as a matter of principle also and that they were willing to apply the principle to all sections of the country alike.

My first disillusionment in this matter came while the 1930 Tariff Act was under consideration and arose over the proposal for a tariff on petroleum. At that time the oil industry in this country was flat on its back. It was in much worse condition than the textile industry now finds itself in in New England. There is no question but what a large part of this distress was due to the importation of crude oil from Venezuela and other countries having low production costs. In our distress we turned to our friends in New England, feeling sure that, having tasted the fruits of protection, we could count upon their help in relieving that portion of the distress which was due to importations. To our amazement and chagrin, we were told that New England was opposed to protection for the oil industry and that its industrial interests demanded cheap, imported oil.

Coming at a time when there was pending in Congress a bill containing great increases in tariff protection for New England interests, it was hard for us to believe that we could possibly be treated thus in what we thought was the house of our friends. To make a long story short, due very largely to the opposition of New England and, I think I should say, in part to the lateness with which the matter was brought before Congress, the 1930 Tariff Act did not contain a tariff on oil. The industry was in such a serious condition and imports constituted such a menace, however, that the fight was carried on and finally consummated in an amendment to the 1932 tax bill which provided for a tax—very inadequate, to be sure—upon imported oil and gasoline. The fight against this tax—which, of course, was nothing more or less than a tariff—was made by New England, and it is interesting to note that the roll call on that amendment, as contained in volume 75, page 7327, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, shows practically every New England Member of Congress, Republican and Democrat, voting against this item. In particular, every Member from Massachusetts voted against this amendment, including, of course, those who are most strenuously opposing the processing tax on cotton.

Now, I do not criticize my good and able friends from Massachusetts for carrying out what they feel are the wishes of their constituents in these matters. I do, however, sympathize with them in having to represent a constituency which is so blind, selfish, and self-centered that it requires its Representatives to assume such inconsistent and ridiculous positions on tariff matters.

Now let us get down to the matter of the textile industry and the processing tax. Concededly the textile industry is in a bad way. It is suffering from numerous ailments, and it is to the credit of the Members of Congress representing districts in which that industry is important that they are doing all in their power to bring about relief. Even if my New England friends proved by their votes that they had no sympathy for the plight of the oil industry in its distress, I am willing to go along with them in any reasonable measure to rehabilitate the textile industry. I do not, however, propose to stand by and see an attempt to rehabilitate that industry at the sole expense of the American farmer. I would make that statement even if I felt that the processing tax was detrimental to the textile industry, which it is not, as I shall presently show.

As it stands today, the processing tax is the farmers' tariff. Every argument that can be made for the tariff can be made for the processing tax, because both are based upon exactly the same principle. If it were possible for the farmer who produces commodities of which we have an exportable surplus to be fully protected by the tariff, then I would say there was no need for the processing tax. With the exception of sugar, processing taxes are not being applied today upon any commodity except those of which we have an exportable surplus. In the case of sugar the processing tax is being applied to compensate for the reduction in the tariff, so that in no instance is the processing tax being used except to complement and supplement our tariff system. That great farm organization—the National Grange—has for years taken a position of not opposing the tariff system but of insisting that all industries must all be treated alike under that system. In other words, if there was tariff protection for one, there must be tariff protection for all. May I say that has always been my understanding of the Republican position on the tariff, and is exactly the position I am taking today. As long as the farmer must buy in a protected market he must have the benefit of the processing tax on products whose price is fixed in world markets. Agriculture has been fighting for this principle for years, and it is not going to give it up at this time, no matter how loud the wails from New England. Whenever you get ready to give up the tariff system, whenever you are willing that the textile industry should operate without protection, then American farmers will be ready to listen to the proposal to take off the processing tax.

The processing tax has not injured the textile industry. Every penny of this tax has been passed on to the consumer, and like other taxes, no doubt in some cases something has been added. The extra cost in the retail price of cotton goods caused by the processing tax has been so little as to be insignificant and has in most cases been much less than the increased cost, due to the operation of the N. R. A. codes. There is no evidence to show that the imposition of the processing tax has resulted in any decrease in the consumption of cotton goods. There is no evidence to show that former consumers of cotton are using competing commodities, and protection against this is expressly provided in the law and regulations, because there is imposed a compensatory tax on competing products. The processing tax does not interfere with our exports of cotton goods because it is provided that there shall be a refund of the tax when such goods are exported. It does not put our domestic manufacturers at any disadvantage as far as imports are concerned, because the amount of the tax is added to the tariff. As a matter of fact, the processing tax is fair and just in every way, and the only basis for the objection to it is that cotton manufacturers are not willing to pay the farmer a fair price for his cotton. This is really the only issue. The fight on this particular item furnishes an interesting sidelight as to the hypocrisy of processors of farm commodities. In appearances before the Agricultural Committee they have consistently maintained that they were in favor of high prices for farm products. They said they wished they could pay more; and yet the first time that machinery has been set up which might enable them to pay more, and do it on a basis which will not be to the disadvantage of any textile manufacturer, we find that their wails and howls fill the air.

The processing tax does not and cannot in any way hinder or interfere with the exports of raw cotton. I think that the policy of Government loans on a basis higher than world cotton prices has resulted in a serious injury to our cotton-export business. I think such loans should be discontinued, or at least made on a basis less than world prices. I think also that these loans have put the textile industry at a disadvantage in making it necessary for cotton spinners in this country to pay more for cotton than their competitors in other countries, but all this has nothing to do with the processing tax. If textile manufacturers desire to render a service to the cotton industry and to themselves, they could well concentrate their efforts on a campaign to do away with this policy of cotton loans.

Now, in conclusion, let me say that if the processing tax on agricultural commodities goes—and it will go on all commodities if this attempt to repeal the processing tax on cotton is successful—then our tariff system goes. This is not a threat, but I am simply stating an economic fact, because under present conditions the American farmer cannot buy in a protected market and sell in a world market. So I suggest to my good friends from New England that they go back to their constituents, tell them to get over their hysteria, tell them that Congress and the country sympathize with their plight, and are willing to help them, but that such help must not be solely at the expense of the American producer of agricultural products. Tell them further that Americans demand fair play, and that they are willing that the American textile industry shall be afforded all necessary protection, but that if it is, the cotton producer, the wheat producer, the tobacco producer, and the producer in every other branch of agriculture is entitled to the same protection. [Applause.]

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN].

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, 37 years ago the United States declared war against Spain. Many of the Spanish-American War veterans are still living, and I do not hesitate to say right now that the amount of compensation which they are receiving from the Government is insufficient. Many of the Spanish-American War veterans are on the relief rolls. They have not been given a square deal and they are not getting one now.

I also want to say a word or two in behalf of the World War veterans. Many of them are also on the relief rolls. Many of those men and their dependents have lost their homes. It seems to me if we would spend some of this money to assist our ex-service men and their dependents, instead of spending it for battleships, we would demonstrate that we have a humane feeling for those men and women who preserved our Nation. I believe that our country should be well fortified, but I do not think it is necessary to spend half a billion dollars for our Navy. If we would spend half of that amount to eradicate the slum districts, it would be a progressive step in the right direction and our crime wave would be reduced considerably. Crime in the United States is costing the Federal Government fabulous sums of money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KNUTE HILL].

Mr. KNUTE HILL. Mr. Chairman, in derision we who oppose war except in case of actual invasion are called pacifists. I, for one, accept the challenge. The first great pacifist was the lowly Nazarene, the Christ. And we dare to call ourselves a Christian Nation! I am a member of no church, but I submit that the very essence of Christianity is action, not profession—mere words.

Members protest that they abhor war. I go far beyond that; I oppose war. Look at the greatest exponents of war. Alexander the Great (God save the mark!), sitting in tears because there were no more worlds to conquer. Grieving not because he could not be of service to mankind but blubbering like a baby because, forsooth, his inordinate lust for power and glory could not be satiated! And Napoleon, that idol of modern war worshipers. A glorified world conqueror and then a miserable exile on the lonely isle of St. Helena. We who have studied our history did not need to read his recently published love letters to know how puny he was, physically, mentally, and morally.

Out along historic Bladensburg Road are the grounds where many a bloody and fatal duel was fought. That was more than a century ago. Today we have advanced far enough to brand dueling as an outlaw, morally and legally. In that day, however, the duelists were the principals. They did not skulk behind their seconds. Today the instigators of war—the Hitlers, the Mussolinis, the Hearsts—incite to war and delude the masses, the rank and file, to fight each other, they know not why nor wherefore.

Individuals no longer arm against each other. Neither do cities, counties, nor States. Then why nations? Only to serve special interests. There were two main causes for our entry into the World War—to swell the already bloated fortunes of the munition makers and the war profiteers, and to distract the attention of the American people from their own economic conditions and problems. It is my humble opinion that if Woodrow Wilson had refused to be led into war and had been wise enough and courageous enough to have given his whole attention to our domestic ills and try to solve these problems in the light of his "New Freedom", not only would there have been a greater luster to his fame but a far greater measure of social justice and security in America today.

It has been stated time and again on the floor of this House that we are sitting on a volcano. Yes; it is too true. But it is a man-made volcano. You cannot stop this human eruption by ridicule and threats as the Hearst papers are daily pouring out against the college youth and the college professors who are really thinking for themselves. Nor can you longer delude the farmers and laborers with mere promises. If you do not remove the cause of this unrest, a standing Army of millions of men and an appropriation of billions of dollars will not quell the disturbance. Only through the avenues of free thought and free expression can we solve these problems and attain recovery through sane reform. It is to stifle this discussion that our war lords are talking about and preparing for the next war. The next great war! Even the sponsors of this bill agree with everybody else that the next great war will destroy civilization. The big air raids, the gas attacks, will spare neither friend nor foe, militarist nor civilian. If it is coming, why prepare for it? It will be complete annihilation. If it is not coming, why prepare for it? It is a snare and a delusion.

Let us see what this "defense program" is. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARY] boasts that our Navy shall be "mistress of the Seven Seas." In "defense" of our far-flung possessions, I presume! And listen to this:

NAVY REVEALS PLAN FOR NEW BATTLESHIPS—BIGGEST AND MOST POWERFUL EVER CONSTRUCTED INCLUDED IN PROGRAM, HOUSE TOLD

The next big step in the administration's naval program will be the building of modern battleships, Representative GLOVER H. CARY (Democrat), of Kentucky, Chairman of the House Appropriations Naval Subcommittee, said today, unless a world naval conference further reduces the number of these men-of-war.

Consideration of the new $457,000,000 naval supply bill in the House revealed that high naval officials already are studying plans to replace obsolete battleships, which cost from $40,000,000 to $50,000,000 each.

BIG SHIPS FAVORED

American naval experts favor building the biggest and most powerful battleships ever undertaken unless a world agreement intervenes. Representative CARY said:

"The administration's naval policy will bring us to the building of modern battleships, unless those we have can be modernized and unless a naval conference changes the situation. They are considered necessary to the Navy and are in the program."

Eleven battleships will be over age by 1937, and with expiration of treaty limits, new ones can be built. Two more ocean fighters will be over age by 1938 and two more by 1940. Since it requires 4 years to build a battleship, high Navy officials are known to favor prompt action on the program.

We quibbled over giving our farmers $60,000,000 for seed loans to raise crops to feed the people and now propose dreadnaughts costing almost that much apiece. In a few years they will be obsolete or sunk in a battle off the coast of Siam. We grudgingly dole out $15 per month to our citizens who have become aged and decrepit in the service of their country and nonchalantly build airplane carriers at $29,000,000 apiece. And then we wonder that we are "sitting on a volcano." The wonder is that we have not been blown to atoms by an exploited and enraged people.

My very estimable friend and colleague from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] spoke yesterday about the cost of war, stating: "Our trouble is not the cost of war. Our trouble is the cost of panics and the depressions which inevitably follow them" (p. 6331, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD). Exactly. All this is the result of war. The grim and ghastly Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse ever ride in the wake of war, and their fearful depredations can be rightfully charged up to Mars, the war god. But let me remind my good friend that he did not count the whole cost. Let him go down across the Potomac to Arlington Cemetery and there sadly count the little white slabs, thousands of them, marking the last resting place of those who thought they were fighting the last war—the one to "make the world safe for democracy." Let him go to Flanders Field and there behold the "crosses, row on row" marking the graves of their brothers in delusion, and then let him tell me the cost of war. Nay, let him count the bitter tears of little orphans, the heavy sighs of grief-stricken widows, the sobbing heartaches of saddened mothers, and then let him tell me the cost of war. Only a merciful God in Heaven can count this bitter cost and forgive his misguided children here on earth. God grant that in my humble way, in or out of office, I may lend my voice and vote for a lasting peace. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENERTY].

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain data I have prepared.

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

There was no objection.

RED MEXICO

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Chairman, in order that I may proceed with my address in unbroken sequence, I request that I be not asked to yield until the completion of that which I hope this afternoon to say to the Membership of this House. And at this outset of my speech I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks that I may also include therein the full text of letters, editorials, manifestoes, articles, statements, and similar papers which, in part, I shall read or which may be otherwise referred to in the course of my address.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Chairman, deeply rooted in the heart and soul of America is the fundamental political principle that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. These rights, which our Nation's founders declared to be self-evident, are held by every man, not by the tolerance or grant of any State but by the laws of nature and the immutable decree of nature's God. It is not within the authority of any government to hamper or destroy them, and the government which attacks them deserves the repudiation and the contempt of all right-minded men. While it is no easy task to enumerate all the rights comprehended under the primal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, it is nevertheless certain, as the Supreme Court of the United States decided in the important case of *Meyer* v. *Nebraska* (262 U. S. 390) that among them is the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience. The constant and unvarying interpretation of the Federal Constitution by our courts sustains our belief that the Government exists to secure the citizen in the exercise of his natural and inalienable rights, and that it may enact no law which destroys them.

To frame a constitution or to enact legislation which renders impossible man's enjoyment of his natural heritage of liberty is not within the legitimate power of government, no matter how constituted. For this inheritance descends to man by the natural law which is "coeval with mankind", and since it "is dictated by God Himself", as Blackstone writes in his celebrated Commentaries—introduction, section 2:

It is, of course, superior in obligation to any other. * * * No human laws are of any validity if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all their force and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.

The legislator who opposes the dictates of this law cannot prescribe a course which is reasonable, or which is profitable

to the community, and since his act in no way reflects the wisdom of the natural law, which is the wisdom of the Eternal Lawgiver, it is in violation of right reason, is not law, and can impose no obligations upon any citizen. An unjust law is a species of tyranny. Meriting no respect, it can evoke no loyalty, particularly from Americans whose principles of government it outrages.

AMERICAN PRINCIPLES ARE CENTURIES OLD

These American doctrines are in accord with the teachings of Christianity, whose most eminent thinkers, such as Bellarmine, Montesquieu, Locke, Thomas Aquinas, Hooker, Grotius, Kant, and Suarez, indicated the rights of the people with which no state or ruler may interfere, insisting that such rights are above and beyond the statutes made by kings and senates, because deriving their sanction, not from the will and power of earthly authority, but from the authority of God and the dignity of man as an intelligent being.

This being so, Mr. Chairman, we are correct in affirming, in true American fashion, that modern political tendencies in some nations have not antiquated or set aside this truth of the Divine source of all authority, for it is not within man's power to destroy that which is true, nor yet within his power to change that which is unchangeable. Truth is fixed and immutable. It is possible to discover new beauty in truth so that it shines more brightly to the eyes of man, but its light cannot be extinguished. Light does not destroy light, but dissolves into it according to the universal law of its essential unity. Nor is it possible to hold that, under exceptional circumstances, a nation may acquire or assume the right to set aside the principles upon which just governments are builded and thus interfere with the fundamental rights of conscience for the supposed good of the state. The state has no title to benefit by wrong, and rights bestowed by man's Creator are beyond the legitimate power of man to suspend or to revoke.

MEXICO SETS UP TOTALITARIAN STATE

The Government of Mexico, by insisting on obedience to a constitution made without reference to justice by a little group of military rulers, contrary to human rights, and never submitted to the people for ratification, declares that the individual citizen has no rights that his rulers are obliged to recognize, that there are no limits to the powers of government, and that the citizen is the mere creature of the totalitarian state. No teaching can more certainly sweep out of existence the sturdy self-reliance of a people, sow discord within and enmity without. The sanctuary of the soul and of conscience the state may not rightly invade. Yet it is precisely this which the present Government of Mexico seeks to do, and then to justify, before the bar of American public opinion, before a people whose national ideals are in direct contradiction to the evil spirit of despotism and tyranny that actuates the laws and rulers now making of Mexico a shocking example of wrong to the civilized world.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we have the extraordinary and shameful spectacle of a foreign government not only filling our country with propaganda in favor of plans and policies so decidedly at variance with American principles, but actually abusing the free franking privilege of the United States Post Office Department to send into our Nation attacks upon Americans and those things which Americans hold sacred, and even attempting to justify and defend among us laws and conduct wholly at variance with the fundamentals set forth in imperishable documents by the fathers of this Republic. Since the Government of Mexico thus submits its case for judgment to a court beyond its own boundaries, pleading not before its own citizens, who, according to its constitution, form the only court competent to pass upon it, but before strangers who claim no jurisdiction over their neighbor's political affairs, the Government of Mexico cannot, therefore, object if the case it has thus presented for judgment be considered in the light of American principles as embodied in our fundamental laws and in the light of Christian principles, since it appeals for the sympathy of Christians; nor, since it claims great zeal for the advancement of its "socialistic" education, if the statements it has presented in support of its pleading be submitted to the test of history.

JUDGED BY AMERICAN TEACHINGS

A comparison of the conception of civil and religious freedom enunciated by the American Constitution and that of the framers and defenders of the present Constitution of Mexico merely emphasizes their entire contrast. To demand American approval for the Constitution of Mexico is nothing less than a demand upon us to repudiate the work of the fathers of our own Republic. We cannot commend the one without registering our condemnation of the other. And what is in this regard true of the constitutions of the two countries is equally so with respect to the laws founded upon them in Mexico and the United States.

I need not enumerate for the Members of this House the rights of the citizen under the American Constitution. They are emblazoned upon every page of our history and written into the decisions of our courts. These rights have stood the test of a century and a half and our people today are undoubtedly more than ever convinced of the desirability of their continuance. For the American Government, fully and frankly recognizing the utility of religion to good government, encourages it to make greater and greater contributions to the happiness of the people, the stability of government, and the reign of order.

In disgraceful contrast to this, the Mexican Constitution and its enforcing acts thrust the citizen into a state of abject subservience to the Government, making him a creature of the dictators who, preaching communism and socialism, have enriched themselves by the debasement and at the expense of Mexico's forgotten people.

MEXICAN CULTURE HAS A GLORIOUS HISTORY

The gross inhumanity and injustice of the present Mexican Government and its oppression of the Mexican people become the more evident if we consider for a moment the possibilities of the Mexican character and the pinnacles of scholarship and cultural achievement to which the native Mexican attained before the anti-God forces assumed control.

Mr. Chairman, two centuries and a half before the Declaration of Independence was written in my own city of Philadelphia, gulf and lagoon in Mexico echoed to the music of Christian praise. The chaplains of the conquerors were still struggling with the hundred dialects of the land when, from Flanders and Spain, came 15 members of the Franciscan Order to receive the warm welcome of Cortes and win the souls and hearts of the natives of Mexico. So indelibly did the sacrificial humility of the missionaries impress itself upon the Indians that they gave to the friars a name that the seraphic Poverello would himself have loved when they called them "Motolinia—poorest of the poor"; and so enduring did the title become that one of the provincials of the order, who later founded churches, schools, missions, and towns from Nicaragua to the northern border, himself baptizing 400,000 souls and holding whole districts in civil and spiritual allegiance, is still affectionately known to history as "Fray Motolinia."

Not less typical of the friars' zeal for the cause of God was the princely kinsman of the Emperor Charles V, Peter of Ghent, who was unceasing in his establishment of churches and schools, whose primary school, with over 1,000 native pupils, gradually developed into a great civilizing center from which teachers and officials went forth for the education of the natives in their own tribal tongues. And it is amazing to realize that this devoted friar found time from his academic labors to translate the hymns of the church into the Aztec language, just as Father Alonzo de Molina composed a Mexican-Spanish dictionary that is regarded by scholars as standard even in our day.

Just as 2,000 years ago it was averred that no good could come out of Nazareth, so there were not lacking a few among the rough European soldiery who thought the Mexican Indian undeserving of the attentive care which the missionaries bestowed upon him. Reports were sent abroad expressing injured amazement that the priests were actually teaching

Latin to the Indians, and with such success that the natives spoke it "like Cicero."

Perhaps the most impressive illustration of this backward attitude of mind toward the native was afforded by the colonists along our own Atlantic seaboard; for, finding here the native North American Indian, no more savage than those the missionaries educated and Christianized, the English colonists adopted as their compelling principle of action the idea that "the only good Indian is a dead one", and destroyed the native races, until today, ingloriously herded into a few reservations, the Indians of this country form less than one-half of 1 percent of the people in the land in which their fathers had hunted centuries before the white man's foot was set on the alien soil.

IT IS NECESSARY TO UNDERSTAND THE INDIAN CHARACTER

To those who, moved by racial antipathy or blinded by historical ignorance, level the shafts of unthinking ridicule at the Indian culture of old Mexico, I say:

Who founded the culture of Mexico? Who created her ancient university and colleges and trade and primary schools? What glory has Mexico that has not been given her by the teachers of whom the Mexican militarist clique would now deprive her people?

Where is the Indian of North America? When England lost her American Colonies, Mr. Chairman, they were taken by descendants of the white man—civilized for over a thousand years—while the dusky native was pursued like a hunted animal across the Alleghenies, over the Ohio and the Mississippi, across the Rockies and the Sierra Nevada, until he sought shelter beneath the cross of the California mission.

In Mexico 90 percent of the people are of full or part Indian blood. There the Indian problem was solved by preservation, by education, and religion. Here the Indian problem was buried beneath the totem poles of the slaughtered natives. It is probably because there is thus no Indian problem here that there is such wide-spread misunderstanding on the part of Americans toward Mexico, and such indifference by much of our press toward that decivilization which is today prostrating our sister land. Such an unworthy attitude may in charity be explained, if not excused, by the fact that our American people as a whole are temperamentally incompetent to value or appraise understandingly a civilization that elevated and preserved the Indian while we exterminated him, or to interpret sympathetically the culture to which Mexico owes everything but her natural loveliness.

The friars' zeal for education of the Mexican Indian, however, was shared by the Queen of Spain, who entreated her subjects to consider him as a free man and a spiritual equal, even as Pope Paul III, as early as 1537, had issued documents condemning slavery in America, giving the Indian equal standing with the white man and asserting his right to the entire heritage of Christian faith.

It is not surprising, then, that so urgent was the desire for education that, during what might be called "the cultural period" in Mexico, there were founded no less than 9,000 churches, each with its own school, academies for adults with a thousand students, trade schools, numerous colleges, like Santa Cruz for Indians and San Juan de Letran for Mestizos, which, in addition to Latin and philosophy, had chairs of music, medicine, and languages, sending forth native graduates to become teachers, mayors, and Governors of the people.

FIRST PRINTING PRESS IN AMERICA

The first Bishop of Mexico, Fray Zummáraga, founded nine schools for Indian girls and an asylum for half-castes. Seventy-six years before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock, almost 90 years before the birth of George Washington, the Bishop of Mexico had had school texts and the Bible translated into Indian and, because of the extensive proficiency in reading taught by the missionaries, he set up the first printing press in the New World, a press which was actively productive of translations, copies, and original works even long before Father Andrew White, S. J., had performed a similar educational service for the American Colonies by establishing the first press in the United States in the little village of St. Marys, in Maryland.

AMERICA'S OLDEST UNIVERSITY

In the meantime the Jesuits, the Benedictines, Dominicans and Augustinians were busily pursuing the same plan of combining secular with religious instruction. The Jesuits founded the College of San Ildefonso, while the Augustinians established that of San Pablo. So wide-spread became the scope of missionary teaching that nearly 400 years ago, in 1553, the church founded the University of Mexico, with all the faculties and privileges pertaining to the renowned University of Salamanca. Ranking in repute with the mighty cultural establishments of medieval and later Europe, from the sixteenth to the beginning of the nineteenth century, when the antireligious group first began its destructive work, this ancient institution in the city of Mexico, the oldest university in America, coequal with San Marcos in Peru, with its affiliated institutions produced a brilliant galaxy of native poets, theologians, dramatists, historians, jurists, scientists, and even journalists, so that, comparing notably with Spanish culture and far outranking that of the contemporary English colonies, the University of Mexico was giving to the world graduates who won international renown generations before Harvard was founded and when the great monumental cities of our western world were still swamps in the prairie.

How many today remember that 200 years before Harvard began the study of medicine, 86 years before Hunter opened the first English school of dissection, the missionary teachers of Mexico had inaugurated the teaching of anatomy and surgery with dissection, while hospitals, like that of Guadalajara, founded 3 centuries ago by Mexican bishops, are regarded as models by American medical scholars of our own generation?

OUR COUNTRY'S DEBT TO MEXICO

American tourists who today gaze with wondering admiration upon the solidity and beauty of our western American missions should not forget that it was Mexico which sent the padres to our western slope. The glory of missionary culture in California was only an extension of the work in Mexico. I wonder how many of those Members of the Senate and House of Representatives who daily pass the statue of Junipero Serra, honored as California's heroic representative in the Hall of the Capitol here in Washington, recall that the beloved Franciscan educator came to us as an ambassador of that Mexican culture which the soviet dictators of Mexico would now have us forget. It was from civilized Mexico that the missionary teachers pushed their way through the uncivilized Mexican territories, through Texas and Arizona, New Mexico, and California.

It was Mexican culture that left the sandal print of missionary feet along every mile of El Camino Real—the royal road of California. It was the Mexican soul that left its monuments along the Rio Grande and the Pacific shores from San Diego to San Francisco. The old records speak in the liquid tongue of the Castilian to tell us that it was not Spain but Mexico that sent the sons of Assisi and Loyola to become the protomartyrs of our land. Through them we share in the impulse and inspiration of faith that Mexico gave to America. Her spiritual treasures become ours, her martyrs, our martyrs. Already, as has been eloquently written into history, our debt to Mexico has been acknowledged by voices which, if they do not all sing the old hymns, yet do all understand something of the message of the singers; if they do not all worship at the old altars, yet do all hold sacred the spots where the padres built them and give to the new cities that surround them the old names, to keep for our great West its traditions, its character, and its unfading charm.

BRILLIANT GALAXY OF MEXICAN SCHOLARS

Modern historians, while eulogizing progress in North America, sometimes forget whose cultural children we are, whose heritage we possess. Have we in America (even though our greatest artists study in Europe), have we produced a greater painter than the Mexican Indian Miguel de Cabrera, or Panduro, or Velazquez? Are our poets or orators superior to Altamirano? Have we produced a professor

like the humble Juan Esteban, to whom pupils were sent from the countries of the old world? What American voices had more of eloquent inspiration than that of Nicholas del Puerto? Is our philosophy more profound than that of Munguia? Have we, even in Philadelphia, the city of lawyers, an attorney whose fame will outlast that of Francisco Pascual Garcia or Sanchez Santos? Cannot our journalists learn from Ignatio Ramirez or Rodriguez or Gavan? Has any surgeon of his time surpassed the ability of Urrutia? What American Indian ever became such an expert Latinist as Adriano de Tlalteloleo? Or such a historian as Valeriano? Have our scientists overshadowed the acumen of Carillo y Azcona? Or our preachers the mental attainments of Bartolome de Alba? Even in political acumen can we ignore Estagnol? Or in intelligent courage excel Mejia? Was it not with reason that Baron von Humboldt testified —even as did the American Ambassador, Henry Lane Wilson, in later years—that no city of the new continent, without even excepting those of the United States, could display such great and solid scientific establishments as the capital of Mexico?

Such, Mr. Speaker, was the Mexico of other days, before the war drums broke out in the first quarter of the nineteenth century—Mexico during 3 centuries of such tranquillity as had not been known during that period to any other country, European or colonial, throughout the world.

ANTIRELIGIOUS GROUP SEIZES CONTROL

What, then, must be said of that system of antireligion that has now persisted in Mexico for 100 years when we recall, as a brilliant English writer has averred, that at the beginning of the nineteenth century, when the antichurch forces first assumed control, Mexico had proportionately more colleges and less illiteracy than Great Britain, whereas today her great university is closed, her colleges confiscated, her people cast into an abysmal ignorance imposed by the machine guns of a mongrel minority?

Is it any wonder that illiteracy today abounds in Mexico, when you recall that her greatest civilizing and educating force, the church, has for a hundred years been ostracized from the classroom? Children may not be brought to the Christ who asked that they be suffered to come unto Him. They may only be brought to Calles and his degraded votaries who demand that they be made the custodians of the conscience of childhood. For three-quarters of a century the church has been a constitutional outlaw, forbidden to exercise her cultural influence on the life and conduct of the Mexican people.

During the 50 years after the break with Spain there were 57 Mexican Presidents and numerous wars. A peaceful interlude under the benevolent dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz enabled education and religion to regain something of their lost inheritance. But when, in 1910, President Diaz began to look with disfavor on certain oil interests affecting the United States, believing that his country was being unduly exploited—though he was probably correct, as is evidenced by the fact that Americans owned half of Mexico's wealth—nevertheless that decision cost him the Presidency of his country.

AMERICAN INTERFERENCE WITH MEXICO

By a strange coincidence, a convenient revolution broke out with help for the rebels from the United States. You will notice that our Government is not really bashful about intervening in Mexico when oil or other material interests are at the base of the problem. America has interfered in Mexico a dozen times and invariably against the best interests of the Mexican people. There was a ray of hope for Mexico when Victoriano Huerta became President. Peace and prosperity were presaged when for the first time since Mexico became a republic, President Huerta opened Congress in the name of God, as our own sessions here begin, and urged it to pray that God's law and concord would reign.

The far-seeing diplomacy of Great Britain and Germany recognized the government of this unusual Mexican leader and the American Ambassador and consuls recommended that the President of the United States extend similar recognition to what appeared to be a stable de facto government. But after the oil companies had protested with many unctuous tears, the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, according to his closest confidant, Col. Edward House, entered into a secret covenant secretly arrived at with Sir William Tyrrell, as a result of which Mr. Wilson induced Congress to reverse its own and his position on the Panama Canal tolls question, allowing British ships equal privileges with our own in the use of the Canal, in exchange for which concession England agreed to repudiate the recognition of Huerta by her own Ambassador and permit Mr. Wilson to have a free hand in Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, it was from this action that there followed the orgy of anarchy and persecution that today is culminating in the sovietizing of Mexico. Carranza, Obregon, Calles, all of these parasitical bandits, secured their position by American intervention. Arms and munitions were sent to Carranza in his attack upon the real government of the Republic, and when the American Secretary of War, Josephus Daniels, by order of President Wilson, sent the American marines to Vera Cruz in 1914, the oil interests were jubilant. Huerta was banished from the Presidency and died asking God's forgiveness for President Wilson, who, he said, never really understood. Revolution flared forth throughout Mexico with America supplying the fuel. Between four and six thousand religious schools, tolerated during the Diaz regime, and numerous libraries and priceless manuscripts, were confiscated or destroyed. Colleges were turned into barracks, the Carranzistas stabled their horses in the churches, priests were murdered, nuns tortured, altars defiled, religion desecrated, God mocked by decree and word and act. Illiteracy, irreligion, vice spread over the land as Mexico lay helpless under the American guns supplied to the bandits. Carranza showed his contempt for the power of the United States by expelling the American Red Cross, just as the present Mexican Government has expelled the Red Cross of Spain. The next day President Wilson extended American recognition to him as the leader of the Mexican people.

Truly the sun had set in blood upon the Mexican hills. It was night—dark as that which Moses laid upon the land of Egypt—black, dismal, murder-filled night, lighted only by the distant glow of incendiary fires; and out of the dark and the terror, with the cunning of the native coyote, stalked a stealthy, animal-like creature, capable of any crime not requiring courage—Plutarcho Elias Calles, the Red Czar of the Montezumas.

THE RED CZAR OF MEXICO

Who is this man Calles, leader of the Revolutionary Party, the present Stalin of Mexico? Who is this half-breed murderer whose name will be remembered, if at all, only as a synonym for brutality and communism—the illiterate son of a Syrian peddler who by sheer disregard for humanity has secured for himself control of the armed minority? Styled "The Turk" by the Mexicans who suspect he is of alien blood, and therefore never qualified for the Presidency; fresh from the haunts of vice, after a youth of crime and violence; a bandit leader, despised even by Madame Kollontai, the Bolshevik representative, having little by little gained control of the army by the simple process of assasinating his competitors, he announced his candidacy for the Presidency and held an election, in which his opponent, Flores, received the votes, but, as Mr. Calles counted them, he rose to the presidential sash and the palace of Chapultepec. There he entertained and wined and dined with American representatives, chambers of commerce and other organizations which occasionally hold none too laudable conventions in Mexico, where they are shown exactly what the Government wishes them to see, and are then addressed by Calles, who finds it difficult to conceal his contempt for their gullibility.

Having stolen the municipal funds as a village treasurer, Calles now takes charge of the national treasury, from which he has paid out millions of pesos to finance revolution in Nicaragua and communistic propaganda in Mexico and Central America.

Having failed in youth as a primary-school teacher in Guaymas, he later seeks to reform the whole educational system of Mexico and boasts of having closed over 20 colleges.

Having been unsuccessful as a farmer at Santa Rosa, where under his devoted care the ranch became bankrupt, he introduces an agrarian scheme destructive of Mexican agriculture.

Having been a failure as an industrialist in charge of a flour mill at Fronteras, he later issues edicts ruinous to many Mexican industries.

Never having studied economics, he embarks on an economic revolution that has inflicted untold hardship on the Mexican people. Posing as a friend of the Indian, he makes inexcusable attacks upon them. Pretending to be a friend of labor, he merely uses labor, as did Lenin, as a stepping stone to power, and he did not hesitate to slaughter workmen during a Sonora strike, and then having murdered some of them, he forced the rest to return to work for 6 cents a day.

Never having attended any church, he founded a church of his own. Having spent a youth of shiftlessness, dishonesty, and poverty, he has now become a multimillionaire by the wanton seizure of haciendas and farms, of public lands in Vera Cruz, of oil wells, mines, and other valuable interests, in addition to forcing all employees to join a union to which they are obliged to pay 10 percent of their wages—to be managed by him.

Mr. Chairman, this is the power behind the Presidential chair in Mexico City, a man who, lifted into power through the subservience of an American administration, is sustained by the continued sanction of our present Government. He it is who is the "deus ex machina"—the man who pulls the strings—a man who is compelled to live on an island off the coast so that he may not be murdered by the oppressed people; the high-souled liberal who is responsible to the world for the enforcement of the communistic laws that today make the Mexican Government at once the execration and the laughing stock of the civilized world.

DESTRUCTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Under the system of Communist philosophy imposed upon Mexico by the guns of Calles and his official murderers, human liberty has gasped and died. Freedom of religion, of education, of speech, of the press, of assembly, of petition, of individual opportunity are destroyed under the scourge of a persecution that has won for Calles the unenviable blood aureole of a Caligula.

For, according to the prevailing oppressive regulations, the God-fearing citizen has practically no rights that anyone is bound to respect. No religious organization may own land or mortgages or any other productive property. If it have any money, however little, it may not invest it, and if it retain it, it will be stolen. Though its members be teachers, it may not conduct schools. Though it be dedicated to the poor and the lowly, it may not administer charities. Though in need of help, it may not solicit funds. Services are permitted only in certain authorized buildings, so that for future purposes the officials of the Government may know who the ministers of religion may be. But the right to wear a distinctive garb is denied, so that the poor may not recognize the spiritual leaders of the people.

If more than 10 persons gather at a house and conduct religious services, the house is confiscated, even though the owner knew nothing of the service. Though the antireligious constitution was never approved by the people or their representatives, no religious spokesman for the people may criticize the laws or even vote for their repeal. No minister of any creed may hold office or conduct an assembly to petition the Government to modify its tyrannical persecution of all religious faiths. All churches, asylums, orphanages, seminaries, convents, religious schools, and residences, with every object in any way pertaining to religion are confiscated by the parasites now enriching themselves at the expense of Mexico's underprivileged people.

Catholics in particular are spied upon, their wires are tapped, their mail opened, their publications banned, their organizations destroyed, even their secular newspapers suppressed for refusal to uphold the policies of the atheist dictators. Liberty in the American sense is totally nonexistent, for no political group may even adopt a name which indicates its belief in the Creator.

MEXICAN REFUGEES FLEE TO UNITED STATES

With poverty and distress on the increase, with thousands of refugees fleeing across the American border to seek food and shelter and clothing and employment from the relief organizations and overburdened taxpayers of this country, the Mexican Government has destroyed private charity by decreeing that every charitable society of more than 10 persons must be controlled by the money changers now selling the Mexican nation into slavery. Under this system the religious citizen, even if starving, can sustain his life only by the surrender of his faith, for the hope of private charity from religious organizations is destroyed by the provision that no minister of any church may inherit property except from certain blood relatives, and if it be anyhow devised to him, it is appropriated by the political despots now misgoverning the land. As a result of such policies, I am informed that Mr. Calles is now the third largest depositor in the Bank of England. Even the Home for the Aged in Mexico City, founded by the wife of President Diaz, was ordered closed, and then reopened after the aged destitute had been deprived of the gentle ministrations of the Little Sisters of the Poor who, upon their expulsion, sought refuge in Cuba and in Spain.

In Querétaro all public employees who are Catholic or married by a priest are subject to dismissal. Federal employees have been discharged for failure to parade in the Government's public demonstrations against God and religion. Internes at the Juarez Hospital have been dismissed from their treatment of the invalid poor because they refused to take part in a similar anti-God ceremony, and, since under the law the Mexican physician is obliged to complete his interneship in the country, this is equivalent to the disbarment of decent doctors from their profession.

In Huijutla, imprisonment is the penalty for teaching religion. The Mexican Indians, whose ancestors, under the guidance of religious teachers, produced eminent scholars in all walks of life, are given small pieces of property only on condition that they promise never to go to Mass or receive the sacraments of their church. If they refuse, and a large proportion of them refused with scorn, their humble homes are sacked for religious images, which are confiscated and burned.

GOVERNMENT MURDER POLICY IN MEXICO

The fidelity of the Mexican clergy to God has been characteristic of them. For instance, from 1926 to 1929 over 200 priests were murdered because they clung to their faith. The Government had given them every inducement to apostatize. They were offered Government positions. As educated men, they were offered special privileges and rights and incomes. They were threatened with prison, exile, death, if they refused to yield. Surely must they have had something of the constancy of the early Christians under Nero, for not one surrendered his belief to the Government's blandishments or threats. The Mexican representatives, paid and unpaid, in this country may shout their denials of persecution to the top of the Washington Monument, but they cannot wash from their hands the blood of the 29 priests murdered in the last few months or the hundreds of clergy wantonly butchered within the past few years—crimes for which no murderer was ever tried!

MEXICAN AGENTS DISTORT FACTS

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the hirelings of the Mexican soviet continue to say that there is no persecution in Mexico. Piously they raise their eyes in holy amazement and deny that there is any violence done to any citizen because of his faith. If I were a diplomat or a politician, I might say that these Mexican representatives are unconsciously misinformed as to the true facts. But being an ordinary garden variety of Philadelphia lawyer, who spent most of his years since coming to the bar in prosecuting criminals and detecting fraud, I have no hesitancy in asserting that the Mexican hirelings are a rather nondescript variety of undiluted and unmitigated liars.

Any paid propagandist who could not manage a more plausible falsehood than these Mexican representatives should make a reasonable and occasional effort to tell the truth.

No persecution in Mexico! Mr. Speaker, let me read to you and the House this excerpt from an article by S. L. A. Marshall in the New York Times:

The question is asked whether religious persecution is occurring in Mexico. The answer depends upon one's understanding of the word "persecution" and the permutations whereby that which is, in fact, persecution may be made to appear as an act of spotless legality.

As a case in point, five men were killed in a riot while I was at the village of Guadalupe. The riot was precipitated when a squad of judicial police was assigned to take inventory of the abbot's furniture. Their method of going about what should have been a peaceful mission was to break in a window and then arrest the abbot for not opening the door. Word spread about the village that the "red shirts" were murdering the abbot, a thousand Indians swarmed to the rescue, and the deaths resulted.

Or let me take you to Querétaro. The hour is sun down, and we walk down the long hill from Convent de la Cruz where Maximilian awaited his firing squad. Slogging toward us comes a file of Indians. Feet bare save for their hand-made guaraches, faces muffled to the eyes in their drab zarapes, they walk mechanically like men moving in sleep, glancing neither right nor left. The guard halts them opposite us.

We ask: "What crime have these men committed?"

The guard answers: "They were caught breaking into a church."

"Did they intend to rob the church?"

"No; they wished to enter and pray."

The churches of Querétaro are padlocked. The Indians violated property in State custody by attempting to enter. It was all quite according to law, and hence no persecution was involved!

Yes; it was all legal, all proper and chivalrous according to the military soviet now misgoverning the land beyond the Rio Grande. As Benen once wrote in the Far East:

You may speak of Christ to the savage, you may raise the Cross on his land,
To the Yukon go, to the Ganges go, but halt at the Rio Grande!
The Mongol will never molest you, you are safe with the dark Malay;
But bring Christ's sign to the Mexican line and a "gentleman" bars your way.

You may build a hut in the jungle and kneel at your altar there,
And a barbarous chief will thank you for teaching the ways of prayer;
But speak of their God to the children in Our Lady's land of the South,
And a highly "civilized" señor will show you his pistol's mouth.

No Indian rajah jails you if he sees you with stole and pyx;
You will find no Dyak head-hunters thieving your crucifix;
The convert redskin's honor is free of the robber's smirch—
It takes a "civilized" señor to strip the walls of a church.

Ay, sometimes the heathen's sword blade has martyred the priest and nun;
In a raw and ignorant frenzy the puerile thing was done;
But this is no band of Zulus that down on the orphanage swoops—
'Tis a highly "civilized" señor with his highly "chivalrous" troops.
You may speak in Mexico City in the name of Lenin the man,
You may speak in the name of Mammon, you may speak in the name of Pan,
You may speak in the name that is legion, you may speak in the name of hell
And you're safe. But speak in the name of Christ—there's a different tale to tell.

The teaching that tamed the vandal, the spirit that chastened the Goth,
The wisdom that gave us Christendom, sole check on man's lust and wrath,
You may spread it in cave or igloo, but not in your Mexican school—
It displeases a "civilized" señor and it's banned by his "civilized" rule.

To Christ in His living members, Good Friday comes anew.
To be honored thus by the world's dark hate is proof of their lineage true.
The spittle is flung on the Kingly Face, the thorns pressed down on the brow,
And Our Lady of Guadalupe mourns—she is Mother of Sorrows now.

"I must follow the laws of the nation", he says, and so echoes the cry
Of the Deicide rabble: "We have a law, and by that law let Christ die!"
So the minions of Nero were righteous? And Robespierre's ethics unflawed?
"Give unto Caesar", your gospel runs, "the things of both Caesar and God."

And the gentle women you harass—we know them and know their works.
Do you hate them for serving, fearless, where the deadly fever lurks?
Do you hate them for shielding the orphan, for keeping the child's soul white?
Is your warfare waged against them for this, O most doughty knight?

You may speak Christ's Name to the savage, you may raise the Cross on his land,
To the Ganges go, to the Yukon go—but halt at the Rio Grande!
Eat bread and salt with the tribesman—he will honor and guard his guest;
But break God's Bread for peon unfed—there's a señor's gun at your breast!

"A DANIELS COME TO JUDGMENT"

To add to the burden of the poor people of Mexico in their fight for freedom of conscience, our Government has sent as our Ambassador to that country a man who apparently is intellectually incapable of understanding Mexico, its people, or its traditions. Without impugning his motives, it is at least amazing that at the very time the people of Mexico are being persecuted for attempting to practice any form of religion, at a time when the Mexican Government is admittedly imprisoning and mistreating innocent men and women for daring to display any faith in a Creator, when Government employees and medical students are discharged for refusal to join in official public manifestations against God, and Americans are deprived of freedom of worship, our erratic Ambassador, according to an Associated Press dispatch of last Sunday, blandly and inanely says:

They—

the Mexican people—

deny there has been any religious persecution.

As a sample of ambassadorial stupidity, Mr. Speaker, there is a choice morsel for you. Actually the lists of official outrages upon Mexico's persecuted people show that thousands upon thousands of crimes from murder to mere overnight kidnaping have been committed by the Government officials in the name of communism and atheism in Mexico. Our Ambassador somehow never hears of them, although millions in every country in the world have the actual proofs of their perpetration and there are affidavits here in this city citing the abuses to Americans.

In addition to this, in the Weekly News Sheet of April 12, sent free through the American mails by the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs, there is a copy of a radio speech by our Ambassador in which he turns press agent for the Mexican communists in an effort to round up some trade for the Rotary Convention in Mexico and says:

* * * They—

The Mexican people—

are going forward in education.

And so forth. And yet, at the very time he is uttering these words, Mexico is dedicated to a system of socialistic education that, as I shall show you in a few minutes, instills hatred of Americans into the minds of the young, that boasts that God is excluded from Mexico, that brings the most perverse forms of degenerate immorality into the classrooms, and compels the children to greet their teachers with the morning salutation, "Good day, teacher, there is no God!"

President Roosevelt knows all this—or he should. And yet he smiles and smiles and plays Pollyanna while men and women die and little children suffer in body and in soul.

COLLEGE STUDENTS CONDEMN MEXICAN OPPRESSION OF LABOR

It is but natural that the educated citizens of Mexico should condemn the tyranny now prevalent there. A strong group of college students arose to protest the 6-year plan, but the newspapers, completely cowed by the Government, refused to carry a line concerning the students' action. The Theresian College for Women in Mixcoac was, only a year ago, surrounded by Government agents who announced that they had come to assume control. The students, knowing the Government and its agents, refused to submit, locked themselves in the building, held their position for 5 days, and faced starvation as a protest against the closing of their

school. Three hundred of them pledged themselves to die as martyrs rather than submit to the sacking of their college by a group of God haters. Fearing that the example of this brave revolt might inflame other student groups and dreading the possibility of this news reaching the outside world, the Government made the students a number of promises. If they submitted, their school was to be left untouched and their rights respected. At the end of the fifth day the 300 young women accepted the promises and left the school. The moment they had done so the Government violated its pledges and seizure and confiscation ended the existence of their beloved institution.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Chairman, that the Federation of University Students of Mexico, in Mexico City on February 25 last, issued this manifesto?—

The people of our country suffer misery and hunger. Innumerable working men's strikes have been called all over Mexico. The Workingmen's Syndicate of the El Mantes region, in the hacienda of El Mante, property of Plutarco Elias Calles; in the hacienda San Fernando, property of Rodolfo Elias Calles, in the hacienda El Guayalejo, property of Aaron Saenz; and in the well-known contracting company, the F. Y. U. S. A., whose principal stockholders are Calles, Saenz, and their political associates; in all these centers of production the laborers have tried in vain to improve their working conditions by means of unsuccessful attempted strikes. Their petitions have been rejected by all the above-mentioned property owners who are no others than the very ones who preach official socialism and who call themselves the "deliberators" of the proletariat. This fact completely proves the selfishness of official socialism and clearly proves before public opinion that the laboring classes are yet the victims of the abuses and the vexations committed by the men in power—the protégés of Calles.

CHILDREN DEBAUCHED BY PERVERSE SEX TEACHINGS

You can readily understand the fear that today grips the youth of Mexico when you remember that Mexican children in primary coeducational grades have been stripped naked to illustrate the facts of sex. According to writers in American publications, animals have been introduced into the classrooms to further the same ends. As stated by a writer of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin for March 19, 1935, (p. 14):

Sex education is being frankly propagated as social education. Children just out of the kindergarten are to study nude pictures of men and women, with the inscription "This is nature."

Children in some localities were even taken to maternity hospitals to witness that which in all other countries is considered to be in the exclusive domain of the physician. One child went mad as a result of this experience.

This sexual system began under Tomas Garrido Canabal, as Governor of Tabasco, and extended to Sonora, where Calles' son is Governor, and in at least eight other States in accordance with instructions of Secretary of State Bassolls, who enforced it in the Federal District until stopped by the protests and demonstrations of some 60,000 outraged parents.

The Mexican consul general who these days apparently has a set-up line of type waiting—like a trained firehorse—which reads: "It is untrue. I deny it, whatever it was." Well, the Mexican consul general denied these facts when news of them first reached the United States. Unfortunately for the official Mexican denial man, his denial contradicted the Mexican press and his own State records.

The Secretary of Public Education in Mexico issued in January of this year a pamphlet in support of sexual education prescribing for teachers the official program for sexual instruction. This, as published in Excelsior, of Mexico City, January 9, 1934, ran a set of headings for boys of the sixth grade in primary schools that are too obscene to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States Congress, and a more detailed list for sixth-grade girls which was even more indecently specific. It included the minutest detail of every organ and function concerning propagation of the species. It also contained such naked details of sex as are taught only in medical schools of civilized countries.

Excelsior, of January 14, 1934, informs us, moreover, that the Secretariat of Education was distributing gratis to all Mexican children, thousands of pamphlets on sexual education and other productions, which even Excelsior refrains from describing because, as it states:

We feel that the ribbon of the typewriter on which we would type them would turn from black to red. They are calculated to awaken the most brutal instincts and excite the most feverish passions of lust.

That the Secretary of Education and General Calles' favorite, Governor Garrido Canabal, of Tabasco, did prescribe and have enacted the naked exposure of the sexes in mixed schools for object lessons in sexual instruction, the consul general in El Paso may find recorded in Excelsior and Universal and the general Mexican press; and any of the 400 Mexican mothers who braved Bassolls' soldiers to protest to him against these outrages will tell the consul all about it.

He can get it also from the 25 schools of Mixcoac, in the Federal District, that went unanimously on strike when Bassolls rejected the parents' protests; and from the 600 in the city school that revolted against their director of sexual methods, denouncing her as a "she-wolf", and from all the daily papers which record these events.

But all this, and more, and worse, the consul knows very well. He also knows that this is the meaning of the socialistic education which his headmaster Calles is just now having his Congress inject into what they call the Mexican constitution. And yet he denies what all the world knows to be true!

GRAVES OF DEAD MUST BE MARKED BY A NUMBER

Indeed, so inhuman is this Government, dominated by men who for 30 pieces of silver would not hesitate to burn a house or cut a throat, that they have even disturbed the ashes of the dead. Monuments of faith have been demolished and in certain sections of the country these vandals have ordered the removal of Christian names from the tombstones, so that, forfeiting their repose and even their identity to the communist state, the dead must now be marked by a number.

PERSECUTION OF PROTESTANTS

When you consider that the Catholic faith is the belief of nine-tenths of the Mexican people, you will realize what an easy step it is from persecution of the Catholic to persecution of all other religions. According to the Christian Index of Atlanta, the organ and property of the Baptists of Georgia, in its issue of November 15 last, the Baptist missions were closed because of the Socialist program of education and the law on religion. That my colleagues in this House may know the extent to which the Mexican dictators have carried their excesses against decency and religion, I feel that I should read to you part of the announcement:

* * * The Government of Mexico has put on an extensive socialistic program of education throughout the Republic. They have placed a ban on the teaching of all religions. The Bible is excluded from all schools, and they have now closed our Baptist Theological Seminary at Saltillo. All church properties being federalized, they have passed into the hands of the Government. Some of our Baptist churches have already been taken over as offices for school superintendents, mayors, or other public officials, and the Mexican flag is now flying from the steeples of Baptist churches. * * *

The Mexican Government is determined to exclude Catholicism in all of its phases from the Republic, and in doing so, of course, they are excluding all Baptists, Presbyterians, and Methodists alike. * * *

The Protestant Review, Puerto Rico Evangelico, which had hitherto been a defender of Calles, now denounces his Government, complaining that Protestants are prevented from placing crosses and inscriptions in their cemeteries and that Christianity is "shackled in the dungeon of governmental tyranny." And last fall it was reported that the Methodist school at Guadalajara has also been closed, while even the Mormon meeting houses have been closed in Chihuahua, despite the fact that the Mormons were in genuine accord with the requirements of the law on religious worship.

ANTI-JEWISH POLICY

It is apparent, too, that anti-Semitism is raising its ugly head with the benediction and approval of those high in the councils of the Mexican Government. The writer to whom

I referred a few minutes ago noted in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin for March 20 that as he was inspecting some projects with a central department official, the Mexican pointed to a street of small shops near the National Palace and said:

In 2 years all this will be changed. These shops are now run by Jews. We are widening the street and rebuilding the stores. When they are open again there will be no Jews.

Very justly and wisely has the editor of the American Hebrew condemned the Mexican persecution in vigorous terms. But remembering the perennial perseverance of the Children of Israel, I imagine that it might have been more accurate to say that the Jews will be there after there are no more Calles officials left to persecute them.

A MILLION PROTESTS

The protests that have deluged our State Department and the White House in hundreds of thousands, and by this time totaling millions of our citizens, have been representative of every religion, of every profession, of every station of life in America. Catholics, Protestants and Jews have not hesitated to raise their voices in vigorous and emphatic demand that our Government arouse itself to the fact that the Rio Grande is now our bolshevist border and communistic propaganda is daily being poured across the boundary into our country. To say that America has no right to intervene is entirely missing the point. No one has ever asked for American intervention and no one expects it. But, nevertheless, President Roosevelt has it in his power to stop the Mexican persecution if he has the will to do so. Mr. Speaker, Americans are being robbed and murdered—and yet the White House remains silent, timidly hoping that things will somehow right themselves.

Outstanding Americans like Newton D. Baker, Alfred E. Smith, Bainbridge Colby, Prof. Carlton J. H. Hayes, Roger W. Straus, Fiorello LaGuardia, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, and others have not been so timorous in asserting human rights. Independent newspapers throughout the land have repeatedly condemned the Mexican Government policy.

Some weeks ago 500 clergymen, 5 Catholic and 495 of other faiths, signed a statement of condemnation. In Detroit a meeting was held at which the speakers were Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, and later in Brooklyn, a meeting was held in which the speakers were a Presbyterian minister, a Jewish rabbi, and a Catholic layman, the resolution of protest being offered by a prominent Methodist layman. Innumerable mass meetings of protest have been held in every State.

At least five States, Arizona, Illinois, New York, Massachusetts, and Maryland, have adopted resolutions demanding an inquiry into the Mexican situation.

Rabbi Philip Bernstein, who recently returned from Mexico, in a strong protest against the Mexican persecution during a recent sermon in Temple B'rith Kodesh in Rochester, N. Y., gave a luminous illustration of how the Mexican antireligion laws affect individual cases. He said:

I was standing in the antechamber of the priest's office in a little church on the Avenue Enrico Martinez, in Mexico City, when a girl rushed in weeping. She begged the secretary to let her see the priest at once, for her mother was dying and the last rites had to be administered immediately. The secretary explained in as kindly a manner as possible that the priest could not come for many, many hours. He reminded her that according to the law of Mexico there was only one priest allowed for every 50,000 inhabitants and that the priest, working day and night, could not adequately care for the needs of so many people. Others also were dying and this girl's mother would have to wait her turn. "But my mother may die in the meantime", sobbed the girl. "I am sorry", said the secretary, his face expressing sorrow and pity, "but we cannot help it."

Here was the first striking and tragic evidence of religious persecution in Mexico. A recent governmental interpretation of the antireligious constitution of 1917 limits the priests in most of the Mexican States to 1 to 50,000 of population. Obviously, no priest can serve so many people. In certain States of Mexico, as, for example, Sonora, Tabasco, Vera Cruz, Yucatan, and several others, not a single priest is permitted to officiate. How in the face of these facts known to every Mexican, President Cardenas can deny the existence of religious persecution in Mexico is hard to understand. That it was insincerity rather than ignorance which prompted his public denial recently is revealed clearly by the fact that on the very day he issued his denial to the assembled foreign correspondents, the press announced that several additional churches had been confiscated by the Government for secular purposes.

Is it any wonder that Rev. Dr. W. W. Van Kirk, of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, in an address before the State Federation of Women's Clubs in Buffalo, declared that Mexico is "bent on the extermination of all religion" and that the time has come "to think less of the things that divide us and more of the things that unite us"?

EFFORTS TO DEGRADE MEXICAN CHILDREN

The intent of the Calles faction to reduce the youth of Mexico to complete atheism and communism is evidenced by the fact that, as I told you a few minutes ago, in the State schools the children are not only debauched by public instruction in immorality, but they are taught to recite antireligious verses, just as our children recite the multiplication table. For example, "Uno, dos; no hay Dios", or as we might translate it, keeping the rime, "One, two, three; no God for me"!

Mr. Chairman, you can read the purpose of this campaign against all religion in the succinct and blasphemous utterance of a public official, Arnulfo Perez, of Tabasco, who said: "The revolution means to burn and destroy the images of the saints, to grab from the paws of religion all men, women, and children, to fight the clergy and—we must courageously say it—fight God." And you can find a real clue to the Mexican Government's attitude and intent supplied by the Calles' Governor of Tabasco, now a member of the Mexican cabinet, who gave his paternal blessing to his three sons in typical fashion when he named them "Lenin", "Lucifer", and "Satan."

MEXICAN GOVERNMENT UNITES WITH RUSSIA

There seems to be no doubt that the entire Mexican campaign against God and morality is sponsored by communist Russia. Ignoring such childish extremists as the Under Secretary of Public Education, Ignatio Garcia Tellez, who issued an order that, in deference to communism, all offices of the department must use only red ribbons on their typewriters, yet it is true that original documents are at hand in both Baltimore and Washington showing a definite link between Calles, supreme chief of the Mexican revolution, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Soviet Union is described in these letters written on official stationery of the Permanent Commission of the Mexican Congress and signed by the actual secretaries of that body as "The Fatherland of the Workers of the World." It is recommended in this message, meant to be a confidential communication to all State governors, that any offense toward communist adherents is to be avoided in view of important diplomatic and commercial negotiations now under way between the Mexican Government and Joseph Stalin, head of the Third International in Moscow. In another of these documents it is disclosed that the sexual and socialistic educational program of the Mexican Government is a concrete, carefully planned preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

OFFICAL MEXICAN PROOF OF SOVIET DOMINATION

You will doubtless be interested in this copy of a circular letter to local legislatures from the Permanent Commission of the Congress of the United States of Mexico. The circular is signed by the two secretaries of the commission. It is dated October 2, 1934. I quote from this official circular the following, in translation:

This honorable permanent commission of the Chamber of Deputies has resolved to express to you that, making ourselves the echo of the ideology that is supported by the division general, Plutarco Elias Calles, supreme chief of the Mexican revolution, we advise you to have conferences with the C. C. governors in their respective states, so that secretly a census may be made of the so-called "Knights of Columbus", with the address of their homes, as well as the so-called "Knights of Guadalupe" and the most prominent Catholics, who at a ripe moment might constitute a danger to the dictatorship of the proletariat toward which we are going. On the other hand, all persecution against the communist elements of the Third International of Moscow shall be suspended, because our revolutionary government is having communications with Joseph Stalin in order to resume conferences, commercial and political

and ideologic agreements at this very time with the great Soviet Russia, mother country of the Workers of the World. * * * It should not escape your notice, esteemed colleagues, that it is necessary to act with extreme caution and special secrecy, because the interests of a whole country are found under our immediate responsibility. * * * Before finishing the present, please keep in mind that this permanent commission will back you against the local executives if quarrelsome or fearful.

And that red socialism in a most perverse form is the primary objective of the soviet group in Mexico is evidenced by this next document, a State dispatch addressed to the governors of the State and municipal presidents by the secretariate general. Dated May 23, 1933, it reads as follows:

By express agreement of the national executive committee of our N. R. P. and superior of the C. division general, Plutarco Elias Calles, supreme chief of the Mexican Revolution, you shall take cognizance that you are to prepare the elements at your disposal for the establishment of the sexual education as the forerunner of the socialistic school which will be implanted when the next government assumes office. This measure is of supreme priority (Es de gran transcendencia) to prevent the great revolutionary family from being divided by fights of merely political ambition. The reactionary element will be frightened and will make the game easy for us.

In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, the following communication, under the state seal of Querétaro, will indicate the communist type of dictatorship now misgoverning the unfortunate people of our sister Republic. My translation is liberal:

By order of the governor, I manifest to you, that the agreement reached by you with General Calles is transcendental, and its realization with admirable exactness will be the definite victory of our cause.

Nothing is better as a banner to accomplish the dictatorship of the proletariat than the systematic attack against the clergymen, the Knights of Columbus, and of Gaudalupe, without forgetting the Catholic parishioners as their necessary aids.

The persecution of this element will impress the workers in our favor, and the socializiation will be finished "with a golden brooch"—"con-broche de oro."

The socialistic school and the sexual education will be magnificent auxiliaries in the endeavor, etc.

(Signed) FERNANDO ZAPATA ARJONA.

You will see how thoroughly this soviet campaign against all religious belief is carried on when I read to you this translation of the oath extorted from all teachers in Mexican schools at the expense of their positions:

I * * * in the presence of the Directorate of Federal Education, solemnly declare that I will accept without any sort of limitation the program of the socialistic school, and that I will be a propagandist and defender;

I declare that I am an atheist, an irreconcilable enemy of the Roman Catholic Apostolic religion, and will do all in my power to destroy it, uprooting from the conscience all religious cult, and that I am disposed to fight against the clergy wherever and whenever it may be necessary;

I declare that I am disposed to take a principal part in the campaign of "defanaticizing" (desfanatizacion) and will attack the Roman Catholic Apostolic religion wherever it might be manifested;

Equally, I shall not allow any religious practice whatsoever to be carried on in my home, nor shall I permit the existence of images; I shall not permit any of my household who may be under my paternal power to assist at any act of a religious character.

I repeat the avowal of my full mind.

JANUARY 23, 1935.

This is what Ambassador Daniels calls "going forward in education."

COMMUNISTIC POSTERS

Even the posters that are placed in strategic positions for the intimidation of the people are Russian and communistic in their inspiration. The rhetorical bombast of Mexico's leaders is the language of sovietism. Official oratory bristles with the verbiage of class unrest. Bookstore windows bulge with Marxist literature. The banner and scythe adorn public buildings and political posters, as you can see by these pictures of them which I hold in my hand. Indeed, the very display of Communist posters by the red artists in Mexico was held in a building which the Government agents proudly point out to gaping American tourists and convention delegates as a newly erected structure, no reference being made to the fact that it was once one of the great Jesuit colleges of the city.

Handbills are distributed urging the youth to despise their parents who forbid them to enter the schools of the revolution and hold them in slavery to religion's fanatic bonds. For example, one reads:

Break the bestial yoke of him you call father and of her you call mother and run to the schools of the revolution where socialist masters will teach you to be free.

Every department has sent out a questionnaire to all teachers and directors, officials and employees in schools, banks, public utilities, and all industries demanding that they state whether they profess, practice, or propagate the principles of the revolution; whether they ever attended church or Mass or any other religious service or permit their wives or children to do so; whether they ever took part in religious processions or had relatives who were clergymen or enemies of the revolution. There is a long list of similar soul-searching in order to secure absolute certainty that none but an unadulterated, antireligious communist shall hold office or position in Mexico, and that wherever the Government's power can reach there shall be excluded from position and economic employment all who are even suspected of belief in God.

BIBLE EXCLUDED FROM MAILS

In addition to this, there is further evidence of the communistic spirit of the military dictatorship now holding the people in subjection in the recent governmental edict that all works or publications teaching a religious idea are to be excluded from the mails. This decree excludes the Bible, the Imitation of Christ, the works of Dante, Shakespeare, Milton, Luther, Calvin, Wesley, St. Augustine—the works of all ancient and modern Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish religious authors, publications, or newspapers. I have an idea that it would exclude even copies of this address I am now making, though it might be good Mexican diplomacy to permit the RECORD of the American Congress to slip by. I suggest that some of you send it down there and see what happens. But you will first have to delete the Chaplain's prayer.

Our Post Office Department has weakly complied with the Cardenas orders and promptly informed some of our most worthy American publications of their exclusion from Mexico, even while Mexican propaganda attacking religion and casting slurs on Americans is carried free in the United States mails. How long is it going to take the administration to wake up to the fact that our public officials are not the masters but the servants of the people who are paying the bills for the mails and all other departments of the Government?

Not without reason, Mr. Speaker, has the State of Arizona served warning on the American people that communism is becoming deeply rooted south of the American border. Senator W. E. Patterson stated, according to the Phoenix Gazette for March 6, that handbills are being distributed in Phoenix practically threatening death to Mexicans in the United States who sign petitions asking for investigation into the true facts in Mexico. Communism in Mexico is no less audacious than its parent in Europe. National boundary lines merit no respect from the spawn of red internationalism.

INTIMIDATING AMERICANS

As another illustration of this communistic disregard of sovereign national borders, the Mexican consul at San Bernardino, Calif., had done his utmost to deter American citizens of Mexican origin from attendance at religious services held on our American soil. He inserted large advertisements in newspapers warning residents of southern California against being present at one of the religious festivals so beloved of the people of that region. According to the testimony given by the mayor and police chief of San Bernardino, it was a clear case of intimidation and threats exercised by a foreign functionary with respect to the rights of individuals domiciled within the borders of the United States. Our present administration did just nothing about it and the State Department did its best to keep the committee from including this fact in its report. Meanwhile, the

Mexican consul at Los Angeles had similarly interfered in our country. Finally American indignation caused the Mexican Government to transfer to Tucson, Ariz., and to Denver, Colo., these hirelings who should have been ignominiously sent home by our Government, had there been any real American statesmanship in control of American destinies.

SCHOOL BOOKS TEACH HATRED FOR AMERICA

As a singularly impressive illustration of the soviet communistic hatred for the United States being instilled into young Mexican hearts, I now hold in my hand copies of the school books, or "readers", as we call them, used today in the socialistic Mexican schools. These, published only a few weeks ago, are for the first and second grades and are entitled "Socialistic School Series." Written by Maria Luisa Vera and Jose Munoz Cota, who call themselves "Miembros de la Federacion de Escritores Proletarios", the book for the first grade is dedicated to the "youth of the proletariat" and they are replete with revolutionary doctrine, attacking religion and America.

I have not the time to read to you all of the "red" attacks made upon religion and authority in these books. It is only necessary to point out that the State of Texas is mentioned for particular execration. Under the title "The Song of Cotton", there is a vicious attempt to stir up in the minds of Mexican children a hatred for Americans as the "white" race and for the plantation owners of Texas in particular. It might be a good thing for you gentlemen from that great State to remember that just south of your border the school books are teaching the youth that your plantation owners are exploiting the groaning workers as "blood drips from their hearts", and verses are printed in these school texts expressing the hope that "the red glow of the sun will be covered by the red blood" of the plantation owners and employers of Texas. What a gentle batch of murderers are these Mexican leaders, who, like Sir Francis Drake, are "as mild-mannered men as ever scuttled ship or cut a throat." Doubtless you will be at least mildly interested in the fact that the children in the socialistic schools of Mexico are taught that it is American throats that need cutting—a real bit of nice, official Mexican discrimination.

So too, in this other school book, at page 103, there appears a story of the protest of the laboring class of Chicago against "excessive work." In part, it reads:

> The police were given orders to disperse the multitude without the authorities taking into account the fact that there were defenseless women and children in the crowd. An enormous confusion took place; shrieks of women and children mingled with the cries of the wounded men. The ground was covered with the bodies of murdered men, but the fight for the 8-hour day had been won.

This story is accompanied by a picture of a marching crowd of laboring people with banners, one bearing an inscription to the "Victims of Chicago" and another, "May the First."

How far Mexican communism has gone in its hatred for the United States can be seen in these two instances. What remains of the policy of the "good neighbor" when the official school teaching is thus deliberately intended to arouse racial and international hatred?

Even the fulsome flattery of our forgetful Ambassador who speaks of such education as "building for all the tomorrows" cannot conceal the fact that official red Mexico is today fomenting in the school hate for America and Americans. There is something more to this propaganda than mere dislike of the American. In the very text you can see the sinister leer of Moscow. For example, in one paragraph, describing the cruelty of the mill owner, it says that "if the Negroes suffer in the fields of cotton (in Texas), in the textile mills they suffer still more cruelly." Here is a typical passage:

> But the employer thinks only of making himself rich. He exploits the machinery of his factory in order to amass money. He never gives a thought to the workers who are left to die of hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I hold no brief for the wrong sort of capitalism any more than I do for the wrong kind of labor theories, but if the Mexican Government and school authorities wish to educate their people for the dictatorship of the proletariat according to the principles of Lenin and Stalin, why do they not call attention to the so-called "capitalistic abuses" in the factories of Monterrey and Mexico City? What about the capitalist Calles, who murdered laboring men during a strike? What about his compelling others to return to work for a daily wage of 6 cents? Where did he make his millions—a bandit leader with no mental attainments worthy of serious mention? What about his rich holdings in England and other countries? What of the exploitation of Mexican workers? No reference is made to these facts. But Mexican children too young to discriminate are being taught that the United States, that Texas and Chicago, are names synonymous with slavery, race hatred, cruelty, and exploitation.

GOOD-NEIGHBOR POLICY DESTROYED

Mexican officials ask Americans to visit Mexico, to be so recreant to our own American principles as to spend our money as tourists in a land whose Government thus makes open and vicious attacks upon our country. They succeeded in inducing our Ambassador to act the part of a travel agent, to laud this sort of teaching, and to extend the welcoming hand to such Americans as are unpatriotic enough and foolhardy enough to run the risk of involving America in the broils of a foreign communist state.

Oh, the White House talks about the "good neighbor" policy! But apparently the policy does not work both ways. We must be a good neighbor to all the world at the expense of the American taxpayer, but the Mexican Government is charitably excused from displaying any good neighborliness on its own account.

Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that the President of the United States can be ignorant of all this? And if not, how long does he expect the patience of Americans to continue? Why is there such subservience to the communists of Mexico? What has he done about the murders of the Americans, Ahern, Wilkins, and Carpenter? Why does he fail to realize that Americans have been murdered and mistreated in Mexico? Why did he (or someone purporting to speak for him) unceremoniously refuse to receive the protesting delegation of the Knights of Columbus, an organization of three-quarters of a million American men, who proved their patriotism in time of war? Like England and France, why does he not instruct our representatives to conduct an investigation into the present denial to Americans of freedom of worship in at least 14 Mexican States? If he could insist upon this in Russia, why not closer to home? Why does he not see that no permanent arrangements for the lease or purchase of Magdalena Bay as a naval base in Lower California are possible with the present treaty-breaking Mexican Government? Why does he encourage our blundering Ambassador? For the President thus constantly to shirk his sworn responsibilities to the millions who are protesting such attacks upon Americans and upon civil and religious liberty is not only aiding and abetting the red enemies of America, but seriously endangering the peace and happiness of our own people. If, as a statesman, he will not think of human rights, let him, as a politician, think of the next election.

NO ONE DEMANDS INTERVENTION

Lest our present position, as Americans, be misunderstood, let me now reassert that it is not the purpose of any American to seek intervention in the purely internal affairs of any other sovereign nation. No resolutions sent to the President have demanded that. It has never been our policy even to attempt to impose our American political principles on any people. While it is true that our Government intervened to place the bandit minority in power and by the present shipment of arms and ammunition from our munition plants to the Mexican dictators, by the sale of gold and silver, and also by the undisciplined and random utterances of its accredited representatives, still actively intervenes to sustain the tyrannous existence of the communist subsidiaries now strangling the Mexican Nation, yet speaking for myself and those I represent, we demand no intervention.

The United States Foreign Relations Papers, 1914, disclosed direct Bryan-Wilson activity in arming and urging the rebels, at the very time when Mr. Wilson was delivering beautiful utterances at Swarthmore, Pa., to the effect that "in no part of this continent can any government survive that is stained with blood", and at Mobile, Ala., that "we shall never condone iniquity solely because it may be most convenient for us to do so." This was intervention without the consent of our American people. Of course with Wilsonian consistency, Mr. Wilson, at or about the same time, stated that we should not deny to Mexico the right to spill blood.

PRECEDENTS FOR AMERICAN PROTEST

It is true that there is ample precedent for official protest. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], a few weeks ago, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD innumerable instances in which America had used her voice and her influence to defend the down-trodden and the oppressed of every nation and clime. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 1362 and 2747.) The waters of the Caribbean, of Manila Bay, the coasts of China and Ireland, the hills of Kishinev and Hungary, testify to America's warm intercession for the victims of persecution and tyranny. We believe that our American people still love freedom and human rights. We know that they stand aghast as Mexico is engaged in a rabid campaign out of the Soviet manual to destroy freedom and morality. We are forced to realize that American institutions built at tremendous cost are being undermined by a red government that utilizing American broadcasting stations for the dissemination of vile songs and propaganda, boasts that it acts under American sanction. We are aware that such an autocracy, distributing soviet literature through the gratuitous use of our mails, an autocracy so maliciously opposed to all sound ideas of human freedom, is a definite peril to religious and civil liberty in the United States, and a threat to our policy of the "good neighbor" with all the Central and South American Republics.

AMERICAN INTERVENTION MUST BE STOPPED

But yet we do not ask intervention. We ask that intervention be stopped. It was American intervention for the sake of oil or other material interests that turned Mexico toward communism. It is American guns that are turned against the innocent worshipers as they leave the Mexican churches. It is American voices that, making careless and thoughtless statements, have given Latin America the conviction that our Government is in harmony with the murderous minority now seeking to communize the people from Panama to the Rio Grande.

Not intervention, Mr. Chairman, but statesmanship; not interference, but withdrawal of interference is the demand of all liberty-loving Americans toward the wealthy military clique now debauching the lives of the unhappy Mexican people.

The United States Government, which reprimanded England for her price-raising rubber monopoly, which prohibited an English radical from entering America, which now threatens to deport one, which refused recognition to the Soviet until it hypocritically promised to respect liberty of conscience in Russia, which went to war to "make the world safe for democracy" at our expense, which sent battleships to China, which intervened in Cuba, which dominated Haiti and the Philippines, which forbade Chile to mobilize against Peru, which admonished Panama because it objected to its settlement of a boundary dispute with Costa Rica, which furnished arms to Obregon and crushed Huerta—this Government goes serenely on and timidly says, "Nothing can be done about it."

Mr. Chairman, something can be done about anything, if those intrusted with the people's affairs have the vision to see and the courage to act. You do not need force, you do not require an army or a navy, you do not even need to threaten. All that is necessary is a little tactful diplomacy, a little unyielding courage, and a goodly portion of sympathetic understanding of forgotten people. And we on the Republican side of the aisle will continue to demand that something be done about it until the voice of the 40,000,000 Christians and 5,000,000 Jews in America can be heard even in the White House and the State Department.

AMERICAN LEADERS FAIL TO LEAD

The Mexican situation has revealed the hypocrisy of much of the present American Government's talk about liberty. It has revealed the unreliability of some of our press. It has revealed the superficiality of our so-called "liberals". It has revealed the weakness of world-peace programs. It has revealed the weakness of those who should be strongest in defense of the people. It has revealed the lack of courage in our "great men." It has revealed so-called "statesmen" as cheap, fearful, picayune, petty politicians.

The truth can be learned by anyone who seeks it. And the truth about Mexico is the truth of brutality, barbarism, and anti-American radicalism.

I do not know what the attitude of you gentlemen over there may be, but I believe in saying what I think. You may not all agree with me, but you will have no doubt about what I mean. I can see no reason for timidity in talking about civil and academic and religious liberty. I am not awed by childish rumors of the wishes of the President and the Secretary of State. Mr. Speaker, it still is better to be right than to be President. It is said that "orders" have been given to let the Borah resolution die in committee. If that happens to the resolution of the eminent Senator from Idaho, Heaven only knows what will happen to the Mexican resolution that I introduced on February 1, 1935! I suppose orders will be sent to take it out some dark night and drop it into the Potomac from the Francis Scott Key Bridge. My resolution may be buried, but I expect to be here for a little while yet and, like William Lloyd Garrison, "I am in earnest, I will not retract, I will not equivocate, I will not be silent, and I will be heard!"

Has the Secretary of State or the President given orders to the chairman of the committee that no resolutions favoring freedom of conscience in Mexico are to be considered? What does the Secretary of State mean in inferring, as was stated in the review America for March 16 last, that such an inquiry would be an infringement upon the prerogatives of the President of the United States? "To what base uses have we come" when a similar argument was dispatched by the Secretary against the plan for public hearings on the Tinkham resolution asking withdrawal of Soviet recognition, only to have the committee set the date and then cancel the hearings after American witnesses against Soviet propaganda in America had come across the continent from California to testify? Why were the hearings canceled? Who gave the orders? Who is now stifling inquiry into the effects of Mexican communism on the United States of America?

What sort of statesmanship is it that denies to the American public the story of the atrocities cited in the files of the American Embassy and consular offices in Mexico and in those of the United States Naval Intelligence? I challenge the administration and the State Department to make public these outrages on American citizens in Mexico—Americans who had believed that even today the United States Government would have the courage to protect its nationals anywhere in the world.

MEXICO'S PLEDGE TO RESPECT LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE INDUCED AMERICAN RECOGNITION

Is it not a curious thing that Emilio Portes Gil, Attorney General of the Republic of Mexico, who had the temerity to insult American citizens by sending here at the expense of our taxpayers under the franking privilege of the United States post office propaganda attacking the religious belief of the Mexican people—only, I may add, to discover his document totally refuted by the answer of Bishop Francis C. Kelley, of Oklahoma, in his work, Blood Drenched Altars—I say, is it not strange that Senor Gil should so emphatically deny that America had demanded a promise from Mexico that she would respect liberty of conscience as a prelude to recognition? Mr. Gil—and I remind you that he is the Attorney General of Mexico—this paladin of truth and honor declares that no such promise was ever made.

In order to refresh another official Mexican memory, I will now narrate the facts and read to you the letter that those who were most concerned in it have conveniently overlooked. On January 6, 1916, the United States Senate adopted a resolution calling upon the President to disclose what assurances had been given by the Mexican Government as to the protection of foreigners and citizens, particularly in the free exercise of their religion, in public or in private. On February 17, 1916, the President transmitted to the Senate a letter to himself from the Secretary of State, enclosing various documents. The Secretary's enclosure no. 4, representing a letter from Senor Arredondo, headed "The Confidential Agent of the Constitutionalist Government of Mexico to the Secretary of State of the United States", reads as follows:

Mr. Venustiano Carranza, depositary of the executive power of Mexico, whom I have the honor to represent in this country, has authorized me to say to Your Excellency that his public declarations of December 12, 1914, and June 11, 1915, bear the statement that the Government he represents in its capacity of a political entity, conscious of its international obligations and of its capability to comply with them, has afforded guaranties to the nationals and has done likewise with regard to foreigners and shall continue to see that their lives and property are respected in accordance with the practices established by civilized nations and the treaties in force between Mexico and other countries. That besides the above, he will recognize and satisfy indemnities for damages caused by the revolution, which shall be settled in due time and in terms of justice.

HERE IS THE LETTER WHOSE EXISTENCE MEXICAN AGENTS NOW DENY

The enclosure marked no. 7, referred to in paragraph 7 of the letter of the Secretary of State to the President, is this:

MY DEAR MR. LANSING: Complying with Your Excellency's request asking me what is the attitude of the constitutionalist government in regard to the Catholic Church in Mexico, I have the honor to say that inasmuch as the reestablishment of peace within order and law is the purpose of the government of Mr. Venustiano Carranza, to the end that all the inhabitants of Mexico without exception, whether nationals or foreigners, may equally enjoy the benefits of true justice, and hence take interest in cooperating to the support of the Government, the laws of reform, which guarantee individual freedom of worship according to everyone's conscience, shall be strictly observed. Therefore, the constitutionalist government will respect everybody's life, property, and religious beliefs without other limitation than the preservation of public order and the observance of the institutions in accordance with the laws in force and the constitution of the Republic.

Hoping that I may have honored Your Excellency's wishes, I avail myself of this opportunity to reiterate to you the assurances of my highest consideration.

E. ARREDONDO.

This letter was dated October 8, 1915, and 11 days later Secretary Lansing wrote to Señor Arredondo stating that the President of the United States—

Takes this opportunity of extending recognition to the de facto government of Mexico, of which Gen. Venustiano Carranza is the chief executive.

The final outcome of the Mexican pledge to respect liberty of conscience, a pledge that was iterated and reiterated by the head of the Mexican Government and by its representatives in Washington, appeared when the new constitution of Mexico was adopted by the Carranza party on January 31, 1917, without reference to the people. An inspection of that instrument shows that every pledge made by the representatives of the Mexican Government was deliberately and completely violated. The record made by the Mexican Government since the adoption of the constitution has shown an almost unbroken violation of the rights which the Government promised to respect.

As a result of this recognition, Mr. Speaker, we permitted Carranzista troops to ride on American railroads through United States territory in order to attack Villa, in consequence of which Villa, in reprisal, raided Columbus, N. Mex., killing a number of the citizens and several United States soldiers.

Some politicians certainly have short memories. Mr. Portes Gil now denies all this. So that the record will be in permanent and succinct form, here let me round out this phase of the question by reading to you this article of David Lawrence, the noted Washington correspondent, in the issue of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin for August 19, 1926, showing that even before Mr. Lansing became Secretary of State, religious freedom was made the basis of Mexican recognition:

WILSON AND BRYAN WARNED MEXICANS—RELIGIOUS FREEDOM MADE BASIS OF RECOGNITION OF REPUBLIC IN 1915 BY UNITED STATES—CARRANZA MADE PROMISE

Search of the files of the Department of State in the latest volumes made public shows that both President Wilson and Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan felt that the treatment by the Mexican authorities of Catholics was a subject for informal diplomatic protest by the American Government.

On the whole it shows, however, that the American Government did make religious freedom a condition of the extension of recognition to the Carranza Government, which has since been succeeded by other governments in Mexico.

Secretary Bryan said March 20, 1915: "The President has referred to me your important letters of the 23d of February concerning the present distressing situation in Mexico, with the request that I tell you very definitely what the attitude and acts of the administration have been in the matter of the protection of the rights of conscience and of worship there, a matter in which the administration, I need not say, is deeply interested, as all true Americans must be.

"A democracy must be sustained by education, and, above and beyond all, the full flower of democracy lies in religious freedom, the principle which the builders of our own Republic made the crown of the whole structure.

"This administration is, of course, the servant of the American people. It seeks to be governed by their convictions and by the principles which have governed their political life. It has felt to be its duty to urge upon the leaders of Mexico, whenever an opportunity offered, the principles and methods of action which must underlie all real democracies as they have supported ours.

"The Mexican leaders will certainly know that, in order to command the sympathy and moral support of America, Mexico must have, when her reconstruction comes, just land tenure, free schools, and true freedom of conscience and worship."

In October 1915, when recognition was extended to the Carranza government, the latter gave a written assurance to the Wilson administration that "all the inhabitants of Mexico, whether nationals or foreigners, may equally enjoy the benefits of true justice" and that the new government "will respect everybody's life, property, and religious beliefs."

Again the record shows that in 1915 the Senate of the United States requested the then Secretary of State to secure assurances from the Carranza government, recognition of which was then in question, that the said government, if recognized by the United States, would grant religious liberty to all its—Mexico's—citizens. The Mexican Government recognized our right to make the inquiry and its confidential agent—practically its then Secretary of State—wrote to the Secretary of State, as I have already stated, under date of October 8, 1915, assuring him the constitutionalist government of Mexico would respect religious liberty. The United States Senate accepted this statement and the Carranza government received recognition.

The records of the State Department will show that throughout 1914 and into 1915 up to the time of the written Arredondo pledge, President Wilson delayed recognition of the so-called "constitutional" government of Mexico. It was this pledge, the result of a conversation between Señor Arredondo and Mr. Lansing, who had succeeded Mr. Bryan as Secretary of State, that overcame the last obstacle and paved the way to the prompt recognition of the very government that Mr. Calles now dominates. Sic transit another "scrap of paper." Another pledge to America is broken and our present administration apparently does not care.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR GOES ON RECORD AGAINST MEXICAN POLICIES

I am glad to inform the House that the American Federation of Labor has publicly announced its adherence to the principles of religious and other liberty. Only a few weeks ago, on March 13, 1935, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (p. 3582) copies of correspondence between the President of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. William Green, and myself, in which Mr. Green read an emphatic and much-needed lesson to the Federation of Labor in Mexico concerning the principles of liberty.

This is particularly interesting at this time in view of the fact that my resolution, now reposing comfortably in the committee, besides asking our Government to protest against the Mexican war on liberty, requests that the Department of Labor investigate the condition and manner of entrance to this country of aliens in the Mexican border States who may be on relief, occupying positions normally held by American labor or otherwise disemploying our people. There are, for example, approximately 95,000 Mexicans in Bexar County, Tex., in which San Antonio is situated. For over 200 years San Antonio has been a veritable Mecca for Mexicans. Before Texas independence, of course, residents of Mexico

had extensive commerce with it as one of their own cities. For the last century they have carried on a traffic with it as if it were one of their own. They like San Antonio, they enjoy visiting it, they respect its people, they think of it in their daily lives. Los Angeles is the only other city in the country which enjoys a similar reputation and it draws chiefly from western Mexico.

There are probably 70,000 Mexicans in Los Angeles, more than 50,000 in Colorado, thousands in Chicago, in the industrial region of northwestern Indiana, and elsewhere in the North, though they naturally prefer the southern climate.

Since the difficulties in Mexico began, there has been a continual exodus to San Antonio. Refugees cross the border at many towns, but San Antonio is their goal. They do not consider such ports of entry as Brownsville, Laredo, Eagle Pass, or Del Rio as goals, but as passage points. They are bound for San Antonio. With such a great affluence as there has been in the last few years, it is impossible to keep track of the numbers, and even if agencies were disposed to do so, it would be difficult to be accurate, for many are reticent about revealing their status, and they can obtain refuge among their own people without a great deal of questioning.

MEXICANS SUPPORTED BY AMERICAN RELIEF AGENCIES

While my figures may be wrong and you may correct me if you think so, I believe 8,000 would be a conservative figure of the number of refugees of all classes now in San Antonio alone. It would probably not be inaccurate to say that there are 5,000 of them receiving some form of relief.

Let us consider that 87,000 Mexicans are normal and legitimate residents of San Antonio. We add to this figure 8,000 refugees of all types. Suppose that 4,000 of these are workers capable of holding some sort of position, who have earning power. The other 4,000 we shall consider as relief subjects, without going into further detail about their status.

The economic condition of the 87,000 normal Mexicans in San Antonio is, at any time, very low. There are some who are rich and some who are well-to-do, and others who are comfortable, but the vast majority must depend upon an income of from a few cents a day to $1 as a maximum. There are many families of from 7 to 12 members who live on $1 a day or less. Under the present depression there is a high percentage of unemployment among these people. The result of these conditions is an abnormal percentage of sickness, including tuberculosis. At the last meeting of the Bexar County Tuberculosis Association it was revealed that San Antonio has the second highest death rate from tuberculosis in the United States.

You can therefore see the urgent necessity for adjusting the Mexican problem without unreasonable delay. A great burden will be lifted from the shoulders of American labor and American charity. Economic losses will be reduced by the return of thousands of Mexicans to their own country. For this reason, then, Mr. Speaker, if not from the higher aspect of human rights, our President and Secretary of State should no longer remain unmoved. And I repeat that my resolution is still awaiting action.

AMERICA IS ON TRIAL

It is a strange thing that while real Americans have the utmost contempt for the hypocritical tenets of red radicalism, yet at our very door the poisonous passion flower of virulent international sovietism blooms under the nurture of a wealthy despotism. The Government of Mexico is a bolshevist and military dictatorship that, just as in Russia, holds the population in subjection without their approval or consent and in defiance of their appeal and protest against the oppression imposed upon them.

Borrowing the words of the United States Supreme Court, we say: "The child is not the mere creature of the State", and back to us from Guadalajara comes the taunt of the red czar of Mexico: "This is selfish doctrine—the children and the youth belong to the community, they belong to the collectivity—the revolution has the inescapable duty to take possession of consciences." This is the lip service rendered to communism by the wealthy military junta now debasing the lives of the poor Mexican people. This is the challenge which they hurl at lovers of freedom in America and throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, America is on trial before the entire world. Our people are the exponents and protagonists of freedom for all mankind. From us, from this House of Representatives, there must go forth today a mighty roll call, a call not to partisan or political bias but to patriotism and humanity. Why are you timid, you Americans of little faith? Where now is our vaunted love of liberty? Where is our unfettered American press? Where our boasted world peace programs? Where now are our courageous, upstanding, and independent statesmen? Where are those who so incessantly prate about "human rights"?

Remember that every individual, every publication, every statesman, every representative, every organization that supports the Calles campaign of revolution and robbery is his ally. The blood of the martyrs is on their consciences. Those who are driven against the walls and shot down for the crime of loving Christ better than their lives are their victims. The helpless peasants, exiled to the penal islands or massacred for the offense of believing in God, are the prey not only of Calles but of all who are silent while innocent blood drips from their fingers. Take care, men and women of America, lest it happen that there today be men and women and children under the blue skies of Mexico who will yet die, because American leaders lack moral courage!

THE VOICE OF A WASHINGTON

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Government of Mexico has submitted its case to the consideration of enlightened American opinion. By its own actions, through its own utterances, it must be judged. We have weighed Mexico's official conduct and declarations in the scale of the American principles to which she has appealed for support. What do we find? Can we discover one vestige of freedom in all the land of Mexico?

Liberty as we know it is dead, crushed and lifeless and in its place a degradation of human rights that is not less than persecution and enslavement.

"Such," says a noble descendant of an illustrious family, "such is the slavery that today oppresses our sister nation, Mexico. There a decadent government, controlled by men who know not God nor care for His laws nor the right of men, whose only thought is self-aggrandizement, and who are devoid of every instinct of truth and honor and justice, have taken from the people the right to life, liberty, and happiness. Such was the slavery of ancient Rome when religion was dead, when morality was destroyed, when patriotism was extinguished. But the church enjoined justice in the hearts of masters and forbade hatred in the hearts of slaves, implanting there instead a mutual sense of love and loyalty, and so down through the ages has she stood by the cradle of liberty. She has unflinchingly opposed tyranny and despotism, proclaiming every man to be free and equal in the sight of God. There is nothing in the Catholic Church opposed to the genius of our Government. Here church and state function in highest harmony. Each stands for the betterment of man, for his betterment spiritually and materially. Patriotism and Catholicism to the consistent American Catholic are one and the same thing."

Who was it who declared this truth? A man, Mr. Speaker, whose noble ancestors have written their names in luminous characters into the history of mankind, a man who, honored in our midst, would today be an outcast, an outlaw, a criminal in the land beyond the Rio Grande. These are the words, my colleagues, of the great-grandson of John Augustine Washington, the brother of our first President, Father Richard Washington, now rector of the Chapel of the Sacred Heart at Hot Springs, Va.

But out of the Kremlin at Moscow comes the red doctrine that the citizen is the mere chattel of the dictator, the slave of the ruthless red International. The Soviet agents in Mexico echo the cry. They boast that they have destroyed academic freedom, political equality, religious liberty at our very door. America, they dare to assert, is next.

MOSCOWISM BLOODY AND UNADORNED

Mexican communism no longer hides its grim features. It is Moscowism, bloody and unadorned—the law of the bayonet, the law spoken by the fiery mouth of the musket, the law that gives power of tyranny to a few and misery and slavery to thousands. It is red sovietism undermining the foundations of the New World. We saw it born in Russia, but it was afar off. Now it thunders at our gates.

Persecution of religion is only a step in its program, in the creation of the red dynasty. The Soviet leaders know that communism will be accepted only by men who have their souls crushed out of them, when they are slaves, cowed and hopeless and groveling. It cannot live in a land where men are men, where they can fortify themselves with spiritual strength and stand up and say, "I am free; I am the captain of my soul!"

Mr. Chairman, behind all the persecution in Mexico is red Russia, offering help if Mexico will set up from the Rio Grande to the Panama Canal an association of radical republics. It was not without reason that delegates have been sent by the Mexican dictator to study in Moscow the Russian principles and methods of government. Communism looks across the seas, and observes that here the western world stands open. Why strain at the cross-crowned portals of Poland, Christian and warrior for a thousand years, when Mexico, already subdued by an irreligious and illiterate military clique, is ready at hand, and just beyond, the goal of all Soviet ambition—America, and American riches? The dark forces of the ancient gods, throwing out their vanguards from the battle ground of the Ural Mountains, have carried the war to us. The forces of pagan darkness, of reversalism, of communist animalism are arrayed against reason, against America, against the Christian culture of the new world. The fight is not now on the blood-stained steppes of Siberia, it is at our own door—the fight to save America from the degradation of Russia, a degradation that reduces man to the level of a soulless animal, a communized, high-powered beast. It is the old warfare between the Powers of Light and the powers of darkness, the struggle of freedom against the red czar of Mexico and the Russian Soviet in their mad endeavor to crucify Christian civilization upon the crimson cross of communism!

This, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues of the House, is the perilous situation that today confronts our Nation. I ask the President of the United States, I ask you Members of this Congress, I ask every God-fearing citizen of this country, I ask every friend of liberty in the land: In the name of God and the American Republic, what must be our answer? [Applause.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE].

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, my sole purpose in rising at this time is to read into the RECORD an unusual statement which appears in today's Washington Daily News from the hand of Heywood Broun, and also for the edification of the faithful 15 Members who still remain in the Chamber. Under the consent to speak out of order, I am going to read this article myself instead of sending it to the desk:

"Born while the guns were roaring, some of them not yet quite 17, the youth of France takes up where another generation stopped from wounds and death and exhaustion."

I quote from a press dispatch which reads: "Paris, April 23.—'War babies,' 120,000 strong, streamed to the colors today to swell the number under arms in France to 420,000. In cities and villages throughout the land the conscripts—born while the big guns of the World War were roaring—thronged railway stations, leaving for barracks for the start of their 18-month training period. Gay for the most part, the recruits sang and joked as they said 'au revoirs.' Many carried gifts of candy, cake, and delicacies."

Born while the guns were roaring, some of them not yet quite 17, the youth of France takes up where another generation stopped from wounds and death and sheer exhaustion.

"And how old did you say Pierre was now? Seventeen his next birthday? I suppose he must be quite big by now. It's years since I saw him. And yet it seems like yesterday that he was just a baby crawling along the parlor floor. And certainly it can't be so long ago that I watched him playing with his blocks in the garden in front of the house and building forts and castles."

"Oh, yes, Pierre is taller than his mother now. He has to shave regularly once a week. Only yesterday we saw him off when he went to join his regiment. He's a man and he's gone to serve his country."

Born while the big guns roared in the Great War, carried by some woman of France heavy already with the fear for her loved ones on the battle line. And perhaps she prayed for a daughter or she said, "They fight that this one close to my heart may never know the agony which is theirs."

Surely no woman bargained that she should conceive in pain to place new recruits upon the altar of anguish. "Sleep, little cabbage, close your eyes and heed not that distant rumble. It is the guns, but they are separated from you by many miles and by the years of your infancy. Daddy's gone a-hunting for that peace which shall be everlasting."

The war babies were gay as they set forth to put on horizon blue and take the chance of what the next 18 months may bring. They never heard the screams and moans of those who lay in No Man's Land throughout the night cut off from stretcher bearers.

And as they munched their chocolate they sang the lively songs of the boulevards. Not yet have they learned, "Here's a toast to the dead already and a cup to the next man that dies."

The Penrods of Paris play as yet something which is a game. They've cut the apron strings and are rollicking off to barracks. Who's afraid of the big bad war? And not even the littlest of the new recruits will whimper in the night or say to the sergeant, "Comrade, I'm homesick." And yet Herod was more merciful when he killed the new-born while they were still in swaddling clothes. These are the lads torn loose after 16 or 17 years of nurture. Nor are they being sent to war. They will but drill and fight sham fights and thrust bayonets a little awkwardly into the straw bellies of dummies swung upon a crosspiece.

"This is the thrust, little man, if you would disembowel your adversary."

Of course, this isn't war. This is the preparedness which makes for peace. The next world war is all the way around the corner.

Pierre and Gaston, Henri and Georges, be choosy with your bon bons. Take one of the better sort all wrapped in foil. Here's a maraschino cherry. You play at war. You lark and sing. But note that something stirs in the wheatfield below the ridge where you and the other babies are encamped. It moves slowly and on its belly. Infants, that is the next war. It creeps up upon you. And it will be a war of blood and torture. Take another chocolate.

You did not hear, your mother did, the guns of the last conflict. You must break free of that prenatal curse. Now is the time to say, "I will not." Speak for your own integrity and that of the woman who bore you. You are life and old men would condemn you. Death always condemns life. Choose for yourself and for the young and the quick of all the world. They are your comrades.

And you, the women of England and Germany and Italy and America, how old is your son? And are you content to wean him to carry on the line of crosses?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LUCKEY].

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a table.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on the naval appropriation bill now before this House. I rise to voice the sentiment of the peace-loving element in America. Let us pause for a moment and consider what we are doing. Just the other day we passed in this House a bill carrying the second largest peace-time Army appropriation ever enacted. We have now before us H. R. 7672, calling for the huge expenditure of $485,443,847 for the Navy Department and naval service for the fiscal year of 1936. When we contemplate the huge sums appropriated in past years for Army and Navy purposes, especially in 1935, and then note that to those large sums there was diverted from the P. W. A. fund $238,000,000, we may well ask, "What does this all mean?" and "Where are we going?"

Are we not a peace-loving Nation, and are we not at peace with the world? Is attack or invasion imminent? If not, against whom are we preparing? Is not our geographic position one of the most favored in the whole world? Yet, in the face of all this, we propose to spend more for preparedness than any other nation. Does this not stamp as a lie our oft-repeated assertion that we are the most peace-loving Nation in the world?

Let us look at the facts and see where we stand. I give here the figures for naval appropriations and expenditures

for the years 1924–34, inclusive. These figures have been compiled from Government records at Washington and they appear on page 941 of the 1935 World Almanac. I leave off the odd dollars:

Expenditures, by years	United States	Great Britain	France	Japan
1923	$346,000,000	$315,000,000	$31,000,000	$137,000,000
1924	328,000,000	281,000,000	43,000,000	196,000,000
1925	323,000,000	271,000,000	40,000,000	124,000,000
1926	317,000,000	327,000,000	49,000,000	112,000,000
1927	320,000,000	281,000,000	72,000,000	119,000,000
1928	336,000,000	282,000,000	96,000,000	127,000,000
1929	366,000,000	278,000,000	99,000,000	130,000,000
1930	375,000,000	271,000,000	64,000,000	130,000,000
1931	357,000,000	281,000,000	134,000,000	131,000,000
1932	353,000,000	250,000,000	109,000,000	104,000,000
1933	349,000,000	245,000,000	94,000,000	146,000,000
1934	282,000,000	260,000,000	106,000,000	201,000,000
Total	4,052,000,000	3,342,000,000	937,000,000	1,657,000,000

Now, what do these figures show? They show that we are appropriating and expending for our Navy more money than any other nation, and yet it is asserted that we are woefully unprepared. Then, in the name of common sense, where is this money going and why have we so little to show for it?

Is it not about time that we call a halt to this orgy of spending? Our Nation is groaning under the heavy and terrific burden of taxes. Why is the Congress asked year after year for even bigger and bigger appropriations for the Army and Navy? It is because these Army and Navy people are military minded. They think in terms of preparedness. They think in terms of war. It is their profession to do so. They ever want a bigger and better war machine.

We do not condemn them for this. We have employed them to do this very thing. But let us check their demands by the yardstick of common sense and reason. Let us not be led off on a tangent. Let us examine each item and cut out the useless and obsolete deadwood which dissipates the Navy's strength. One of the sharpest indictments of waste in the Navy comes from one of its own officers, Rear Admiral T. P. Magruder, who, a few years ago, had the courage to tell the public where he thought the Navy was inefficient. A prominent Washington writer, Raymond Clapper, in his recent book entitled "Racketeering in Washington", points out many wasteful practices in the Navy.

But why a big Navy? One of the chief arguments in favor of a large military machine is that it is the best insurance for peace. If that were true, Europe, in 1914, should have been safe from war, for all her nations were prepared to the highest degree.

It has been stated here on the floor of the House by the proponents of this bill that we must build a Navy second to none, that we must become the mistress of the sea. We must do this to protect our commerce. Well, we went into the World War ostensibly to protect our foreign commerce and to make the world safe for democracy. But where is our foreign commerce today and what has become of democracy? Our ill-fated effort has cost us over $40,000,000,000, and thousands of our boys are sleeping in Flanders Field. The tears of our Gold Star Mothers have been shed in vain and we have reaped the enmity of the world.

Are we so stupid that we cannot see the futility of it all? Have we forgotten that "righteousness exalteth a nation"? Is not the just and fair dealing with other nations the greatest safeguard for peace? Let us come back to our senses and reason together. If nations must depend on force to settle their misunderstandings, then modern scientific warfare spells the doom of civilization. I am opposed to this huge appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this huge appropriation, and I appeal to the peace-loving American people to deluge their Representatives in Congress to put a stop to this war racket. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I would rather have the honor of returning this time to the House at this late hour than to try to condense what I have to say to fit this short time. I thank the chairman very much for his generosity in yielding to me.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk start reading the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the first paragraph of the bill.

Mr. CARY. 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. McCORMACK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7672, the Navy Department appropriation bill, 1936, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ESTATE OF THE LATE MR. JUSTICE HOLMES (H. DOC. NO. 166)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Congress is aware that Mr. Justice Holmes bequeathed his residuary estate to the Government of his country. It is the gift of one who in war and in peace devoted his life to its service. Clearly he thereby sought, with a generous emphasis, to mark the full measure of his faith in those principles of freedom and justice which the country was founded to preserve.

I shall, I think, be interpreting aright the feeling of the country and the wishes of the Congress if I suggest that this striking gift be devoted to some purpose worthy of the great man who gave it. Mr. Justice Holmes was fond of saying that we live by symbols. Our fellow citizens of this generation would, I am confident, desire the Congress to translate this gift into a form that may serve as a permanent impulse for the maintenance of the deepest tradition that Mr. Justice Holmes embodied.

That tradition was a faith in the creative possibilities of the law. For him law was an instrument of just relations between man and man. With an insight into its history that no American scholar has surpassed; with a capacity to mold ancient principles to present needs, unique in range and remarkable in prophetic power; with a grasp of its significance as the basis upon which the purposes of men are shaped, Mr. Justice Holmes sought to make the jurisprudence of the United States fulfill the great ends our Nation was established to accomplish. Our generation will not soon forget, as the learned the world over will long remember, his extraordinary achievements as judge, as historian, and as philosopher of the law.

The Congress will, I am sure, agree that it is fitting to utilize this opportunity to remind those who will come after us of our sense of the eminence of Mr. Justice Holmes. In so doing we do not merely commemorate the distinction of an American to whom the whole world has paid tribute. We also mark for posterity our pride in his faith in American democracy, his confidence in the power of our legal institutions to realize, when rightly used, the highest American ideals. Posterity which learns the significance of a life such as that of Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., draws inspiration from its understanding.

I therefore commend to the Congress that the bequest of Mr. Justice Holmes be not covered into the general fund of the Treasury but that it be set aside in a special fund at this time, and at a later date be devoted to purposes which will effectively promote the contributions which law can make to the national welfare. Once it is decided that the Holmes bequest be set apart for special use the precise object may await ample deliberation. A select committee of the Congress, acting in collaboration with a committee of

the Supreme Court of the United States, will doubtless evolve the wisest uses to which this noble bequest should be put.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 25, 1935.*

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL BUILDINGS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, presented a conference report (Rept. No. 793) on the bill S. 2035, to amend an act approved June 25, 1934, authorizing loans from the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works for the construction of certain municipal buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a conference report (Report No. 794) on the bill (H. R. 6223) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

STATE ALLOTMENTS UNDER THE COTTON CONTROL ACT

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 258, to provide for certain State allotments under the Cotton Control Act.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am faced with the same proposition that confronted me last night in connection with another bill which was brought up at the close of the day under a unanimous-consent request. This is not a proper practice to follow. I do not know that there is anything wrong with this resolution; the gentleman from Illinois spoke to me about it as far as that is concerned, but this is not the way to legislate, and I am opposed to it.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection a moment?

Mr. SNELL. Certainly.

Mr. KELLER. This is simply a committee amendment to the Cotton Control Act. The amendment passed the House unanimously.

Mr. SNELL. I know the gentleman presented it, but I did not think it was unanimously adopted.

Mr. KELLER. The amendment passed unanimously. I say "unanimously", it was accepted by everybody; there was not a single voice raised against it.

This amendment is necessary by reason of the fact that Illinois was not known as a cotton-raising State. She had been raising some cotton, but not more than five, six, seven, or eight thousand bales. The Bankhead bill provided that the allotment should be made on the previous 5-year record. During those 5 years Illinois had had a major flood in 1927, a secondary flood in 1928; and there was a very severe drought during the years 1929, 1930, and 1931. Figured on the basis of the Cotton Control Act, the amount of cotton we would be allowed to raise would be next to nothing. This amendment merely increases the amount of the allotment.

Mr. SNELL. I think the explanation of the gentleman is all right, but I do not think it is proper to legislate in this way. If the Speaker intends to continue recognizing Members to bring up matters of legislation in this way I shall insist on having a quorum present so that every Member can look out for himself.

I have tried to be decent about this matter, and I do not want to object to individual bills being brought up, but it is not the fair and legitimate way to legislate.

Mr. KELLER. I entirely agree with the gentleman, but I consulted him on Monday when I introduced the resolution.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman has been fair as far as I am concerned.

Mr. KELLER. The resolution was published in the RECORD, and I stated then that I intended to call it up at a later day. I published it for the information of the House, and unless there is some very good reason for the objection, it should not be made.

Mr. SNELL. But I am opposed to this way of legislating.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as far as I am concerned this question is purely impersonal. However, it seems to me that during this session of Congress we have got into a bad habit of calling up resolutions and bills by unanimous consent late in the day when very few Members are on the floor. It is not very much of a job to get unanimous consent to pass important legislation if only the introducer of the legislation is on the floor. I think the membership of the House generally has the right to assume that after general debate during all the afternoon on a bill such as we have had this afternoon, no important legislation is going to be brought up. I believe, out of fairness to the membership of the House generally, it is a bad habit to allow Members to ask unanimous consent to bring up and pass important legislation at this time.

The bill which the gentleman from Illinois seeks to have called up now was introduced only 2 days ago and was referred to a committee. The committee has taken no action on it, and the purpose of the Unanimous-Consent Calendar is to bring up legislation by unanimous consent. On those days every Member of the House is put on notice that unanimous consent may be asked to pass bills, but Members of the House generally have the right to assume that after general debate such as we have had today, legislation of this kind will not be called up. I think it is a bad practice to allow it to be done.

Mr. KELLER. May I make a suggestion to the gentleman? I spoke to the committee to try to find out about this matter. The bill became marooned over in the Senate. The people out in Illinois are ready to plant cotton in the two counties where they depend on cotton crops for a living, and these people ought not to be penalized in this way unless there is some greater principle involved.

Mr. MAPES. Every Member may work himself up into the feeling that the legislation which he proposes is very important and should be brought up at once. I think we ought to have action by a committee on important legislation before it is called up in the House.

Mr. KELLER. I have consulted members of the committee.

Mr. MAPES. I do not believe that legislation should be brought up at the end of the day by unanimous consent.

Mr. KELLER. I agree with the gentleman. I asked the committee if there was any other way I could get consideration of the resolution, and they informed me there was no other way.

Mr. SNELL. Consent Calendar day is not very far distant.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this sort of thing should be allowed, and therefore, on the principle of the thing, I object.

REVENUE

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain revenue figures of foreign governments.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following figures of revenues of certain foreign countries derived from lotteries.

The Kingdom of Italy supports its Navy in part by lottery money. The gentlemen who referred to the lottery this afternoon seem to fail to grasp the significance of a national lottery. It perhaps could not be expected of these great naval experts.

Data of the receipts from Italian lotteries follow:

	Lire
1923–24	195,500,000
1924–25	210,900,000
1925–26	475,800,000
1926–27	481,000,000
1927–28	526,000,000
1928–29 [1]	480,000,000

Lottery revenues of certain other foreign countries [2] which are modest compared to the revenues from the most popular lotteries participated in by the American people:

AUSTRIA [3]

	Schillings
1923	1,381,000
1924	2,824,000
1925	6,404,000
1926	5,805,000

BRAZIL [4]

	Milreis
1923	1,800,000
1924	1,100,000
1925	1,100,000
1926	2,100,000

CZECHOSLOVAKIA [3]

	Crowns
1924	27,300,000
1925	29,100,000
1926	45,600,000
1927 [1]	42,300,000
1928 [1]	42,100,000

DENMARK [3]

	Krones
1924–25	2,500,000
1925–26 [1]	2,500,000
1926–27 [1]	2,500,000

HUNGARY [3]

	Pengos
1924–25	200,000
1925–26	800,000
1926–27	1,200,000
1927–28 [1]	1,400,000

GERMANY [4]

	Reichsmarks
1926–27	35,800,000
1927–28	42,800,000
1928–29	47,700,000
1929–30 [1]	50,000,000

PORTUGAL [3]

	Escudos
1922–23 [1]	870,000
1923–24 [1]	1,860,000
1924–25 [1]	1,560,000
1925–26	6,600,000
1926–27	5,700,000
1927–28	9,300,000
1928–29	17,000,000
1929–30 [1]	16,900,000

SPAIN [3]

	Pesetas
1925–26	95,700,000
1926 (6 mos.)	102,100,000
1927	112,300,000
1928 [1]	113,800,000

The receipts from lottery monopolies and taxes are given in the domestic currencies of the various countries. The following are the par rates of exchange as quoted in the Federal Reserve Bulletin for January 1931 in cents per unit of foreign currency:

	Cents
Austria, schilling	14.07
Czechoslovakia, crown	2.96
Denmark, krone	26.80
Germany, reichsmark	23.82
Hungary, pengo	17.49
Italy, lira	5.26
Portugal, escudo	4.42
Spain, peseta	19.30

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow. I may say I make this request because it is felt that if we begin at 11 o'clock tomorrow we may be able to finish the consideration of the pending bill tomorrow and adjourn over Saturday.

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, I shall not object to the gentleman's request if he will include in the request that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next; otherwise I shall object. If that situation is definitely in front of the membership tomorrow, we will get through.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning and that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may say that I agree with the gentleman from New York. We convened at 11 o'clock this morning. There were very few Members on the floor. Some of us have work to do in the mornings and also have committee meetings to attend. It was practically 12 o'clock today when we got started with general debate on this bill. I know of one Member who was promised 20 minutes and was cut down to 10 minutes. This is not the fault of the gentleman handling the time. It seems it is of little avail in the long run to meet at 11 o'clock.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think that is true, generally speaking, but at the same time the occurrence that happened this morning might have occurred if we had met at 12 o'clock. I make this request at the suggestion of the chairman of the committee, who advises me that if we begin at 11 o'clock tomorrow we can finish the bill tomorrow, and I am hopeful we may do so.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, when we meet at 11 o'clock the attendance in the afternoon during general debate dwindles down to a corporal's guard. Some of us stay on the floor nearly all the time, and I think it is manifestly unfair to those who do spend their time on the floor to meet at 11 o'clock. It is also hard on the newspapermen in the press gallery. They are not always able to be here at 11 o'clock and in this way miss a great deal that goes on. However, I shall not object.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to serve notice now that on tomorrow morning, after the reading of the Journal, I shall ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution which I called up this afternoon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BOEHNE, for 2 days, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet, in accordance with its previous order, tomorrow, Friday, April 26, 1935, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS

(Saturday, Apr. 27, 10:30 a. m.)

Subcommittee will hold hearings on bill (H. R. 6374) providing compensation for the Post Office Department for the extra work involved in the return of valuable packages from the dead-letter office to the writers. Room 213, old House Office Building.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 6607. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination

[1] Budget estimates.

[2] League of Nations: Memorandum on Public Finance 1922–26; 1926–28.

[3] Lottery is a government monopoly.

[4] Lottery tax.

of Fox River and its tributaries in Clark County, Mo., with a view to the control of floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 788). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. S. 865. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of the Willamette River and its tributaries in the State of Oregon, with a view to controlling floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 789). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 6829. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination of Sebewaing River, in Huron County, Mich., with a view to the controlling of floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 790). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. AYERS: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 1531. An act to credit certain Indian tribes with sums heretofore expended from tribal funds on Indian irrigation works; without amendment (Rept. No. 791). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WERNER: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 1537. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of Shannon County, S. Dak., in the construction of a consolidated high-school building to be available to both white and Indian children; without amendment (Rept. No. 792). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HAINES: A bill (H. R. 7731) to provide for the erection of a statue of Abraham Lincoln in the Gettysburg National Cemetery; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MORITZ: A bill (H. R. 7732) to reduce the rent of houses and apartments for Government employees in the District of Columbia; to encourage the investment of idle capital; to put laboring men to work; to take men off the relief rolls and put them on pay rolls; and to reduce the hazard of disease; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 7733) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 7734) for the economic rehabilitation of the Mescalero Indians of New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 7735) to authorize the erection of additional facilities to the existing Veterans' Administration facility, Lake City, Fla.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KNUTE HILL: A bill (H. R. 7736) to provide for the establishment of the Whitman National Monument; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 7737) to increase the minimum salary of deputy United States marshals to $1,800 per annum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: A bill (H. R. 7738) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of the products of child labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RAMSAY (by request): A bill (H. R. 7739) to amend chapter 104, section 6, of the acts of 1887 of the United States, relating to the printing of schedules showing the rates of fares and charges for the transportation of passengers and property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZIMMERMAN: A bill (H. R. 7740) granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Missouri to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Black River at or near the north line of section 2, township 24 north, range 6 east, near Poplar Bluff, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 7741) to authorize an appropriation to pay non-Indian claimants whose claims have been extinguished under the act of June 7, 1924, but who have been found entitled to awards under said act as supplemented by the act of May 31, 1933; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN: Resolution (H. Res. 204) for the consideration of H. R. 151; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. COLE of New York: A bill (H. R. 7742) granting an increase of pension to Carrie L. Fay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEEN: A bill (H. R. 7743) for the relief of Mrs. David C. Stafford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 7744) for the relief of J. T. Schoolcraft; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 7745) for the relief of George E. Collins; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7746) for the relief of Herbert Winn Casey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7747) for the relief of Walter Herbert Green; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7748) for the relief of William Martin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7749) for the relief of Elmer Burlingame; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 7750) granting an increase of pension to Mary Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7751) granting an increase of pension to Ella N. Nerwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7752) granting an increase of pension to Georgiana K. Griest, widow of William P. Griest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 7753) granting an increase of pension to Addie L. Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WITHROW: A bill (H. R. 7754) granting a pension to Kathryn Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7508. By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Petition headed by W. H. Clark, of Ashland, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7509. Also, petition headed by Frank L. Clark, of Decatur, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7510. Also, petition headed by J. P. Cummings, of Leeds, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7511. Also, petition headed by M. Summerset, of St. Petersburg, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7512. Also, petition headed by Cape Smith, of Morris, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7513. Also, petition headed by C. A. Hollis, of Beaverton, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7514. Also, petition headed by D. J. Wordlan, of Altoona, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7515. Also, petition headed by A. Sinnington, of Lawrenceburg, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7516. Also, petition headed by James A. Wingo, of Empire, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7517. Also, petition headed by Jim Benton, of Carbon Hill, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7518. Also, petition headed by M. Clifton, of Lanett, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7519. Also, petition headed by A. Brown, of New Orleans, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7520. Also, petition headed by A. Wright, of Owensboro, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7521. Also, petition headed by A. T. Martinez, of Las Vegas, N. Mex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7522. Also, petition headed by Pat Vecehione, of Benwood, W. Va., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7523. Also, petition headed by J. A. Stevens, of New Hanover, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7524. Also, petition headed by S. W. Cox, of Cherokee, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7525. Also, petition headed by C. M. Harvey, of Elizabethton, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7526. Also, petition headed by Lionel Myers, of Elizabethton, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7527. Also, petition headed by Fred Austin, of Pastura, N. Mex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7528. Also, petition headed by Charles Montgomery, of Monroeville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7529. Also, petition headed by K. Ballentine, of Cloverdale, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7530. Also, petition headed by G. Jackson, of Tuscumbia, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7531. Also, petition headed by John L. Smith, of Grand Ridge, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7532. Also, petition headed by O. W. Cason, of Otter Creek, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7533. Also, petition headed by I. B. Garrett, of Fayetteville, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7534. Also, petition headed by C. T. Robinson, of Amory, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7535. Also, petition headed by Willie Hainfield, of Glenora, Va., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7536. Also, petition headed by G. F. Scoggins, of Siluria, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7537. Also, petition headed by John Cook, of Bremen, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7538. Also, petition headed by Frank Kniser, of Edwardsville, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7539. Also, petition headed by Nicholas Byrnes, of Topeka, Kans., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7540. Also, petition headed by J. R. Phillips, of Almo, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7541. Also, petition headed by Joseph Sarlo, of Melrose Park, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7542. Also, petition headed by R. E. Carter, of Mascot, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7543. Also, petition headed by John C. Satter, of Harpers Island, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7544. Also, petition headed by Edward Austin, of Pastura, N. Mex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7545. Also, petition headed by W. B. Ford of Trezevant, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope Plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7546. Also, petition headed by C. L. Curkling, of Puryear, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7547. Also, petition headed by Harvey Martin, of North Chicago, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7548. Also, petition headed by Martin Ujdur, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7549. Also, petition headed by V. Batts, of Mayfield, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7550. Also, petition of J. F. Drake, of Memphis, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS,

the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7551. Also, petition headed by G. W. Childs, of Zwolle, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7552. Also, petition headed by Willie Robison, of Selma, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7553. Also, petition headed by David Smith, of Madison, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7554. Also, petition headed by J. C. Norrid, of Barnhart, Mo., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7555. Also, petition headed by W. F. Wilson, of Cabot, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7556. Also, petition headed by M. S. Roper, of Danville, Va., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7557. Also, petition headed by R. H. Lucas, of Owensville, Ind., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7558. Also, petition headed by S. Spicer, of Tamo, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7559. Also, opinion headed by M. Hatchett, of North Little Rock, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7560. Also, petition headed by Henderson Phelan, of Aberdeen, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7561. Also, petition headed by W. T. Brown, of Bridgeport, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7562. Also, petition headed by R. L. Bellville, of Weston, Mass., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7563. Also, petition headed by Fred Jefferson, of Hub, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7564. Also, petition headed by W. E. Barrett, of Jasper, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7565. Also, petition headed by Lorenzo Copua, of Steger, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7566. Also, petition headed by C. L. Slaughter, of Ensley, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7567. Also, petition headed by Elbert Wright, of Harrisburg, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7568. Also, petition headed by S. Thomas, of Atlanta, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7569. Also, petition headed by Robert Summitt, of Trussville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7570. Also, petition headed by N. E. Carroll, of Maryville, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7571. Also, petition headed by R. J. Bass, of Trussville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7572. Also, petition headed by S. Emmerson, of Atlanta, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7573. Also, petition headed by John Ward, of Perry, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7574. Also, petition headed by H. Eisenberg, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7575. Also, petition headed by John McComb, of Houlka, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7576. Also, petition headed by D. A. Morris, of Patsburg, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7577. Also, petition headed by C. H. Hand, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7578. Also, petition headed by S. Harper, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7579. Also, petition headed by M. Reynolds, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7580. Also, petition headed by Jeff Mare, of Shorter, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7581. Also, petition headed by M. Bullocks, of Trenton, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7582. Also, petition headed by Bruce Medians, of Hub, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7583. Also, petition headed by Lorenzo Maloney, of Marshall, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7584. Also, petition headed by A. T. Stanford, of Quinton, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7585. Also, petition headed by M. Lewis, of Decatur, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7586. Also, petition headed by J. T. Williams, of Albertville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7587. Also, petition headed by A. M. Cooper, of Hickory, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS,

the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7588. Also, petition headed by Jim Lynch, of Heth, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7589. Also, petition headed by T. N. Stripling, of Kennedy, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7590. Also, petition headed by Clark Allis, of South Pittsburg, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7591. Also, petition headed by T. P. Jenkins, of Irondale, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7592. Also, petition headed by G. S. Parish, of Bonifay, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7593. Also, petition headed by Bert Goodwin, of Crane Hill, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7594. Also, petition headed by W. C. Harnil, of Bremen, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7595. Also, petition headed by S. Nabors, of Wilton, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7596. Also, petition headed by M. Fairchild, of State Line, Ind., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7597. Also, petition headed by J. Whitman, of Altamont, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7598. Also, petition headed by J. E. Logan, of Ashland, Mo., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7599. Also, petition headed by John Alexander, of Madison, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7600. Also, petition headed by A. Watts, of White Rock, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7601. Also, petition headed by H. Armstead, of Florence, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7602. Also, petition headed by B. Helton, of Atlanta, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7603. Also, petition headed by John R. Price, of Madisonville, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7604. Also, petition headed by General Smith, of Roland, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7605. Also, petition headed by Robert Shipp, of Proctor, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7606. Also, petition headed by C. Henderson, of Boaz, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7607. Also, petition headed by B. R. Perry, of North Chicago, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7608. Also, petition headed by P. M. Morris, of Glen Allen, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7609. Also, petition headed by J. H. Young, of Memphis, Tenn, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7610. By Mr. BOYLAN: Concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York, relative to the program of Federal acquisition of land for State forests included in House bill 6914; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

7611. By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: Petition of George S. Douglas, president, and Gust H. Bachmann, secretary, of the Perham Game and Fish Protective League, of Perham, Minn., praying for the support and vote of legislation that would establish a closed season on migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7612. By Mr. DRISCOLL: Petition of the Security Holders Protective Association of Oil City, Pa., signed by John Reid, president, and John H. Glass, secretary, both of Oil City, Pa., opposing House bill 5423; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7613. By Mr. KENNEY: Resolution of the International Workers Order of Hackensack, N. J., endorsing the unemployment and social-insurance bill (H. R. 2827), and demanding its immediate enactment by the Seventy-fourth Congress of the United States of America; to the Committee on Labor.

7614. By Mr. MERRITT of Connecticut: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, urging the Congress of the United States to terminate the application of the cotton-processing tax and the North-South wage differential in the cotton-textile industry, and to enact legislation which will restrict the importation into this country of any textile article from any country in a greater volume than the average annual volume of importation of that article from such country during the years 1930–34, inclusive; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7615. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of Charles Schaefer & Son, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., endorsing House bill 5802, introduced by Congressman LEA of California, to protect the American poultry and egg industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7616. Also, petition of the New York Credit Men's Association, New York, concerning the proposed banking bill for 1935; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7617. Also, petition of the State of New York Conservation Department, Albany, N. Y., concerning the Fulmer bill (H. R. 6914); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7618. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, concerning the repeal of the charter of the North River Bridge Co., which was granted by an act of Congress of the United States (ch. 669, 1889–90, 51st Cong., and Public Act No. 350, 67th Cong., 1922); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7619. By Mr. POLK: Petition signed by Oregon E. Evans, L. D. Spencer, S. P. Sigesmund, and 342 other citizens of Scioto County, Ohio, urging the early passage of House bill 5262, entitled "A bill for the purpose of regulating interstate highway transportation for the protection of the public as well as in the interest of orderly and coordinated transportation"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7620. By Mr. SHANLEY: Petition of the General Assembly, State of Connecticut, January session, 1935, concerning the textile industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7621. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of Kanawha Camp, No. 2, United Spanish War Veterans, of Charleston, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 6995; to the Committee on Pensions.

7622. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of Local Union 7070 of the United Mine Workers of America, New Philadelphia, Ohio, by their secretary, Lawrence Minnis, urging support of the Guffey coal bill, Wagner labor-disputes bill, and the Black 30-hour-week bill; to the Committee on Labor.

7623. Also, petition of the American Blue Shirts of Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, by their secretary, C. C. Cunningham, urging support of the Nye-Sweeney bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7624. Also, petition of Local 1418, United Mine Workers of America, New Philadelphia, Ohio, by their secretary, Joseph Walker, urging support of the Guffey coal bill, the Wagner labor-disputes bill, and the Black 30-hour-week bill; to the Committee on Labor.

7625. Also, petition of H. J. Donnelly and numerous other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging support of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7626. Also, petition of the United Textile Workers of America, Cleveland, Ohio, by their secretary, Theo. R. Longmire, urging support of the Wagner labor-disputes bill; Connery bill, providing labor representation on codes; Connery Resolution No. 141, to prohibit use of Federal arms and supplies during strikes; and Byrnes bill, S. 2039, stopping shipment of strikebreakers over State lines during strikes; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 26, 1935

(Legislative day of Monday, Apr. 15, 1935)

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, April 25, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. 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:

Adams	Clark	Hatch	Nye
Ashurst	Connally	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Austin	Coolidge	Johnson	Pittman
Bachman	Copeland	Keyes	Pope
Bailey	Costigan	King	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Couzens	La Follette	Robinson
Barbour	Cutting	Lewis	Russell
Barkley	Dickinson	Logan	Schall
Bilbo	Dieterich	Lonergan	Schwellenbach
Black	Donahey	McAdoo	Sheppard
Bone	Duffy	McCarran	Shipstead
Borah	Fletcher	McGill	Smith
Brown	Frazier	McKellar	Steiwer
Bulkley	Gerry	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Gibson	Metcalf	Trammell
Burke	Glass	Minton	Vandenberg
Byrd	Gore	Moore	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Guffey	Murphy	Wagner
Capper	Hale	Murray	Walsh
Caraway	Harrison	Neely	Wheeler
Carey	Hastings	Norris	White

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent because of illness, and that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are necessarily detained from the Senate. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] are necessarily absent.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Senate Memorial 6

Whereas the city of Palatka, Putnam County, Fla., has, with the cooperation and the financial assistance of the Federal Government, converted its municipal waterworks property into one of the outstanding beauty spots of not only Florida but of the entire Nation; and

Whereas great numbers of citizens of the United States, including residents of every State in the Union, have during the winter season just closed visited and enjoyed Palatka's Ravine Azalea Gardens; and

Whereas the gardens, with their thousands of azaleas, magnolias, flame vines, crepe myrtles, cherokee roses, and a profusion of tropical plantings, have attained to the proportions far beyond local or even State-wide interest and scope: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully memorialized to enact the necessary legislation to authorize the United States Government to receive and accept as a gift from the city of Palatka, in the State of Florida, the said Palatka Ravine Azalea Gardens, embracing 85 acres of land and all plantings and improvements thereon, and to constitute and maintain such gardens as a national park or garden for the pleasure, education, and edification of all persons seeking beauty in and knowledge of flowers, vines, plants, and native trees such as are found in this place of indescribable beauty; and be it

Resolved further, That the secretary of state of the State of Florida is directed to transmit a duly authenticated copy of this memorial under the great seal of the State to the Congress of the United States and to each of Florida's Senators and Representatives in the Congress; and that our said Senators and Representatives are most earnestly requested to employ their best efforts to induce the Congress to act favorably to the accomplishment of the purposes outlined in this memorial.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Nevada Home Labor Association, Reno, Nev., favoring modification of the law governing the awarding of contracts so as to more rigidly compel contractors to employ Nevada citizens and workers on any and all public works within the State of Nevada, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for an investigation of charges filed by the Women's Committee of Louisiana relative to the qualifications of the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. LONG and Mr. OVERTON], which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance, of Little Rock, Ark., and vicinity, praying for the enactment of the so-called "Costigan-Wagner antilynching bill", which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by Westmoreland County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jeannette, Pa., favoring the prompt enactment of the so-called "Patman bill", providing for the immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate the memorial of John B. Watson, of Media, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the prepayment, or payment in advance of maturity, of the adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram from the Square Deal Association of Louisiana, by Oscar R. Whilden, leader of the First and Second Congressional Districts, New Orleans, La., relative to certain alleged statements of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] in connection with the disbursement and distribution of Federal funds in Louisiana, and pledging the support of the association to the national administration, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BARBOUR presented a memorial of the New Jersey Women's State Republican Club, representing 1,500 women, remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called